

# 7

## The Formation and Legacies of Racial and Ethnic Minorities

THE PREVIOUS CHAPTERS HAVE ARGUED THAT MANY SOCIAL DIFFERENCES between individuals and groups are socially constructed rather than a reflection of intrinsic biological differences and that these constructed ideas about difference are often used to justify or perpetuate oppression. Ethnic and racial distinctions, for example, are routinely taken for granted and assumed to represent fundamental differences between groups of people. Whether true or fictitious, these ideas about racial and ethnic differences have been used throughout history to categorize people. At the same time, identification with ethnic and racial groups, and the sense of belonging they foster, is often a source of pride, resistance, and resiliency. Ethnic and racial groups are a vital part of the fabric of society, and we will review some of the historical and social processes that led to the emergence of the minority status assigned to several ethnic and racial groups in the United States and explore how the minority status of several different ethnic and racial groups is rooted in a legacy of oppression and discrimination and a rich history of resistance and resiliency. Minority status will be explained in its social and historical contexts. The minority status assigned to some groups is not a natural given but the product of particular historical contexts and events (Preece, 2006). For example, being black in Nigeria does not make a person part of a racial minority group; however, being black in the United States or in Brazil makes a person part of a minority group. It is the history of slavery and its legacy of oppression in Brazil and in the United States that gave this group its minority status. The term “minority” is not used in this chapter in a numerical sense but instead is used in a sociological sense to describe the group’s lesser power and status compared to other groups, particularly vis-à-vis the white majority. Likewise, when the term “majority” is used, it is not used in a numerical sense but reflects the concentration of power within that group.

### COLONIALISM AND GENOCIDE: NATIVE AMERICANS

Colonialism is a system of organizing society that concentrates all the power over the local population in the hands of an invading outsider group. The process

of colonization not only targets land but also aims at colonizing the minds, the emotions, the bodies, and the labor of those residing on the occupied land (Brown, 1993). The process of colonization is justified by the oppressor or dominant group's definition of the conquered group as inferior. Conversely, adopting a social Darwinist viewpoint, the dominant group views itself as superior and better equipped to rule.

Colonialism has been part of the human experience since the beginning of civilization: examples of empires that have practiced colonialism are the Roman, Portuguese, Spanish, British, and Japanese empires. Although Rome, Lisbon, Madrid, London, and Tokyo were very different colonial metropolises that reached their zenith of power and expansion at different times in history, these empires shared much in terms of goals, organizational styles, and outcomes. In all cases, the top authority of the colonial power (the Caesar, the king or queen, or the emperor) never resided on the colonized lands. The empires not only imposed their culture on the colonized populations, but they extracted raw materials from the colonies and made them buy back the manufactured goods they produced using the raw materials. The original residents of the colonized lands were viewed by their conquerors as lacking the social and intellectual capacity to govern their own affairs.

During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Africa underwent an intensive process of colonization. With very few exceptions, by the beginning of World War II, Africa had become a fully colonized continent. The colonial political map of Africa shows how European powers carved out pieces of the continent and its wealth to benefit themselves. The colonial ambition of rulers such as King Leopold of Belgium has been well documented in books such as *King Leopold's Ghost* (Hochschild, 1998). The resurgence and expansion of slavery is intimately related to the colonial experience of Africa from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Slavery on such a large scale and such a high level of organization would not have been possible without colonialism as its economic and political engine. The legacy of colonialism continues to cast its shadow over Africa. For example, artificial national borders created by European powers and favoritism toward one indigenous group over another during colonial rule led to ethnic group conflict and genocide in Rwanda in the mid-1990s. Colonial administrations deliberately suppressed or stunted the development of strong educational and health institutions. Since political independence was won in the second half of the twentieth century, African nations struggled in a global economy dominated by the West, subject to rich nations' manipulation of the raw materials and commodities that are Africa's chief revenue source. Beleaguered by the demands of rapid population growth, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, interethnic strife and civil war, falling agricultural production, and poor industrial and technology capacities, even very resource-rich countries like the Congo (formerly Zaire) have seen their average incomes cut in half in recent decades.

Colonialism is closely related to the concept of internal colonialism, which was first introduced by Robert Blauner (1972) to show how African Americans faced social conditions in the United States that were similar to those faced by developing nations as a result of European colonialism, such as lack of political and economic power. Internal colonialism does not require incursions across international borders. The oppressive power relations take place within national borders, although the relationship and its end results are similar to the classic forms of colonialism. The United States followed a colonial path, subjugating African Americans, Native Americans, Native Hawaiians, Mexicans, Filipinos, and Puerto Ricans to colonialism when their land or labor became attractive economic and political targets. Internal colonialism continues to be a means for the dominant racial group to perpetuate social inequalities for its own benefit. The shadow of internal colonialism is reflected in contemporary society's perception that some groups are racially inferior as well as in the persistence of racially segregated ghettos and neighborhoods. The extreme social isolation and economic marginalization of some African American and Latino urban communities has been attributed to their lack of economic, administrative, and political control, which are typically held by white outsiders. In the 1960s, for example, young black militants interpreted their racial oppression as a form of internal colonialism and aligned themselves with developing countries and groups struggling for liberation from the legacy of colonialism in Africa (Takaki, 1993). Despite these important struggles, the legacy of internal colonialism persists, as evidenced by the fact that one in every four black men comes under the control of the criminal justice system at some point in his life, the majority for nonviolent offenses (Brown-Dean, 2007). This has very damaging consequences not only for these men but also for their families and their communities.

The concept of internal colonialism explains how racial inequality in the United States has been perpetuated over time, but it lacks explanatory power for the changing conditions of African Americans and members of other ethnic minority groups, such as the gains that have been achieved in educational and occupational opportunities and in earnings, which have increased upward mobility for some. Although the concept of internal colonialism needs to be updated to maintain its relevance in a rapidly changing world, it continues to provide important insights into the ongoing oppression of ethnic and racial communities in the United States and around the world.

Genocide is often connected to colonialism, but it can occur autonomously within nations without outside intervention. Genocide is the organized effort to eliminate an entire group of people. The United Nations (1951) defines genocide as "actions committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnic, racial, or religion group as such." Some argue that this definition is too narrow because it limits genocide to the killing of a group and does not consider policies of cultural, social, political, and economic destruction. It also leaves out classes

and groups that are not necessarily ethnic or communal, such as gays, lesbians, and transgender groups (Melson, 1992). These groups were targeted by the Nazi party and continue to be vulnerable to the threat of genocide in many societies (Abed, 2006). Other definitions of genocide as organized state murder highlight the role of the state as a key component of modern premeditated genocide (Fein, 1979).

Genocide has devastating consequences not only for those who perish but also for those who survive. Native American scholars have argued that some contemporary ills experienced by Native American communities in the United States can be traced to their ancestors' experience of genocide. That is, the post-traumatic stress disorder experienced by survivors of genocide can be passed on to later generations, as shown by research on descendants of Holocaust survivors and Bosnian survivors of "ethnic cleansing" (Becker, McGlashan, Vojvoda, & Weine, 1999; Bower, 1996). These studies all demonstrate that the PTSD associated with survival of genocide is as much of a collective phenomenon as that associated with genocide itself. Genocide that is connected to colonialism and internal colonialism is part of the legacy of many ethnic and racial communities in the United States and other countries. For example, the legacy of colonialism and genocide affects many Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian refugee communities that have settled in the United States. It is often through narratives that those legacies surface, which allows them to be honored so that the related trauma can be addressed.

The experience with both colonialism and genocide and their legacy resulted in the present minority status of the descendants of the original inhabitants of what is today the United States. Native Americans, also called American Indians and First Nations people, were for many centuries the only inhabitants of the United States centuries before the European arrival. These groups developed a variety of cultures (identities) and political organizations. When the Europeans invaded the Americas in the late 1400s, Native Americans were a numerical majority, but over time and due to colonialism and genocide they were decimated, and in addition to becoming a sociological minority (that is, they had less power than those in control), they also eventually became a numerical minority.

Genocide commenced almost immediately after the arrival of European explorers in the so-called New World, beginning in 1493 with Christopher Columbus's enslavement and mass extermination of the Taino population of the Caribbean. Within three years, 5 million Taino had perished, and a Spanish census from fifty years later records only two hundred left alive. Columbus's contemporary, the historian Father Bartolomé de las Casas (1992), reported numerous atrocities perpetrated on indigenous people, including mass hangings, the roasting of people on spits, and the hacking of children to pieces for use as dog food.

Later European colonists and subsequently the United States government resorted to various means for removing Native Americans, including the extermina-

tion of whole villages, bounties on the scalps of Natives, and bacterial warfare. In one of the first reported uses of bacterial warfare, British agents murdered more than 100,000 members of the Mingo, Delaware, Shawnee, and other Ohio River tribes by distributing blankets purposely contaminated with smallpox, an Old World disease to which the Native population of the Americas had virtually no resistance. The same measure was used against the Ottawa and Lenape tribes, and the U.S. Army successfully duplicated the practice on Plains tribal populations (Friedberg, 2000). The colonial governments offered large sums of money to whites for the scalps of Native Americans. The state of California spent approximately \$1 million a year from gold rush revenue to finance campaigns whose purpose was exterminating the Native people during 1851–1852. Whites received between fifty cents and five dollars for each severed head (Chatterjee, 1998). In addition to this intentional slaughter, Native Americans were forced by whites to give up their traditional occupations, which resulted in poverty, hunger, illness, and death (Berkhofer, 1978).

The enormity of what David Stannard (1993) has called an “American holocaust” parallels the unfathomable and more recent human losses suffered during the Holocaust. The systematic murder of European Jews under the Nazi regime is estimated at around 65 percent of the prewar population, while the rate of attrition of indigenous populations in the United States is calculated at around 98 to 99 percent, meaning that only about 1 to 2 percent of the original indigenous population survived genocide (Friedberg, 2000). White attitudes to the slaughter are exemplified by an editorial by L. Frank Baum (the author of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*) that was printed in the *Aberdeen Saturday Pioneer*, a weekly South Dakota newspaper, in 1890: “Our only safety depends upon the total extermination of the Native Americans. Having wronged them for centuries we had better, in order to protect our civilization, follow it up by one more wrong and wipe these untamed and untamable creatures from the face of the earth. In this lies safety for our settlers and the soldiers. . . . Otherwise, we may expect future years to be as full of trouble with the redskins as those have been in the past” (qtd. in Ritter, 1997, p. 21). In addition, cultural misperceptions and stereotypes contributed to the cultural demise of Native American communities. European and European American failure to appreciate the cultures and tribal identities of the Native American nations led to a history of confusion, myths, stereotypes, and misunderstanding that has been particularly destructive to Native communities. Native Americans were viewed as savages and as scalp hunters. The Europeans’ lack of appreciation for and understanding of the Native American cultures as well as other indigenous cultures in colonies such as Australia allowed them to label the Native people they encountered as less than human and to target them for elimination (Fenzsch, 2005).

Although Europeans had engaged in a nearly continuous history of warfare before coming to the Americas and continued fighting among themselves for con-

trol of the New World, in order to justify their genocide of Native people, they constructed an image of the Native Americans as fierce and savage fighters (Mihesuah, 1996). Even the U.S. Declaration of Independence refers to Native populations as “merciless Indian Savages.” This helped disguise the reality that many armed conflicts with the Native communities occurred because the Europeans wanted to expropriate Indian land and enslave Indians to serve as laborers for mines and farms. More often than not, Native Americans were merely defending their territories, families, ways of life, and sovereignty from the intruders.

Through government decrees and policies, surviving Native people lost not only their lands, but also their parental rights. This practice started as early as the 1540s, when Franciscan friars took the children of the leaders of tribal communities in the Yucatan in Mexico away from their families to be educated in Franciscan schools (Pagden, 1975). In 1898, the U.S. Indian Peace Commission recommended that Native children be educated in the ways of European Americans so their cultural differences would disappear (Johnson, 1974). The mission boarding schools created in light of this recommendation, largely under the control of the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs, took Native children from their parents, homes, and communities—often forcibly—to distant institutions (Cross, Earle, & Simmons, 2000). Forbidden to speak their own language, and given European-style clothes and Christian names, the Native American children who would become tribal leaders once they returned to their communities were systematically stripped of their cultural heritage. These boarding schools took generations of Native Americans away from their homes, and since their way of learning was different from that of European Americans (traditional Native American learning often took place through observation, listening, and hands-on activities rather than through passive lectures and readings), these children struggled in school (Becker, 1998). Torn between their own culture and the one they were supposed to embrace, Native students were often made to feel inferior, and many ultimately lost their connection to Native American culture and never became accustomed to European American ways (Larsen & Jesch, 1980). It was not until 1978 that the Indian Child Welfare Act was created to protect Native American children in need of homes from being placed in non-Native adoptive and foster homes, although today there is still a disproportionate number of out-of-home placements of Native children (Hand, 2006).

Reservations are another legacy of colonialism. As a result of treaties and forced relocation, the number of Native Americans living on reservations had reached 300,000 by 1880 and continued to grow (Thorton, 2000). Although it was not easy to leave their lands and lifestyles behind, Native Americans demonstrated their resiliency by adapting to reservation life. In Oregon, the Native Americans of Grand Ronde demonstrated creativity, flexibility, and initiative during the transition from their vast ancestral lands to the much more limited reservation by developing an agricultural life but continuing to use tribal doctors and methods

of healing (Leavelle, 1998). Native Americans viewed their lives on the reservation as different from their lives “outside”; they struggled to maintain their traditions and cultural knowledge and many started to view reservations as safe places where they were able to preserve and nurture their cultural identity (Lone-Knapp, 2000).

Native American youths who attend school on reservations may develop stronger connections to their cultural heritage because they are not exposed to prejudice from the dominant culture. However, families who decide to stay on the reservation often face inequalities, as they do not have access to the resources and opportunities available in cities. The social problems those inequalities engender, such as unemployment, poverty, and alcoholism, have a negative impact on the well-being of the whole family. Urban tribal members in need often go back to their reservation of origin because the reservation is home. This can present challenges to limited reservations resources and infrastructure, as those returning for help may have multiple and acute needs. In addition, the Community Policing Consortium (2004) reports that returnees often “bring with them attitudes and values that conflict with traditional ways[,] causing disorder and crime” (p. 11).

During the 1950s, in yet another attempt to promote assimilation into the dominant culture, the Bureau of Indian Affairs coordinated efforts for relocation that would lead more than 160,000 Native Americans to leave their reservations by promising them jobs and housing in cities across the nation. Since then, the number of Native Americans leaving the reservations has continued to rise, and currently more than 60 percent live outside Native American communities and reservations (Duran, 2005).

For most of its history, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was paternalistic and authoritarian in nature, and it was regarded with justifiable suspicion by Native American communities. By the 1960s, federal policy began to shift toward a goal of self-determination, meaning that Native American nations would have the power to govern themselves and in turn preserve their culture. The core components of self-determination were the preservation of treaty rights, consultation on policy making, and economic self-sufficiency (Riggs, 2000). New approaches to furthering the Native American cause appeared in 1972, when the American Indian Movement staged the Trail of Broken Treaties, a cross-country protest that brought attention to the mistreatment of Native Americans and the drastic effects of colonization and genocide. Although nothing ever came of the movement’s twenty-point paper advocating the restoration of Native governments (American Indian Movement, 1972), the Self-Determination Act of 1975 granted all tribes the right to manage services and programs formerly administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Despite the organized attempts by European colonial powers and later by the U.S. government to exterminate the original inhabitants of the land, and subsequent policies designed to destroy their cultures and forcibly assimilate them into the dominant society, the number of Native Americans has increased by at least

30 percent in each of the last four decennial censuses (Wilkins, 2006). The census for the year 2000 reported a doubling of the Native American population over the prior ten years, with over four million individuals claiming heritage as a Native American or Alaska Native. This makes them America's fastest-growing ethnic minority group (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). Nonetheless, this group still constitutes less than 2 percent of the total U.S. population and only a minute fraction of the estimated 15 million Native people residing in the territory that is now the United States during the 1500s (Wissler, 2005).

In their struggle for survival, Native Americans have made use of a range of strategies for dealing with oppression while maintaining or renewing their connections to their cultural heritage. One way of accommodating the outside pressures involved not calling attention to themselves or to their cultural differences. Those who adapted in this way may sometimes be seen by other tribal members as not being Native American enough (Ring, 2001). Despite these strategies for survival, the dominant culture's failure to validate Native American pain has resulted in unresolved historical trauma and a myriad of social problems connected to generational post-traumatic stress and its symptoms of alcoholism, rage, depression, and anxiety (BraveHeart, 1995).

Recently, a shift from tribal or clan identity to a broader umbrella Native American identity that has variously been called a pan-Indian, pan-tribal, and pan-traditions identity has taken place. Pan-Indianism offers Native Americans the opportunity to practice Native traditions and retain or regain (through enculturation) a Native cultural identity when away from tribe of origin and even while living among a dominant culture that rejects it. Instead of clustering in neighborhood enclaves, Native Americans living in cities—who now constitute the majority of all Native Americans—tend to live in the midst of other ethnic groups (Powers, 2006). In contrast to reservation identities tied to a specific place and tribal enrollment, membership in urban Native American communities is defined by various criteria that can include Native American ancestry, cultural or tribal knowledge, and active participation in Native American community activities.

Urban Native Americans are often described as "invisible" to non-Native Americans, mainly as a result of their wide geographic dispersion (Jojola, 1999; Lobo, 1998). Urban Native American communities are also very fluid because of frequent movement back and forth between the city and reservations for educational and employment reasons as well as return visits for ceremonies and family responsibilities (Guillemin, 1975; Straus, 1998; Weibel-Orlando, 1991). As a result, not only are Native Americans frequently underserved by the health and mental health service systems, but misunderstandings and disagreements about who is eligible for social services can result in an inability to access services mandated by federal law to be available to all Native Americans through the Indian Health Service (Frith-Smith & Singleton, 2000). Some nations have been able to develop their own sources of revenue through mining, farming, fishing, industry,

and gambling and are using generated revenue to improve the educational, health, and social services infrastructures of their communities. For the first time since colonization started, many individuals are meeting their basic needs and advancing economically and socially without having to let go of their cultural traditions. The use of culturally grounded social work can support a community's efforts to achieve self-determination and improve its quality of life.

**SLAVERY: AFRICAN AMERICANS, EMANCIPATION, RECONSTRUCTION, JIM CROW, AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT**

Slavery, which many consider a tragic but distant chapter in U.S. and world history, actually continues to be a major problem in contemporary societies. It encompasses a variety of widespread human rights violations, including the traditional slave trade, the selling of children, sexual exploitation of children and women, the use of children in armed conflicts, debt bondage, and the selling of human organs (United Nations, 1991).

Slavery dehumanized both those who were enslaved as well as the enslavers who benefited from this form of oppression. Prior to the Civil War, there were approximately four million enslaved African Americans in the United States, numbering more than ten times the number of African Americans living as free men and women (Franklin & Moss, 1994). In order to justify slavery, and very much in alignment with the social Darwinist principles reviewed previously, the ruling elite established an elaborate theory of biological inferiority based on skin color to support the idea that slavery was the proper state of the "inferior" race (Blumberg, 1984). Because people who were enslaved were brought to the American colonies involuntarily, racial inequality had existed from the start (Farley, 2000). Africans who were enslaved as well as free blacks were the victims of discrimination, segregation, violence, and negative racial images that contributed to their racial degradation and poverty, which in turn reinforced prejudice (Takaki, 1993). Slavery provided economic rewards for those involved at every level of the slave trade except for those who were enslaved and their descendents. Slavery benefited slave traders, plantation owners, exporters, and merchants. These dynamics played a large role in the pervasive acceptance of a slavery system that today is universally condemned.

Unlike most of the instances of slavery around the world today, the slave trade in the Americas was part of a system of exploitation that was officially sanctioned by major societal institutions, from politics and law to education, the family, and religion. The slave system in the New World started in the sixteenth century as a way to provide free labor to European colonies in Central and South America and the Caribbean; it was spurred in part by the colonists' inability to turn many of

the indigenous peoples of the Americas into readily exploitable slave labor due to cultural resistance, susceptibility to Western diseases, and genocide (Eltis, 2000).

During the seventeenth century, the first generations of Africans were brought involuntarily to what is now the United States. The first to arrive in the English colony in Jamestown, Virginia, were indentured African servants from the West Indies who were sold by a Dutch ship captain in exchange for supplies (Rawley & Behrendt, 2005). Initially, indentured Africans in British North America had a legal status somewhat comparable to that of English indentured servants, which meant that they were servants for a limited period of time, after which they were released to live a free life and given land of their own. All indentured servants at that time, both white and black, were considered personal property. Soon, however, a legal precedent for racially based discrimination was set. In a 1640 case involving the capture of three runaway indentured servants, the two white runaways were given thirty lashes and an extra four years of servitude, but the black servant was sentenced to servitude for life (Catterall, 1968). By the 1660s, it was understood in the English colonies that black slaves were property with few or no legal rights (Farley, 2000).

Upon their arrival on American soil—after a perilous ocean voyage in inhumane conditions that claimed many lives—African people who were enslaved confronted a painful period of adjustment and disorientation and then had to face illnesses, a life of hard work, and often an early death. Africans captured and forced into slavery were considered expendable, and many slaves died at the hands of their masters through beatings, lynchings, and burnings. In the New World, they lived mostly on plantations, growing cash crops such as cotton, sugar, and tobacco, in dilapidated dwellings and cramped quarters, with substandard food and clothing. Spouses, parents, and children could be separated at the slave owner's whim and sold to different masters because African slaves lacked legal sanction for their marriages. Sexual assaults of women of color by their owners and other white males were common, and because slavery was defined as a racial and hereditary condition, children born of an enslaved mother and her white owner were considered slaves and were sometimes sold by their own biological fathers for a profit (Campbell, Miers, & Miller, 2006). Interracial marriage was outlawed in 1662 throughout the English colonies.

People who were enslaved were considered objects with no legal rights and could not act in their own defense. They could be convicted by the testimony of only one white accuser (Outwin, 1996). The only right that most slaves retained was the right to profess their religious beliefs; in 1670, the colonial government of Carolina declared that religion only alters people's souls, not their civil state or rights; therefore, all people, slaves included, were free to follow their own religious beliefs. However, even that prerogative was limited. Although the open practice of their ancestral African religions was suppressed, many aspects of these religions came to be integrated in the enslaved people's expression of Christianity

(Griffith & Savage, 2006). Even before Emancipation, African Americans developed their own religious institutions. Richard Allen, a free black who was an ordained Methodist minister, founded the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Philadelphia in 1794. Organized religion became a crucial part of African American culture, providing the cohesive force that helped Africans resist slavery (Clarke, 1976).

During and in the years following the U.S. Civil War, African Americans eventually gained their freedom through the passage of several Constitutional amendments, but Emancipation did not mean equality. Segregation and discrimination continued to be practiced and were reinstated through laws that provided a legal framework for racial discrimination, exclusion, and the denial of access to economic and educational opportunities and social advancement (what are known today as Jim Crow laws) in the South, and informal practices that had much the same result in the North. In 1896, with the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, a doctrine of "separate but equal" helped to entrench the system of legal and social resegregation in the South. Under *Plessy*, African Americans were disenfranchised at the voting booth and relegated to second-class status in the public school, transportation, housing, health care, and economic systems.

Throughout history, violence against African Americans often has increased as they have gained more social and political power. For a century after the Civil War, African Americans were routinely victims of violence at the hands of white individuals and mobs (Watson, 2006). Lynchings were used regularly by whites to instill fear, to intimidate African Americans, and to enforce economic exploitation and residential and educational segregation. According to civil rights activists, lynching continues to be practiced in contemporary U.S. society, but under the guise of self-defense or punishment. For example, according to the Stolen Lives Project, 90 percent of unarmed civilians who are suspected of no crime and are shot or killed by police in the United States are black (Lawson, 2003).

During the 1950s and 1960s, two distinct versions of black resistance gained national visibility: one a nonviolent movement inspired by Gandhi, and the other embracing more direct confrontation as the means to produce change. Malcolm X, the leader of the latter group, disagreed with the nonviolent approach of Dr. Martin Luther King (Blumberg, 1984). Before both were assassinated in the 1960s, both Dr. King and Malcolm X worked at improving the life conditions of African Americans, but through different means. These two traditions continue to be used today to analyze current events in African American communities across the nation. To some degree, they have influenced the design and implementation of many community-based organizations where social workers are employed (Sherr, 2006).

As an outgrowth of the civil rights movements and the related passage of civil rights legislation, African Americans slowly gained political power from the dismantling of state laws that had disenfranchised them for a century, and they

experienced an increase in electoral participation and coalition building. During the administration of President Bill Clinton, six African Americans served as secretaries of commerce, agriculture, energy, labor, transportation, and veterans' affairs. Unfortunately, these positions did not entail broad policy-making powers providing opportunities to change the distribution of economic and political resources. Nonetheless, these appointments did reflect an increased representation of African Americans in high government positions. The administration of President George W. Bush continued this trend to some degree by appointing African Americans to selected top posts, including two successive African American secretaries of state. These appointments have been interpreted by some as a form of tokenism rather than a reflection of true equality or representation, but they are also indications of ongoing changes in the national boundaries of political participation.

Slavery has been identified as a cultural marker that continues to influence the identity formation of African Americans today (Eyerman, 2002). Slavery left a legacy of both collective memory and collective trauma and is being reinterpreted by African American communities around the nation. As part of the reconceptualization of slavery, the postcolonial interpretation of the institution of slavery which takes into account the slaves' experiences of oppression and perspective of the institution and at the same time calls attention to the bountiful benefits that slavery produced for the slaveholders in black Atlantic America, is being questioned, and a more accurate and complete story is being developed in its place (Sweeney, 2006). This analysis aims at recognizing the resiliency and the cultural contribution of African American slaves and at the same time advocates the recognition of the enormous economic contributions they were forced to make as slaves. Slavery, for example, has been described as a key institution that allowed the United States to develop into the economic superpower that it is today (Wright, 2006). Inhumane free labor provided the basis for the accumulation of extensive sums of capital that made possible the enormous economic development of the country. A national campaign seeking reparations is underway to persuade the federal government and local governments to approve some kind of compensation for the descendents of the victims of American slavery and the century of de jure racial discrimination that succeeded it.

There is a continuing generational legacy of mistrust toward people outside the African American community as well as a style of communication that has been passed down within families. In her book *Yearning*, the African American feminist writer bell hooks (1990) tells of how her grandmother taught her grandchildren to keep their distance from white outsiders in order to be safe and to protect their "otherness." The federally funded Tuskegee experiment provides an example of the mistreatment African Americans received at the hands of outsiders, in this case the scientific establishment. This study, which began in 1932 and ended only in 1972, tricked impoverished black sharecroppers who had syphilis

but were told they had “bad blood” into taking part in a “treatment plan” that, unknown to them, offered no medical care, even after penicillin became the standard treatment for syphilis. Scientists documented the men’s declining health but did nothing to cure the disease, which over time can cause tumors, paralysis, blindness, insanity, and death. In addition, because the men were not told that they had syphilis, many passed the disease on to their wives and children. In 1997, President Bill Clinton offered an apology to the eight remaining survivors of the Tuskegee syphilis experiment.

Culturally grounded social workers can honor this legacy by designing and implementing interventions that take into account the African American community’s history and traditions. Honoring the struggles of African Americans throughout history is a key component of culturally grounded interventions with this community.

### **ANNEXATION: MEXICAN AMERICANS**

“The border crossed us before we ever crossed the border” is a common saying among older Mexican Americans residing in the borderlands of the Southwest that refers to the annexation of Mexican territories by the United States. Annexation occurs when a group expands its territory by taking control of an area occupied by another group through military action or when residents of the area request annexation (Farley, 2000). Although similar to colonialism in its impact on the local population, annexation occurs when the territory that is conquered is contiguous or next to the expanding territory. For example, the Anglo leaders of the Republic of Texas—then a part of Mexico—requested annexation by the United States in 1837, but the original request was refused by the federal government out of fear that Mexico would be offended. The “voluntary” annexation of Texas into the United States occurred because of agitation for independence by Anglo settlers in Texas and the subsequent war between the United States and Mexico that it triggered.

In the United States, the idea of Manifest Destiny gave rise to the annexation of vast territories and, during James Madison’s presidency, the belief that the United States’ mission was to spread democracy, the only fair way of government. Advocates of Manifest Destiny believed that expansion was necessary, good, obvious (“manifest”), inevitable (“destiny”), and ordained by God. Originally a political catchphrase of the nineteenth century, Manifest Destiny has served as a historical metaphor for the territorial expansion of the United States across North America toward the Pacific Ocean, which displaced both the previous colonial rulers and indigenous populations. Manifest Destiny has racist overtones, as it suggests that white European Americans should lead the expansion over territory

already occupied by other peoples without any regard for them, their rights, or cultures.

Annexation may occur in peaceful or violent ways; for example, the United States' acquisition of Louisiana from France in 1803 (the Louisiana Purchase) was a peaceful annexation, in contrast to the vast territorial annexation of what is now the Southwest United States, which was accomplished through an expansionist war with Mexico in 1846. This war and its consequences have in many ways shaped the history and current status of the Mexican American community. Through forced purchase of land and armed conquest, Mexican territories originally located in the northern territories of New Spain's colonies and later the independent nation of Mexico, and the people residing in them, became part of a new country, and Mexican Americans became a subordinate ethnic group (Bacal, 1994). This experience and its consequences have shaped the history and current status of the Mexican American community.

During the centuries when the Southwest and California were under the political control of Spain and later Mexico, vast regions of the present-day states of California, Texas, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, and Arizona were sparsely populated by Mexican settlers. Thus when English-speaking Americans started to move into these regions in the 1800s to farm and look for gold, they were usually welcomed by the Mexican inhabitants, and mixed marriages between members of the two groups were common. During the gold rush the Anglos' efforts to displace Mexicans, Spaniards, and Native Americans intensified and the efforts toward independence intensified as a means to secure control over the resource-rich lands (Truett, 2006).

In 1846 the United States invaded Mexico and its northern territories. A final military attack on Mexico City gave the Mexican government no choice but to agree to a peace treaty, which took place at Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 and forced Mexico to relinquish approximately a third of its national territory to the United States (Weber, 1973). Under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Mexicans who remained in what became U.S. territory were nominally guaranteed all the rights of citizenship, protection of their property, and the right to maintain religious and cultural integrity, including the use of the Spanish language for all government transactions (Rosales, 2000). However, only the state of New Mexico has honored these provisions. Soon after the treaty was signed, the other territories and states began ignoring the provisions that protected the cultural, political, and economic integrity of Mexican American families and communities (Weber, 1973). A classic example of a violation of the treaty was the lack of recognition of the property titles (land grants) of Mexican families, as a result of which great extensions of land were taken away from their lawful owners. These families appealed to the courts of their new country without success, and many cases reached the Supreme Court (Soltero, 2006). As a result, even though they had been guaranteed citizenship, Mexicans in the U.S. territory became a disenfranchised minority,

foreigners in their own land. At best, Mexican Americans were treated as second-class citizens; at worst, they were victims of overt discrimination (Weber, 1973). Mexican Americans were divested of their properties through legal and political ploys by Anglo farmers, who coveted the land and used claims that the new Americans were not industrious and used the land inefficiently to justify their seizure (Rosales, 1996). This process was facilitated by two conflicting legal systems: the Napoleonic Code of Spain and Mexico and the new U.S. legal system. The latter often refused to recognize the property rights established by the Napoleonic Code, including property rights for communally or collectively owned agricultural lots (*ejidos*), which U.S. law treated as land without ownership (Taylor, 1972). As a result, many families of Mexican and Spanish heritage lost their ranches and found themselves reduced to day laborers on land that was theirs. Overt discrimination, including the loss of property and status in society, forced others, many of whom had never been to old Mexico before, to cross the newly drawn border to return to a shrunken Mexico (Weber, 1973).

At times during the early and mid-twentieth century when their labor was needed, Mexicans were encouraged to cross the border to become temporary workers through the Bracero Program but were not truly welcomed. Mexicans were excluded from mainstream society and isolated by ethnic segregation. Discrimination was rampant even in schools, where children of Mexican descent were trained to become obedient workers and discouraged from pursuing white-collar careers (Rodriguez, 2005). In California and throughout the Southwest there were elementary schools for Mexican Americans only, leading to unequal educational opportunities for Mexican American children. The Mexican American community again went to the courts and in 1946 won the first significant legal case against school segregation with *Mendez v. Westminster*, which served as a springboard for the later case of *Brown v. Board of Education* (Valencia, 2005).

Over time, a Chicano identity developed in reaction to the history of oppression experienced by U.S. Mexican communities. Originally meant as an insult implying a lack of sophistication, the term “Chicano” was appropriated during the 1960s by youthful political militants to signify Mexican Americans’ growing awareness of their special ethnic and cultural heritage (Rinderle, 2005). Chicanos saw themselves as an exploited and conquered people suffering from the deculturalization carried out in schools. *Chicanismo* emphasized the ideology of *La Raza* (the people), which favored collective versus individual achievement of goals. Some of the main goals of the Chicano movement were to strengthen the ethnic identity and pride of Mexican Americans and to advance a civil rights agenda aimed at ending discrimination and promoting equality in jobs, housing, and education (Chávez, 2002). Although in some communities the word “Chicano” has lost its connection to the Chicano movement and is often used as a synonym for “Mexican American,” the term “Chicano” continues to signify a more defiant approach to ethnic pride and identity.

Even before the height of the Chicano movement, Mexican Americans had displayed a great deal of strength in the face of oppression. By 1933, Mexican field workers' protests against their degrading living conditions and poor wages were taking the form of strikes (Takaki, 1993). During the 1950s and 1960s, a Chicano organization called the GI Forum fought discrimination and conducted voter registration drives throughout the Southwest and California (Farley, 2000). It also focused on system reform to improve the educational attainment of Mexican Americans by challenging school segregation. It was also during the 1960s that Mexican Americans turned away from assimilation and started emphasizing a self-defense ideology that promoted the preservation of the Spanish language and Mexican American culture and heritage (Torres-Saillant, 2006).

In order to ease the shortage of workers produced by World War II, the U.S. government established the Bracero Program, which brought five million Mexican-born farmworkers to the United States between 1942 and 1964 (Borjas & Katz, 2007). The Bracero Program was abruptly discontinued, but migrant workers (both documented and undocumented) continue to be hired to work in the fields and they continue to come to the United States in great numbers. Today Mexicans account for approximately 77 percent of the total number of migrant workers and continue to endure the most oppressive working and living conditions. César Chávez was raised under such conditions and in 1962 started the National Farm Workers Association, a crusade he called *el movimiento*. Chávez used Gandhi's nonviolent methods to unionize farmworkers and improve their working conditions and overall quality of life. He dedicated his life to the struggles of migrant workers and fought for basic amenities and decent wages, as well as protection against occupational hazards like exposure to pesticide spraying. At this time, farmworkers' exploitation and misery resulted from the fact that corporate farm owners were either too far away or too indifferent to notice their workers' suffering, even when conditions were so bad that children were dying of malnutrition. Although Chávez was successful and saw changes in many areas, migrant farmworkers continue to face oppressive conditions such as lack of medical insurance and decent housing.

After more than a century of domination, exploitation, and oppression, Mexican Americans continue to be targets of stereotypes and prejudice. Mexican immigrants who have arrived recently regularly find that their choices in jobs, housing, and political participation are restricted (Gutierrez, Ortega, & Yeakley, 2000). Despite all the challenges Mexican Americans have faced as a subordinate group, their experiences with discrimination have produced an "ethnic consciousness" that in turn has helped them develop a strong ethnic identity (Bacal, 1994). In many Mexican American communities, murals are a display of community strength, providing a canvas on which to demonstrate pride in a common cultural heritage and articulate struggles against historical and current oppression (Barton & Delgado, 1998).

Mexican and Mexican American culture has been identified by some as a source of strength that has given rise to the so-called Mexican paradox: despite the fact that Mexican-born mothers (as well as other foreign-born Latina mothers) tend to have lower incomes and less access to health care and begin prenatal care later than other groups, they give birth to healthy babies at rates higher than other ethnic minority groups and non-Latino whites (Buekens, Notzon, Kotelchuck, & Wilcox, 2000). Infant mortality rates are lower for Mexican-born mothers than for whites and African Americans, and even lower than for Mexican American mothers born in the United States. Similar patterns of low infant mortality have been found for mothers from many other parts of Latin America. Immigrant Latina mothers, especially those from Mexico, appear to possess some protective factors related to pregnancy and childbirth that outweigh other risks they face. However, those advantages appear to weaken over time as Mexican mothers become more acculturated. Culturally grounded social work aims at identifying protective factors that lead to positive outcomes so that interventions that capitalize on the strength of families navigating the acculturation process can be designed and implemented.

An example of such an intervention is *Keepin' It REAL*, a culturally grounded intervention that utilizes the protective factors that inhere in the culture of origin to help participants retain healthy behaviors and attitudes. *Keepin' It REAL* is a substance abuse prevention program designed for and tested with predominantly Mexican and Mexican American middle school students in the southwest United States. It draws on the values and communication styles of Mexican American culture to teach youths strategies for resisting drugs—refuse, explain, avoid, and leave, or *REAL*—in ways that are appropriate for the social situations that the youths encounter in daily life. Results from the randomized trial conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the program showed that recent Mexican immigrant students who spoke predominantly Spanish had a significantly lower drug use rate and significantly stronger anti-drug attitudes than their more acculturated Mexican and Mexican American classmates. The lower levels of acculturation found among students who still used Spanish at home and with friends appeared to offer a protective effect against alcohol and other drug use. This protective effect weakened over time as students began to use English as their primary language. Ironically, the intervention was particularly effective among the more acculturated students, mostly because they were more at risk for substance use than their less acculturated counterparts (Marsiglia, Kulis, Wagstaff, Elek, & Dran, 2005).

Despite such hopeful illustrations of the strength that comes from culture, in many parts of the country Mexican Americans are at risk of poverty and poor physical and mental health. They are overrepresented in the criminal justice system and typically have low levels of education, alarming school dropout rates, and high unemployment rates. Anti-immigrant attitudes have caused community

members to be fearful of using social services (Paris, Añez, Bedregal, Andrés-Hyman, & Davidson, 2005). Therefore, culturally grounded social work with Mexicans and Mexican Americans starts with the recognition and validation of the civil and human rights of all clients.

### **MIGRATION, EXPLOITATION, REJECTION, AND THE MODEL MINORITY: ASIAN AMERICANS**

Migration has played a central role in the formation of most major American ethnic groups, including Asian Americans. Migration has been part of the human experience for millennia. It can be defined as the movement of people from one geographic location to another; it can take place within a country or across international borders. Migration can be voluntary (e.g., migration of Europeans in the nineteenth century) or involuntary (e.g., slavery and human trafficking). Migration is a complex process entailing the need to let go of a familiar environment and adjust to an unfamiliar environment. Migration processes are very diverse because they can be triggered by different factors at the sending point and are influenced by different sets of conditions at the receiving point. For example, the migration experience of a wealthy English-speaking family from Hong Kong relocating to Vancouver, Canada, is very different from the experience of a Sudanese refugee family from Darfur relocating to Minneapolis, Minnesota. These differences are often captured by terms used to describe migrants such as “immigrant,” “undocumented immigrant,” “refugee,” “asylum seeker,” “permanent resident,” and “naturalized citizen” that are imposed from the outside to describe different journeys in legal but not necessarily psychosocial terms.

In 1882, the United States passed a law that banned Asians from immigrating to the country. Although ethnic prejudice might have played a role in such an exclusionary policy, economic competition between whites and Asian Americans was more likely the major cause (Farley, 2000). Asians had been coming to the United States in debt as a result of the large amounts of money they had to pay to immigrate and were willing to work for lower wages than whites. Thus negative stereotypes of Chinese and Japanese immigrants stemmed primarily from their roles as laborers and their impact on the job market, allegedly one that drove down wages for native-born workers. The term “coolie labor” (denoting undignified work) dates from this period. The perception that Asian immigrants were taking jobs away from whites or lowering their wages created tension and fed the xenophobia of working-class whites who felt threatened by the influx of Asian immigrants. In some areas with larger Asian communities, intergroup tensions resulted in widespread violence against Asian immigrants (Anbinder, 2006).

In addition, prejudice was fueled by myths that racial mixing through intermarriage between whites and minorities resulted in the contamination of white

racial purity and was therefore dangerous (Kenney, 2002). In 1880, California and other states and territories passed anti-miscegenation laws (the first of which had been passed in the colony of Maryland in 1661 but applied only to marriages between blacks and whites) prohibiting marriages between whites and individuals of other races; this was the first such law to outlaw marriages between whites and Asians (Takaki, 1998). These laws not only served to maintain group boundaries and the power and privilege of the dominant group but created other problems owing to exclusionary laws that made it difficult for Chinese immigrants' wives to migrate to the United States and resulted in serious gender imbalances within the Chinese community in America (Lee & Fernandez, 1998; McKeown, 1999).

Another devastating aspect of the so-called yellow peril was the widespread fear that Chinese and Japanese immigrants were loyal only to their countries of origin and, if not stopped, would take over the United States. This social hysteria reached its height after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, when much of the Japanese American population, most of whom were American born and therefore denied the fundamental civil rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, was interned. The internment experience meant that Japanese Americans had to liquidate their businesses; lost their life savings, homes, and possessions; and lived with the knowledge that American democracy had failed to provide protection for all its citizens. (The belief that immigrants constitute a foreign peril has resurfaced recently in response to newcomers from Mexico and other countries in Latin America.)

Anti-Chinese laws, economic exploitation, and racial antagonism set up an effective exclusionary system that ensured that Chinese immigrants remained strangers in their adopted land (Takaki, 1998). Even today, certain Asian groups are victims of antagonism and are perceived to be foreigners regardless of their immigrant status or history. For example, a customer at a local store may express her surprise when the third-generation Asian American cashier responds to her in unaccented English. Seemingly innocent questions about their origins that imply that they do not belong (e.g., "And where are you from?") constantly remind Asian Americans whose families have lived in the United States for many generations that the majority culture sees them as outsiders. Those who are immigrants continue to experience hardships related to migration. Asians of lower socioeconomic status often face mistreatment as they attempt to immigrate to the United States and are employed by individuals and companies that exploit their precarious financial situations. During the 1990s, federal investigators found seventy-two Thai immigrants indentured illegally in Californian sweatshops—living in virtual slavery behind barbed-wire fences—while their salaries were confiscated to pay the costs of their trip to the United States (Finnigan, 1995).

Recent changes in the way Asian Americans are viewed in our society demonstrate that their status is determined not only by their behaviors and achievements but also by the dominant group's openness to and approval of them. Asian

Americans are no longer perceived to be inassimilable and exotic but are now viewed as industrious and smart. Today, Asian Americans often need to cope with the stereotype of the model minority. The image of Asian Americans as a monolithic group characterized by supportive and self-reliant family ties, high educational aspirations, and personal discipline was created by a changing racial climate rather than by the inherent characteristics of this very heterogeneous group. Attitudes started to change in the 1960s as the term "Asian American" started to be used instead of "Oriental," and Asian Americans' incomes and educational attainment began to resemble those of whites (Zhou, 2004). The model minority stereotype has been exploited by political conservatives and used by policy makers who believe that nongovernmental assistance (i.e., help provided by NGOs) is the key to helping ethnic minorities get ahead. Unfortunately, this stereotype of Asian American self-sufficiency, enterprise, and success leaves many Asians at the mercy of underfunded community assistance programs (Thrupkaew, 2002). A comprehensive review of published social work research on Chinese Americans concluded that they continue to be "essentialized," "otherized," and viewed in a negative light (Tsang, 2001). The stereotype not only promotes antagonism between ethnic minority groups but also overlooks the real needs many Asian American have and makes them vulnerable to being underserved.

### THE END OF RACISM?

Since the civil rights movement and the rights legislation it triggered, public opinion polls have revealed that an increasing number of people think that racism has weakened or even disappeared from U.S. society (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). When people think of racism, many think only of public expressions of extremist racist attitudes and behaviors (like the hanging of a noose from a tree at a Louisiana high school by white students in 2006), which have become increasingly rare; they do not think about the more subtle expressions of racism and discrimination that are still prevalent in our society. There has also been a sharp increase in the number of whites who believe that racial equality exists in most arenas of public life, including access to education, jobs, and public services (Schuman, Steeh, Bobo, & Krysan, 1997). The struggle led by African Americans and their allies during the second half of the twentieth century has produced significant results. In fact, society has witnessed an important reduction in personal racism (i.e., individuals overtly espousing racist and bigoted views and subscribing to stereotypes). There is, however, ample evidence that racism and the problems it engenders have not faded away. The National Opinion Research Center's General Social Survey shows that about one in six white adults still holds the opinion that laws should prohibit marriage between whites and African Americans and that whites should have the right to keep African Americans from living in their neighbor-

hoods (Paradies, 2006). Racially prejudiced attitudes have also been shown to be a source of the opposition of a substantial number of whites to school busing (a measure implemented to create more racially integrated schools), bilingual education, affirmative action, government assistance to ethnic minorities, and residential integration; it also influences their views of how crime should be fought (see Bobo & Fox, 2003). Institutional racism continues to be present in the workplace and politics, often in subtle, symbolic, and indirect ways that are transmitted during early childhood socialization (see Feagin, 2000). Even though institutional racism may be subtle, unintentional, nearly invisible, and virtually undetectable, it can be measured more by its impact than the intentions behind it (Keleher & Johnson, 2001). One way to see institutional racism is as a barrier within organizations that prevents ethnic minority employees from reaching higher positions in the system. Within the health care system, racism has even been found in patterns of organ donation and organ transplants. Even though African Americans are more often in need of kidney transplants, they are much less likely than whites to be referred for or receive a transplant, and they wait twice as long on waiting lists before receiving transplants (National Institutes of Health, 2006).

Despite the scientific evidence developed over the last century showing that race is a socially constructed concept, racism continues to pervade contemporary society, and socially constructed categories of race are still used to set up social hierarchies that affect millions of individuals' experiences and opportunities (Esposito & Murphy, 2000). Regardless of its roots, racism continues to limit the independence and freedom of America's racial and ethnic minorities, reduce their empowerment, and deny their dignity and inherent worth. Racism—whether conscious or unconscious, deliberate or unintentional—continues to be present in society. Racial and ethnic appearance has historically constituted an important line of demarcation in U.S. social, cultural, economic, and political life, and it continues to do so. Although judging people based on color lines seems like a remnant of the nation's repudiated past, contemporary studies show that African Americans and Latinos with darker skin tone face more challenges and disadvantages than those with a lighter complexion and more European facial features. Skin tone and facial features continue to predict objective quality-of-life indicators such as educational and occupational advancement, even after differences in educational and socioeconomic backgrounds are adjusted for (Herring, Keith, & Horton, 2004; Murguia & Telles, 1996; Telles & Murguia, 1990). Studies have also found that relatively darker skin tone has negative effects on self-esteem, perceived attractiveness, life satisfaction, and depression (Boyd-Franklin, 1991; Brown, Ward, Lighbourn, & Jackson, 1999). Rather than reflecting some inherent racial quality, these disparities arise from an individual's awareness and internalization of the dominant culture's norms and beliefs, which continue to give

preference to light complexions and European features (Bond & Cash, 1992; Porter, 1991).

Border vigilante movements (e.g., the Minutemen) are contemporary forms of racism that target groups whose often imagined differences in appearance are perceived to signify much more fundamental cultural differences. For example, Mexican American families in Arizona border towns who can trace their ancestry many generations back have reported repeated incidents of harassment by the Minutemen militia (Rosas, 2006). Many members of the Minutemen and related fringe anti-immigrant organizations harass anyone around the border who “looks” Mexican.

It is important to be familiar with the history of different ethnic and racial groups, as this history can often help explain status differentials that exist among individuals and groups. Social workers can become better practitioners by becoming aware of the long struggle that members of those communities have led and of their ability to endure and overcome difficult situations, both individually and collectively. Culturally grounded social work honors those struggles and encourages practitioners to partner with ethnic and racial minority communities as they overcome oppression and work toward creating a more just society.

### Key Concepts

**Colonialism** a system of oppression of and domination over the local population imposed by an invading outside group

**Internal colonialism** oppressive power that is exerted by the majority culture over minority groups within national borders

**Genocide** the organized effort to eliminate an entire group of people

**Jim Crow laws** post–Civil War laws that provided the “separate but equal” legal framework for the racial discrimination against, segregation of, and denial of political, economic, educational, and social opportunities to African Americans

**Annexation** the taking of an area already occupied by another group, either through military action or the invitation of residents living there

**Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo** the treaty that ended the war between the United States and Mexico and forced Mexico to cede the territories of what is now most of the states of New Mexico, Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, and Utah to the United States

**Chicano (Chicana)** a Mexican American; a term that came out of, and often continues to signify solidarity with, the Chicano movement

**Migration** the movement of people from one geographic location to another either within a country or across international borders