

White Ethnic: A Social Concept

Joseph M. Conforti

Why such a term as *white ethnic* or *ethnic* developed and what purposes it served guides this inquiry. Its origins in the wake of the Civil Rights Movement in a context of American immigration history are explored together with its adoption as a sociological concept. A survey of textbooks most likely to use such a term, particularly texts concerning race and ethnicity, inter-group relations, and sociology of minorities, together with related literature illustrates both its usage and the basis of such usage.

Introduction

This paper examines the noun *white ethnic* or *ethnic*, as a label for particular groups of people in the United States. This term has been used by American sociologists (and others) extensively enough to have entered the general vocabulary of the society, particularly as reflected in the mass media. The inherent logic of the term is elusive at best. It suggests that there are *ethnics* who are other than white and *whites* who are other than ethnic. Neither of these logical implications of the term have ever been addressed. While these nomenclature issues are intriguing, they will not be addressed here. The discussion here concerns why such a term developed in a particular time frame and what purposes it served.

It is difficult to determine precisely where, when, or by whom the term *white ethnic* was invented. It is probably safest

to say that it had no single point of origin, but can be attributed to a combination of mutually reinforcing origins. This paper places its emergence in the late 1960s on the heels of the Civil Rights Movement with which it was somewhat intertwined. It became a popularly used concept in the 1970s, extending through the 1980s with usage dissipating in the 1990s.

Self-Labeling

The origins of the term white ethnic are complex and reflect several different bases. One basis would be self-labeling, arising out of a self consciousness that developed within some white ethnic groups in the United States, a self consciousness stimulated by the Civil Rights Movement. The increased self consciousness revolved around perception that the federal government was uniquely helping black people through a combination of judicial decisions and legislation in the 1950s and 1960s, particularly through The Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is the legislation that produced Affirmative Action as a policy, though this component received little attention until the early 1970s. Once it appeared that black people were receiving help from the Congress, the President, the Supreme Court, and much of the rest of the federal government to compensate for past oppression there arose several me too proclamations. In addition to the women's movement, several ethnic groups (or at least some of those individuals who claimed leadership of such groups) emphasized that their group had also been oppressed, and they also deserved some kind of reparation or compensation. These were the leaders of the people who were primarily the descendants of those who had long been called the *new immigrants*, the immigrants who had come to the United States from southern and eastern Europe after 1890 such as Italians and Ashkenazik Jews.¹

The argument was, in part, that the white population should be examined in terms of distinguishing those whites responsible for the oppression of black people from those whites who were not only not responsible for the oppression of black people but who had themselves been oppressed. While no arguments were made to suggest that there were any groups of whites in the United States that had suffered oppression comparable to that of blacks, the emphasis was that

groups other than blacks, including whites, had also suffered oppression. Since no such compensation or promise of such compensation was forthcoming to any white ethnic groups, a degree of resentment developed with some of their members. The resentment was complex. For some it was a simple resentment toward black people on the grounds that helping only one group was unfair. A second form the resentment took was that no group should have any easier a time than their own group had had in coping with such matters as developing job skills, getting through school or moving into decent housing in neighborhoods that had been closed to them.²

A third form the resentment took was toward assimilation, a particularly ambivalent form of resentment. It simultaneously stressed a pride in being American and a questioning of whether giving up one's ethnicity and becoming American had been worthwhile.³

The press, eager to report conflict, tended to exaggerate both the depth of the conflict and the resentment on the part of the whites, which in turn became generalized to and interlarded with resistance to busing, hard-hat intolerance, and the embracement of right-wing politics.⁴ For some this fueled the resentment even further insofar as this characterization included the suggestion that it was these newer Americans who made up the ranks of racists in the United States rather than the older Americans.

That the term was being used by the media in such a negative fashion to label groups of people was one of the grounds for the defensive books that emerged in the 1970s, a second basis for the term's emergence. Several authors took up the cause of the new ethnicity, as it was often initially called, with such titles as *America and the new Ethnicity* and *The Ethnic Imperative: Examining the New White Ethnic movement*.⁵ To different degrees, they were advocates of the reality and desirability of an ethnic resurgence and of both the maintenance and enhancement of ethnicity among particular groups of whites. The best known were probably Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan's *Beyond the melting Pot*,⁶ Andrew Greeley's *Why Can't They Be Like Us?*⁷ and Michael Novak's *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics*.⁸ These authors tended to explain and often defend the new ethnicity and the people

they called white ethnics.⁹ Their defense was two-fold: to a lesser degree, a defense against assimilation pressures ¹⁰ and to a greater degree, a clarification of who and what the presumably misunderstood white ethnics really were.¹¹ At an even broader level these authors could be viewed further as proponents of ethnic pluralism in terms of arguing for its continued relevance, bemoaning its feared loss, or urging its resurgence.

An Ethnic Resurgence?

An unintended or unanticipated consequence of the term's use had been to call attention to the question of whether or not there had been an ethnic resurgence in the United States during the 1970s. Some people, particularly the self-proclaimed ethnic leaders, insisted that there was a resurgence and insisted upon reaffirming their ethnic ancestry, such as Italian Americans or Polish Americans.¹² That they had to undertake such endeavors could, however, be taken to reflect the fact that without conscious effort the ethnic community or ethnic culture in which such people were interested and invested would die or that it had already died to a considerable degree and required their (often self-serving) concerted efforts to try to keep it alive.¹³

Richard D. Alba¹⁴ in his research took up a challenge to the question of an ethnic resurgence in the United States with a theme that went back to the 1940s with Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy and to the 1950s with Will Herberg,¹⁵ the theme being that of assimilation and amalgamation through interethnic marriage, within the bounds of a common religion (common race being taken for granted). Kennedy and Herberg earlier spoke of a triple melting pot in American society, with ethnic barriers collapsing within religions and a corresponding shift in identity from ethnicity to religion.¹⁶ Alba's data challenged the idea of an ethnic resurgence by showing extensive intermarriage between members of different ethnic groups within the Roman Catholic religion. Alba emphasized college attendance and intermarriage as indicative of acculturation and assimilation. His phrase twilight of ethnicity captured the almost completed assimilation and the uncertainty of its ethnic residues.

Although Herbert Gans¹⁷ referred to people as ethnics (particularly Catholics), he also seemed to challenge the idea

of an ethnic resurgence in American society with his concept of symbolic ethnicity. Symbolic ethnicity was viewed as mostly a matter of selective self identity and comprised largely of nostalgia, generally devoid of content, presumably characteristic of the third, fourth, and later generations of an ethnic group. But the retention of ethnicity even in symbolic form suggests the retention of a fairly simple singular ethnic background. This does not fit well with the extensive interethnic marriage that has occurred in the United States and the complex ethnicity that such marriages produce. But carried a step further, such complex ethnicity would seem to lend itself to oversimplification, especially in symbolic terms, through the selective ethnic identification that Mary Waters¹⁸ identified through her research.

An American Sociological Conceptual Term

A third basis for the introduction of the term comes from the sociological literature. Sociologists have long been interested in race and ethnicity, going back at least as far as Max Weber or even further back to the early 19th Century Social Darwinists.¹⁹ Over the past century the sociological literature of the United States has dealt with ethnicity largely in terms of European immigrant groups. Robert E. Park, drawing upon the experience of early 20th century Chicago, set the tone with his race relations cycle.²⁰ The flow of wave after wave of different groups of European immigrants to the United States accommodated such a theory, at least as much as the theory explained the flow. Park's theory focused on a sequence of contact, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation. Such a model stressed assimilation as both an ongoing process and the ultimate goal for each immigrant group. This model also suggested that distinctions could be made among the ethnic groups in terms of the degree of assimilation that each represented at any given point in time.

The easiest, and ostensibly most popular, approach to such distinctions in sociology textbooks involved dividing the immigrants, who had come to the United States from different countries at different times, into two broad groupings. The first grouping, called the old immigrants, had come from Northern and Western Europe during the late 18th and early 19th cen-

turies, such as the English, Dutch, Germans, and Irish. The second grouping, called the new immigrants, had come from Eastern and Southern Europe between 1890 and 1920, such as the Poles, Italians, and Greeks.²¹

It was the first European immigrant group, from England, which ethnocentrically established the context for these kinds of distinctions, first by renaming themselves Americans and, second, by putting themselves forth as the model (of Americans) which all subsequent immigrants should emulate, a process that Gordon descriptively referred to as Anglo-conformity but which tended to prevail in the term assimilation.²² Such a process readily lent itself to distinguishing degrees of assimilation among immigrant groups. The old immigrants, having adjusted culturally and linguistically to the American model for the longest time, and especially in contrast to the more recent immigrants, were viewed as assimilated. They could be called American or referred to as native born. The more recent or new immigrants could, by contrast, be viewed as unassimilated and referred to as foreign born. Even the United States Bureau of the Census used to make such a distinction, including the offspring of immigrants in the category foreign-born. In such an approach it was not until the third generation that the grandchildren of immigrants would be defined as native born Americans.²³

During the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s the sociology textbooks dealing with intergroup relations, race, and ethnicity or majority-minority relations took account of this distinction, though they focused mostly on race and often devoted at least one chapter to Jews.²⁴ Insofar as account was taken of ethnicity, the old immigrant/new immigrant distinction was commonplace and consistent in these kinds of textbooks.

By the 1960s and 1970s a third generation, descended from the new immigrants, came of age, making it awkward to call them foreign-born immigrants or even new immigrants, and yet they were still perceived as somewhat foreign, not fully assimilated, or at least not assimilated enough to be called American. In terms of Park's race relations cycle they were perceived as being in a kind of limbo somewhere between accommodation and assimilation.²⁵ The term white ethnic became a label to reflect this medial position and distinguish

them from those people descended from the earlier waves of immigration, who could be called American. That is, as used by sociologists, the term largely distinguished people who were perceived as not fully assimilated to the American model from those who were perceived as fully assimilated.

The basic content of the conceptual term white ethnic is obviously descriptive as a label. The label puts a group of people into one discrete category, assimilated in contrast to another discrete category, unassimilated, thus treating the concept as an attribute even though assimilation might be viewed more usefully as a variable representing degrees of assimilation. In this sense it also could be argued that the term represented a stereotype insofar as the same characteristics or properties were generalized including everyone in the ethnic group. This implied that everyone in a particular ethnic group assimilated at the same rate and had assimilated to the same degree.

It also served as an analytic term insofar as efforts were made (at least implicitly) to contrast and compare different ethnic groups or to compare white ethnic group members with those whites who were ostensibly not members of ethnic groups. That there could be Americans who are not members of an ethnic group initially sounds logically absurd. But if ethnic is being used as an adjective and then as a noun to distinguish some people, there would logically have to be other people who are not ethnic. Those so inferred would be, in this instance, the descendants of the earlier white immigrant groups, the Americans. The logic of such usage is supported by the observation that the United States contains growing numbers of white people whose ethnicity has been so obscured and diluted or is evolving in such a manner that they have no simple distinctive ethnic identity of which they are conscious other than American. ²⁶

Implications

How the distinctions between the assimilated and unassimilated were made, by whom they were made, and on the basis of what criteria seem both reasonable and empirical questions. But little or no effort has been made to justify the distinctions in textbooks that use such terms as ethnic or white ethnic. It is essentially arbitrary; it is simply done with no expla-

nation of why²⁷. It is as if the meaning is taken to be so obvious and valid that it warrants no definition or explanation. It is what post-modernist critics would characterize as largely unchallenged, unexplained sociological canon.

This is not to say that such use has necessarily been benign or inconsequential. The manner in which the term white ethnic has been applied in the sociological literature largely has been to describe groups of people who are said to have maintained characteristics from their ancestral culture sufficiently so that they could be described as ethnically distinct groups of people. Such ethnically distinct groups are quite familiar in terms of ethnic ghettos, such as Chinatown, el Barrio, or Little Italy. These were areas characterized by people who came directly from China, Mexico, or Italy or by people who, being only a generation away from the experience of immigration, were very close to the people who came from those countries. It becomes a much more difficult and elusive concept to apply after such people moved out of ghettos and were distributed over various parts of metropolitan areas, as were the third and fourth generation descendants who usually grew up outside such ghettos and in the suburbs of the United States. In such cases sociologists have had to try to identify those aspects of their life style or cultural practices that sufficiently differentiated some groups of people in terms of their ancestry to justify such characterization. Such comparisons could focus on any number of things such as cultural residues, family organization, child rearing practices, ceremonies and celebrations, language usage, food, or political participation. In the absence of careful dating the descriptions and depictions could be outdated or obsolete. Thus Gans' depiction of ethnic village neighborhoods or even Whyte's depiction of street corner life could be projected and generalized to an ethnic group well beyond the times and places they reflected.²⁸ This is particularly the case where there is a lack of more contemporary literature to counterbalance the outdated images of the group being depicted.

It is likely that, for at least some of the sociologists using the term white *ethnic*, it was a gentler, more generous term than might have been used in terms of social class characterization. The line between ethnic characterization and class characterization is obscure at best. As would similarly be the

case with religions, there is a reluctance to acknowledge the correspondence many hold between ethnicity and other dimensions of social stratification. Since immigrants coming to the United States have done so primarily on economic grounds, the very term, immigrant, tends to stimulate images not only of the foreign but also of poverty and desperation. The strongest images of immigrants over the past century have emphasized poor people crowded into city slums. In such a context the white ethnics, if not as desperately poor as their immigrant forebears, were most likely being seen as lower class. Even advocates of the new ethnicity, if eschewing an unacceptable label like lower class, did not hesitate to refer to them with the more acceptable term working class.

Ethnicity has been a dimension of social class in all socially stratified societies in which ethnicity has served as a relevant distinction among groups.²⁹ That social class and ethnicity have been intertwined in American society can be seen in the familiar delineation of social class that ranges from the poorest inner city ghettos to the most affluent of suburbs in most metropolitan areas. In this regard the white ethnics being described in the literature were often in the cities, beyond the ghettos but not quite in the suburbs.³⁰

Still another perspective from which the concept white ethnic might be considered is in terms of race. Like social class, race has been viewed by a number of social scientists in recent years as a correlate of assimilation, at least in the case of the European immigrants and their descendants. This approach has been cast in terms of whiteness studies.³¹ In this regard the dominant Anglo-Saxon group defined itself as white, a property extended to the German immigrants but emphatically denied to the Irish. The Irish were viewed and characterized as an inferior race other than white.³² The new immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe were similarly disdained as inferior races.³³ In this sense white ethnic may be taken to mean not quite white. It is ironic of course that the term ethnic is being used in this sense to modify the term white. But that white ethnic is thus distinguished from white would be equivalent, perhaps, to a more direct term such as quasi-white.

Conclusion

Insofar as American sociologists continued to make assimilation distinctions among white ethnic groups, in terms of which some were perceived as retaining distinct cultural patterns more so than others, it could be said that the term white ethnic has served its intended purpose for American sociologists, to replace the terms foreign-born or new immigrant. Insofar as members of white ethnic groups organized politically and culturally to embrace and celebrate their ethnic heritage, the term, white ethnic, served their purposes, too, as a term for a common identity that sometimes reflected a single group and sometimes reflected a grouping of ethnic groups that could be distinguished from other groups.

While it served the needs of American sociologists for more than two decades, it does not appear that the concept white ethnic has much of a future.³⁴ There are at least two reasons for this. One is the increasing recognition that in the course of suburbanization, intermarriage, and their intertwining with assimilation as is reflected in the triple melting pot model the ethnic differences among white people in American society have significantly diminished, if not disappeared.³⁵ The people who were distinguished as white ethnics are now being lumped together with previously assimilated people as Whites, European-Americans³⁶ or un-hyphenated Americans.³⁷

A second reason is that there have arrived in the United States since 1965 large numbers of immigrants from throughout the world who are overwhelmingly not of European ancestry. These have included large numbers of Hispanic people from Mexico, Central, and South America; increasing numbers of Asians and smaller numbers of people from various parts of the Caribbean and elsewhere. As a result many of the current textbooks in discussing ethnic groups are not talking about Italians or Poles so much as they are talking about Chinese and Mexicans.³⁸

This further encourages treating all whites as a single dominating majority group. And that perspective brings us full circle in suggesting a situation very similar to the distinction made between old immigrants and new immigrants. Some textbooks in the field had already started focusing on such groups as far back as the 1970s.³⁹ Such immigrants who can

be distinguished by phenotype and linguistic patterns have become characterized as the new new immigrants. This in turn fits well with the embracement of pluralism that has been growing in recent years in the United States, emphasizing diversity and multiculturalism. Multiculturalism stresses differences between groups, the value of these differences, and the importance of maintaining them; its particular focuses is on groups of color, although it includes a wide array of groups defined as minorities.⁴⁰

As the term white ethnic served as a label for people of European ancestry perceived to be unassimilated or unassimilable, similar labels may be in formation in relation to the newest groups of immigrants. American sociologists have already introduced such terms such as segmented assimilation, the new assimilation, collective identity, and the new second generation.⁴¹ This nomenclature again seems to suggest that the members of some ethnic groups are not going to assimilate, are not going to assimilate fully, or even that they are unable to assimilate.

Endnotes

¹ Irish-Americans, whose ancestors had come to the United States much earlier, were often included among the disenfranchised white ethnics who did not receive compensation for their oppression in America.

² This kind of resentment is not unlike one of the objections that people in the English Only movement have to the tolerance of foreign languages. It might best be summed up as: "If we had to learn English, why shouldn't they!"

³ Stanley Feldstein and Lawrence Costello. *The Ordeal of Assimilation* (New York: Anchor, 1974).

⁴ Richard Krickus. *Pursuing the American Dream: White Ethnics and the New Populism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), Joseph Ryan. *White Ethnics: Their Life in Working Class America* (Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall, 1973).

Ethnic Studies Review Volume 23

⁵ David R. Colburn and George E. Pozzetta. *America and the New Ethnicity* (Port Washington, NY: Kennicat Press, 1979); Howard F. Stein, and Robert F. Hill, *The Ethnic Imperative: Examining the New White Ethnic Movement* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1977).

⁶ Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. *Beyond the Melting Pot* (Cambridge: MIT University Press, 1963).

⁷ Andrew M. Greeley. *Why Can't They Be Like Us?* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1971). Andrew M. Greeley. *Ethnicity in the United States* (New York: John Wiley and Son, 1974).

⁸ Michael Novak, *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics* (New York: Macmillan, 1971).

⁹ Howard Bahr, Bruce Chadwick and Joseph H. Strauss. *American Ethnicity*, chap. 5 (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1979); Nathan Glazer. *Affirmative Discrimination: Ethnic Inequality and Public Policy* (New York: Basic Books, 1975).

¹⁰ Feldstein and Costello, 1974.

¹¹ Greeley, 1974; Barbara Mikulski. "Who Speaks for Ethnic America," in *Divided Society: the Ethnic Experience in America*, ed. Colin Greer (New York: Basic Books, 1974); Perry L. Weed. *The White Ethnic Movement and Ethnic Politics* (New York: Praeger, 1973).

¹² Mikulski, 1974; Novak, 1971.

¹³ Stephen Steinberg. *The Ethnic Myth* (New York: Anthenum, 1981).

¹⁴ Richard D. Alba. "Social Assimilation Among American Catholic National Origin Groups." *American Sociological Review* 41 (December 1976): 1030-1046; Richard D. Alba. *Italian-Americans: Into the Twilight of Ethnicity* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1985); Richard D. Alba. *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

¹⁵ Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy. "Single or Triple Melting Pot: Intermarriage Trends in New Haven." *American Journal of Sociology* 49 (January 1944): 331-339. Will Herberg. *Protestant-Catholic-Jew* (New York: Doubleday, 1955).

¹⁶ People would, for example, be expected to identify as Catholic or Protestant rather than as Irish or German.

¹⁷ Herbert J. Gans. "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2 (January 1979): 1-20.

¹⁸ Mary C. Waters. *Ethnic Options* (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1990).

¹⁹ Max Weber. "On Nationalism, Ethnicity and Race," in *Race and Ethnicity*, ed. J. Owens Smith and Carl E. Jackson (Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt, 1989. Joseph Hraba. *American Ethnicity* (Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock,1979).

²⁰ Robert E. Park. *Race and Culture* (Glencoe, IL: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1950).

²¹ Francis J. Brown, and Joseph S. Roucek. *One America* (New York: Prentice Hall,1945).

²² Milton M. Gordon. *Assimilation in American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press,1964).Gordon attributes the term to the Coles, Stewart G. Cole, and Mildred Weise Cole. *Minorities and the American Promise* (New York: Harper and Brothers,1954).

²³ Judith R. Kramer. *The American Minority Community* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1970).

²⁴ Milton L. Barron. *American Minorities* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957); Brewton Berry, and Henry L. Tischler. *Race and Ethnic Relations* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951); Ina Corine Brown. *Race Relations in a Democracy* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1949); Joseph B. Gittler. *Understanding Minority Groups* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1956); Oscar Handlin. *Race and Nationality in American Life* (Boston: Little Brown, 1948);.Raymond W. Mack. *Race, Class and Power* (New York: American Book Company, 1968); Charles F. Marden, and Gladys Meyer. *Minorities in American Life* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1952); Arnold Rose, and Caroline Rose, *America Divided: Minority Group Relations in the United States* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948); Bernard E. Segal. *Racial and Ethnic Relations: Selected Readings* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1966); George Eaton Simpson, and J. Milton Yinger. *Racial and Cultural Minorities* (New York: Harper and Row, 1953);

Ethnic Studies Review Volume 23

James W. Vander Zanden. *American Minority Relations* (New York: The Ronald Press, 1963).

²⁵ Park.

²⁶ Stanley Lieberson. "A New Ethnic Group in the United States," in *Majority and Minority*, ed. Norman R. Yetman (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1991);

²⁷ Nathan Glazer. *Ethnic Dilemmas: 1964-1982* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983; S. Dale McLemore. *Racial and Ethnic Relations in America* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980; Humbert S. Nelli. *From Immigrants to Ethnics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983; H. Edward Ransford. *Race and Class in American Society* (Rochester, VT: Shenkman Books,1977); Richard T. Schaefer. *Racial and Ethnic Groups* (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1988).

²⁸ Herbert Gans. *The Urban Villagers* (New York: Free Press, 1962); William Foote Whyte. *Street Corner Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943

²⁹ Richard A. Schermerhorn. *Comparative Ethnic Relations* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970; Tamotsu Shibutani and Kian Kwan. *Ethnic Stratification* (New York: Macmillan, 1965).

³⁰ Glazer and Moynihan.

³¹ Richard D. Alba. "Immigration and the American Realities of Assimilation and Multiculturalism." *Sociological Forum* 14 (No. 1): 3-25.

³² Noel Ingatiev. *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995); David R. Roediger. *The Wages of Whiteness* (New York: Verso, 1991).

³³ Karen Brodtkin. "How Jews Became White," in *Race*, ed. Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press); Dominic R. Massaro. "Italian Americans as a Cognizable Racial Group," in *Italian-Americans in a Multicultural Society* ed. Jerome Krase and Judith N. DeSena (Stony Brook, NY: Forum Italicum, 1994).

³⁴ That some authors continue to include the Irish among white eth-

nics, despite seven to eight generations of assimilation, suggests that the term cannot be fully counted out yet.

³⁵ Stanley Lieberson and Mary C. Waters. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups In Contemporary America* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988); Gordon Daniel Morgan. *America Without Ethnicity* (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1981).

³⁶ Richard D. Alba had suggested the term Euro-American or European-American. While such a term would be descriptive and parallel to the terms African-American and Asian-American, it has thus far not caught on and white remains the more popular term in the United States.

³⁷ Lieberson.

³⁸ Juan L. Gonzales Jr. *Racial and Ethnic Groups in America*, (Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt, 1993); Juan L. Gonzales Jr. *Racial and Ethnic Families in America* 2nd edition (Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt, 1994).

³⁹ Donald Keith Fellows. *A Mosaic of America's Ethnic Minorities* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972); Rudolph Gomez, Clement Cottingham, Jr., Russell Endo and Kathleen Jackson. *The Social Reality of Ethnic America* (Lexington, MA: D.D. Heath and Company, 1974); Harry H. L. Kitano. *Race Relations* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1976); McLemore.

⁴⁰ Margaret L. Anderson, and Patricia Hill Collins. *Race, Class and Gender*, 2nd edition (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1995); John E. Farley. *Majority-Minority Relations*, 3rd edition (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995); B. Eugene Griessman. *Diversity: Challenges and Opportunities* (New York: Harper Collins College Publishers, 1993); Martin N. Marger. *Race and Ethnic Relations; American and Global Perspectives*, 4th edition (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1997); Samuel P. Oliver, and Phillip T. Gay. *Race, Ethnicity and Gender: A Global Perspective* (Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt, 1997); Vincent Parrillo. *Diversity in America* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1996); Vincent Parrillo. *Strangers to These Shores* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1997).

⁴¹ Alejandro Portes and Ruben G. Rumbaut. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); M. Kelly,

Ethnic Studies Review Volume 23

Patricia Fernandez and Richard Schaufli. "Divided Fates: Immigrant Children and the New Assimilation," in *The New Second Generation* ed. Alejandro Portes (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1996); Alejandro Portes. *The New Second Generation* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1996).