Every year I incorporate U.S. cultural diversity in an introductory anthropology class. When I reach this point, I inevitably hear students invoke cultural racialization as they comment on allegedly immoral behaviors by saying, "They can’t help it, that’s their culture." Immutable behavior which was once located in the body ("blood") is now just as firmly fixed in the mind ("culture"). Culture displaces the problematic concept of race but is used in similarly essentialist ways.1

With expanding interest in "multiculturalism," cultural anthropologists are often called upon to teach about diversity in general education classes. The pernicious cultural essentialism frequently expressed by our students has been reinforced in public discourse and the academy by the intersection of dominant U.S. discourses of official multiculturalism2 with a popular view of timeless, bounded "cultures" fixed in individuals through early childhood. A central goal of anthropology courses which address cultural diversity is to counteract this creeping culturalism.

This chapter will focus on strategies to denaturalize commonsense cultural categories. Such strategies make explicit the ways in which global, national, regional, and local institutions shape the formation, maintenance, and shifts in categories and hierarchies of difference. In doing this, we must replace the view of cultures as primordial with dynamic processes in which power shapes the boundaries within which cultural ideas and practices develop (Barth 1969; Harris 1992).

After discussing the contemporary context in which our students have learned to essentialize culture, several case studies will demonstrate the contingent nature of boundaries and hierarchies. These include historic shifts in the extension of whiteness to new populations, the role of the state in generating panethinic movements, the importance of local contexts in creating variations in "ethnic culture," and the effects of contemporary transnationalism.

The Complicity of Anthropology in Culturalism

As Eric Wolf (1982:23) has argued, the view of cultures as discrete and stable, like the concept of race, can be traced to the emergence of the discipline within colonial capitalism. Enlightenment beliefs in progress within a context of labor and resource exploitation encouraged the classification and ranking of "ways of life." In the academic division of labor, anthropology took on "the Other" while other disciplines focused on the ancient roots and contemporary forms of Western culture newly imagined as homogeneous. Anthropology's acceptance of this division persists in the way we marginalize studies of Europe and North America today.

 Earlier definitions of culture in anthropology emphasized homogeneity and stasis (structural functionalism), geographically bounded systems of traits (culture areas), and automatic cultural reproduction through the internalization of culture (culture and personality, national character). These tendencies were linked to the privileging of closed local spaces in developing fieldwork methods (Gupta and Ferguson 1997), the Freudian moment with its emphasis on internalized early childhood experiences, and most significantly the Boss-Benedict project, which used cultural relativism to counter scientific racism and ethnocentric models of cultural evolution (Wax 1993).3

Since the 1970s, anthropology and social theory in general have shifted to viewing cultural boundaries and practices as dynamic. People are no longer seen as determined by "culture" but as producers of shifting meanings and practices within the context of historically contingent power relations.

Yet the essentialized view of culture is still embedded in our teaching. In introductory textbooks, cultures are often portrayed with unproblematized boundaries and described in terms of particular uniform and internally integrated traits. Colonialism, urbanization, and international migration are discussed separately and viewed as events which disturb otherwise stable reproduced traditions. This conceptual framework now undermines our attempts to illuminate the contingency of boundary-making processes and identities, in the United States as well as the rest of the world.

From Race to Culture in U.S. Nation-Building Discourses

Ideas about race and culture are fundamental to all narratives of the nation (Williams 1988; Dominguez 1995). Unlike many European and postcolonial national myths which emphasize common descent and history, the United States, "a nation of immigrants," uses a national narrative which focuses on unifying the culturally different through liberal democracy and presumed equal opportunity. Unity is symbolized by a <i>plusbus umanum</i> (one out of many). Giving such significance to cultural heritage while denying exclusion and structural inequality encourages culturalist explanations for inequality. Just as 19th-century scientific racism based on biological inheritance produced hierarchies,
20th-century "culturalism," based on cultures as fixed rules, leads to the construction of hierarchies of moral worth (Chock 1995). Moreover, cultural essentialism by invoking bounded cultures masks possibilities for changing relationships. We need to teach students that boundaries between groups are not natural but are formed and dissolved through historical contingencies which alter identities and relationships.

Understandings of national unity have varied in different historic moments. Current "unity in diversity" describes the nation as a mosaic, tapestry, or salad of different cultures in which the parts retain their integrity as they contribute to a better whole. This contrasts with the earlier prairies models of Anglo-conformity which required the relinquishing of all specific elements of foreign cultural practices through forced Americanization (elimination) or through a "melting pot" in which new elements are melted down and absorbed.

As Steinberg (1981) argues, the "new ethnicity" which generated today's "unity in diversity" pluralism emerged in part to deny the existence of racial inequality. It covered over the overt discussion of racial oppression which characterized the civil rights initiatives of the black, Chicano and red power movements of the 1960s and 1970s. The celebration of the United States bicentennial in 1976 allowed the state to replace an image of racial conflict with one of unity and provided an opportunity to institutionalize this new ethnic form of pluralism based on national origin. European American groups who immigrated at the turn of the century had been freed and submitted to the Americanizing project of the state. Now such groups were provided with money for museums, parades, and festivals which encouraged ethnic performances and testified the pluralist mosaic. In becoming culturally hypervigilant Americans, they stressed the way groups used traditional cultural heritage as resources to overcome hardship.

The new pluralist master narrative (Chock 1995; Goode and Schneider 1994; Urciuoli 1996) supported an ideology that linked group success and failure to cultural values and reinforced the construction of hierarchies of moral worth. The effects of major historical political-economic processes and increased race and class inequalities are completely masked by such an emphasis.

Yet at the same time, a competing and contradictory understanding of U.S. diversity was being encoded in law and political action. The civil rights model of difference which emphasized the history of systematic racial exclusion was made official by the state in 1977 when OMB Directive 15 created official categories of difference to be used for purposes of equal civil rights remedies. Five official categories of difference were constructed. Four were ostensibly based on "race" (white, black, American Indian/Alaskan Native and Asian/Pacific Islander) while Hispanic was considered an ethnic category based on language, history, and culture.

These categories ignore vast differences in identities and experience. They also reflect the degree to which European immigrants have become "white," the unmarked default category against which African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans and Hispanic Americans are defined as minorities. While designated as racial, such categories were not biological realities but reflected social constructions through state laws, judicial decisions and policies related to the regulation of land and labor (see Chapter 8, this volume). They were often reciprocally accepted as collective identities (Espiritu 1992).

In 1997, the American Anthropological Association suggested that ethnic origin be substituted for official race and ethnic categories to capture the fact that all members of the nation state, with the exception of indigenous peoples, come from somewhere else. However, it would not impute to ethnic origin the fundamental significance in "determining" one's essential identity, social affiliations, beliefs, or behavior in the way that post-1970s popular understandings of race and ethnicity do.

These official categories which conflate biology, culture, and geography have become the official categories of difference ("unity through diversity") utilized by the media, schools, churches, workplaces, and other civil institutions. The concept of multiculturalism reflects an avoidance of talk about race. Culture, seen as a positive term, bears all the weight of talk about difference. Yet, as race is submerged, the two terms are conflated, and culture becomes the polite proxy for race in much discourse (Dominguez 1995).

Student Experiences with Official Multiculturalism

Our students have grown up amongst varying discourses of multiculturalism produced by different institutional interests (Paredes 1996; Paredes and Polli 1995; Goode 1998; Urciuoli 1996) and come to us with many preconceptions. In mainstream schools (and many public parades and festivals), multiculturalism denies that race and class matter. "Unity in diversity" is celebrated with emphasis on discrete cultures of long-term ethnic and immigrant-becoming-ethnic groups as the fundamental building blocks of the nation. In these celebrations, sanitized, packaged performances of culture at a distance allow other Americans to consume aesthetized commodities like food, music, and dance. These "good" folkloric presentations of culture are silent about the perceived "bad" parts of some heritages: the contested moral arenas relating to stereotyped "family values," work habits, and violence. Such silence leaves racialized images intact. "They can't help it, it's their culture."

University campuses became important sites of action for cultural identity movements in the 1970s and 1980s. Ethnic studies programs were demanded and became spaces in which a generation of community intellectuals formed a collective political consciousness. However, today, many university administrations and multicultural programs for their own purposes to defuse conflicts and to market "multiculturalism" in order to recruit and retain new students. Such programs often return to and promote a naturalized and essentialized view of bounded, objectified cultures which own icons and monolithic historical narratives (Segal and Handler 1995). One of the most essentializing uses of official multiculturalism permeates professional training in which multiculturalism is seen as a commodified professional skill. Professional authorities construct uniform "traditional" cultural concepts for each official category. These are then taught to professionals to enhance patient compliance, market transactions, or conflict resolution on the campus or in the workplace.
Finally, students have been exposed to the marketing of exotic culture as a postmodern leisure commodity, a form of cultural tourism. In this way, multiculturalism is used to attract consumers to cities like New Orleans and Miami. These efforts exploit ethnic neighborhoods and create cycles of festivals packaged for the consumption of exoticism.

There are significant differences in cultural systems of meaning and practice in the United States. However, students need to learn that meaningful communities of practice are neither permanent, nor do they conform to standard multicultural categories.

**Denaturalizing Categories and Demonstrating Boundary Processes**

Cultural boundaries often emerge and shift as groups ally with, oppose, or avoid each other within complex structures of power. Cultural practices shift as boundaries and relationships across boundaries change and groups invert, subvert, or reinterpret ideologies and practices of dominant, competing, and allied groups in relation to their own. Boundaries can become more inclusive, for example, as panethnic movements create alliances between groups who do not share close common descent. Similarly, competition and conflict within populations with common cultural lineage can produce avoidance, opposition, and ultimately new boundaries. As boundaries shift, new cultural forms and practices are invented or reinterpreted. Resistance to assimilation leads to rejection of cultural practices identified with dominant groups.

This chapter focuses on boundary processes rather than individual identity. Yet students also need a framework for understanding their place as individuals in this process. As Zavella (1994) points out in discussing Chicana diversity, we need to understand how categories affect shifting and multiple individual subjectivities. While people first experience life within natural families, they later move through diverse, expanding networks of relationships in differently structured local spaces. As they are exposed to shifting and contingent ideologies of powerful institutions like schools and mass media, or participate in social movements of opposition and resistance, they constantly manipulate their identity, beliefs, and practices.

**Extending White Privilege**

The ways in which whiteness as a privileged status was extended reveals the significance of population movements, economic shifts, electoral politics and state policy. The two cases below illustrate the extension of whiteness to formerly racialized groups: Irish in the 19th century and Jews after World War II.

Definitions of racial otherness in the United States are contingent on shifting economic and political relationships. Wars of conquest, struggles over land and recruitment, and control of labor influenced the ways in which populations were excluded and racialized. Groups who were conquered such as indigenous populations or residents of annexed Spanish territories (Mexicans and Puerto Ricans) or those exploited economically (slaves and Chinese unskilled labor) were denied suffrage and were excluded from national myths. At different points in time, the government and the public treated populations differently. For example, Africans, first brought to the United States as free labor were not significantly differentiated from white indentured labor in early settlements (Smedley 1993). Their defined inferiority grew as changes in world market commodity values made slave trading a lucrative capital investment. Exploitation increased as Africans were transformed into chattel slaves and denied personhood and civil rights.

As whiteness became a privileged racial category, many European groups immigrating to the United States were not automatically considered white. The way in which white privilege was extended to the Irish (Roediger 1990; Ignatiev 1995) is a significant example of how major economic transformations and labor force shifts intersected with political events. In this instance, Democratic Party formation within the context of the regional conflict between Northern industrialists and Southern planters helped to shape collective identities and boundaries.

The Irish, denied rights and treated as an inferior group by the British in their homeland, arrived in the United States in the mid-19th century freighted with a racialized identity and victimized by discrimination in jobs and housing. Yet the Irish arrived at a critical moment in the expanding industrial economy and provided an unskilled labor pool different from native-born artisans.

Irish immigrants originally inhabited the bottom of the social hierarchy alongside freed slaves in Northern cities. Both populations worked together in menial jobs and lived in tenement housing. Irish leadership was active in the abolition movement. Yet in the context of the pre-Civil War sectional dispute between Northern industrialists and Southern planters, suffrage gave the Irish both a symbolic advantage as included free citizens and the power that came from the courtship of their vote by potential political patrons. At the same time, free blacks who had been given suffrage within many Northern states were losing the right to vote.

Increasing numbers of Irish citizens who had once supported abolition opposed their Northern Whig bosses who led the abolition movement. Irish laborers were recruited into the Democratic Party and persuaded by Southern planters that freed slaves would take their jobs and that slaves as property received better care from their owners than they did as "wage slaves" to industrialists. As they turned away from their support of abolition, they accepted the "psychological wages" of white privilege which foreclosed the alternative possibility of solidarity with blacks based on shared labor exploitation.

The 20th century provides another example of the extension of whiteness to formerly racialized southern and Eastern European immigrants: Italians, Slavic-speaking peoples, and Jews. These populations made up a significant portion of the 1880s to 1920s immigration wave. Their arrival in large numbers during the expansion of industrial capitalism coincided with and exacerbated the developing ideology of scientific racism. Physical characteristics such as head form were used to create hierarchies of racial types which allegedly correlated with aspects of intelligence, behavior, and morality.

Assimilationist policies were carried out by schools and settlement houses. These policies pushed the new populations to become American and
discouraged Old World habits, particularly those related to diet and language use.

World War II and the economic expansion and public policies which followed the war changed all this. Descendants of the turn-of-the-century migration wave were whitened as they moved into the suburban middle class. First, the prewar New Deal enabled collective bargaining which provided middle-class wages, benefits, and job security to the working class. The cessation of massive immigration through restrictive quotas in the 1920s diminished the visible threat of foreigners. The war also dissolved the line between excluded foreigners and citizen as the children of immigrants bled for the nation. Finally, the GI bill, a policy response to the fear of mass unemployment, contained educational provisions and related mortgage subsidies for home ownership. Educated veterans were easily absorbed by the demand for educated technical, professional, and managerial workers in the expanded economy. New highway construction coupled with massive federal mortgage subsidies favored new building and opened up suburban development. This loosened the links between the new middle classes and the older urban neighborhoods.

Brodkin (Sacks) (1994, 1998) demonstrates how this process worked for Jews who had been formally excluded from many residential spaces and professional careers through deed covenants and university quotas. They were extended white privilege in the postwar expansion through the extensive affirmative action programs for veterans. Anti-Semitic racism was severely constrained as Americans became aware of the effects of Nazi racism on Jews in the Holocaust.

As the formerly racialized turn-of-the-century immigrant populations gained access to the professions, new corporate workplaces, and suburban residential spaces, their collective ethnic identities became less salient both inside and outside the boundary. As the boundary softened, everyday cultural practices changed and, for many, ethnically specific practices were situationally limited to simple symbols used at holidays and life cycle events (Waters 1990).

Meanwhile, blacks displaced from the rural South were coming north in large numbers into the declining and discriminatory industrial labor market and the aging housing market in northern cities. Mexican agricultural labor was being imported to the Southwest through the Bracero program in the 1940s and 1950s. Both populations remained racialized and were systematically but informally excluded from public programs which subsidized middle-class status.

Panethnicity and the Role of the State

The state has historically played several different roles in creating and maintaining racial exclusion (Takaki 1979). As Merry (Chapter 8, this volume) illustrates in the Hawaiian case, while indigenous people and in-migrating unskilled Asian laborers are both marked and excluded, they have generally been defined and treated differently because their encounters with colonial settlers involved different issues: land vs. labor.

---

Policy and shifting Native American boundaries

Mainland Native Americans have been the subjects of unusually rigid definition and regulation by the state (Pevar 1992:2). They were subject to a set of contradictory policies which at different times produced separation amongst tribes, encouraged assimilation, or promoted panethnic American Indian consciousness.

As European settlement expanded, state-sponsored pacification and control set official tribal boundaries through the treaty process which granted "sovereignty." In the process of forced settlement on tribal reservations, many settlements brought together several different tribes, creating new collective boundaries (Nagel and Snipp 1993). Pressure by white settlers for land produced the Dawes Act (1887) designed to release reservation land to the open market. Indians were in turn encouraged to leave reservation land for work and education and to assimilate.

As part of the New Deal in the 1930s, the Indian Reorganization Act restored the importance of tribal separateness by attempting to create local self-determination and economic development (Spicer 1969). Through individualized charters reflecting past tribal practices, reservations would retain sovereign rights to local jurisdiction over criminal law, land rights, and taxation within their territory (Boli 1995b). New Deal social services were to be provided through these newly institutionalized and regulated tribal governments.

One ironic unintended result of this program which echoed tribal difference was that it forged a pan-Native American collective identity. Tribal leaders converging on Washington to work on these new initiatives came to see themselves as having shared interests vis-à-vis the state, thus laying the basis for later pan-Indian consciousness (Nagel 1995).

In the postwar 1950s, federal policy again encouraged off-reservation relocation to urban labor markets. These urban areas became important sites for the development of the Red Power movement during the civil rights struggle of the 1960s and 1970s, further strengthening pan-Indian consciousness (Cornell 1988).

In 1978, attenuated tribal identities were revived and reinforced when an official recognition process administered by the BIA's Bureau of Acknowledgment and Recognition extended recognition to formerly unrecognized tribes in response to civil rights land claims by tribes that had never had a treaty relationship to the federal government. Tribes had to prove historical community through archival and anthropological evidence.

This formal recognition process worked against growth: pan-Indian unity by engendering competition between tribes for recognition and a cleavage between recognized and unrecognized tribes. Recently, rights to authenticate contracts and to operate casinos have exacerbated this split.

Self-identified tribes like the Lumbee, who emerged from fragments of separate bands of Tuscarora could not sufficiently document their histories. Bui (1980) and Siler (1993) see a Lumbee identity and boundary as forged over time in an agricultural region in which the white community severely denigrated former slaves. Lumbee identity was forged to differentiate this fragmented
population from blacks. Maintaining a strong collective identity for over a century but lacking required documents, Lumbee are excluded from federal recognition as an "authentic" tribe and denied the federal rights and entitlements which accompany recognition. 
The state through its policies is deeply implicated in the structuring of Native American tribal boundaries and identities. Compliance and resistance to these policies has produced, in different times and places, heightened tribal consciousness, heightened pan-Indian consciousness and increased assimilation. Each move had significant consequences for cultural beliefs and practices.

OMB Directive 15 and Panethnicity

The civil rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s and the state response in creating the OMB categories of 1977 accelerated panethnic identity movements, Espiritu (1992) has defined panethnicity as shifts in levels of group consciousness from smaller to larger units, which are not as closely related in culture or descent. When the state seeks to allocate resources or enforce political representation through reifying such categories, these constructions have new saliency for collective boundaries. Panethnic cultural identity movements accept state categories and attempt to seek political power through them. It produces narratives of common oppression and shared practices and symbols to mark new boundaries. Espiritu (1992) describes the process of Asian panethnicity on the west coast as a response to the application of the official state label – Asian/Pacific Islander – to many populations with very different histories. She chronicles the ways in which commonality in history and culture is rearticulated as the new movement attempts to construct a broad new boundary while leaving room for differences resulting from national origin, class, wave of immigration, and the role of U.S. intervention in the homeland.

Today, the contemporary Asian American movement includes both descendants of 19th-century exploited-labor migrants (Chinese and Japanese) and the very different recent Chinese immigrants from Taiwan and Hong Kong who come with financial and cultural capital. Other Asian migrants came to the United States as the direct or indirect result of U.S. military involvement in their home nations. These include Filipinos whose colonial subordination dates back to the Spanish-American War in 1898, and Koreans and Southeast Asian refugees whose displacement from their homelands is heavily related to more recent U.S. military activity. South Asians (from India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka) were an ambiguous population added to the Asian category at the last minute. The ambiguities in their relationship to the pan-Asian movement is discussed in a series of essays in a recent volume, A Part, and Yet Apart (1998). Cultural forms and performances are often used to form collective memories and consciousness as the basis for politicization. Lisa Lowe (1997) has documented the emergence of particular Asian American cultural forms (literature, theater, etc.) and spaces (ethnic studies programs) which have fostered an Asian American consciousness. They recognize an alternative history in which Asian exploited labor was "brought in but kept outside" through exclusionary legislative and judicial acts in the 19th century. Later Asians were culturally constructed as the foreign enemy as the result of 20th-century wars (Japan, Korea, and Southeast Asia). She comments on the way in which contemporary anti-immigrant movements serve to further strengthen the common consciousness of Asian Americans from diverse national and class backgrounds.

Similarly, a collection edited by W. Flores and Benmayor (1997) features case studies showing how Latino cultural forms of expression can create legitimacy for Latinos as respected public persons who can make political claims. For example, one case study looks at how participation in a cultural performance group which evokes collective memories is linked to local political action (R. Flores 1997). Another illustrates how the production of cultural meanings transformed women canneries workers during a strike (W. Flores 1997).

Several studies examine how local intra-Latino economic and power relations respectively strengthened or weakened pan-Latino boundaries. For example, this leads to a reassessment of Mexican vs. Puerto Rican identity at certain times within the movement in Chicago (Padilla 1985), where the Mexican community is older and larger.

In these situations groups select, modify, and invent new shared symbols to serve as boundary markers of the new collective space. Often symbols originate with one group but become accepted by the collective. In Philadelphia the Colombian national day in July was for some time celebrated together by a coalition of non-Puerto Rican populations in order to counter Puerto Rican dominance of autumn Latino celebrations, their seniority and their numerical strength (Goode and Schneider 1994). In a similar way in San Francisco, Cinco de Mayo (Mexican Independence Day) was also celebrated by a pan-Latino coalition. Simms (1991) computes several San Francisco Cinco de Mayo festivals which try to maintain both a national "inner" boundary and a panethnic "outer" boundary within the marked Latino space of the Mission District business strip. Under certain conditions this effort succeeded while in other circumstances it failed.

African panethnicity is also complex and contradictory. The relationship between African Americans and transnational migrants of African descent from the Caribbean and Africa has been negatively affected by U.S. structural racism. There is a growing interest in studying the ways in which pan-African diasporan cultural forms are produced as critique and resistance (Gilroy 1995). At the same time Basch et al. (1994) discuss the ways in which avoiding U.S. practices of racialization plays a role in the use of strong national origin identities by Caribbean peoples and Africans who avoid panethnicity in their desire to avoid racialization as American blacks. Portes and Stepick (1993: 176–202) illustrate this for Haitians vis-à-vis American blacks in Miami. In this way, transnational identities limit panethnic collective consciousness.

The strategic use of panethnic cultural essentialism involves searching for cultural and historical similarities using categories established by state power. Such movements are important political mobilization strategies, but can succumb to the trap of cultural essentialism accompanied by assertions of moral and cultural superiority. This limits the capacity to see common class interests across ethnic boundaries.
Grants who bore the brunt of racial ideology (DiLeonardo 1984) they were not significantly racialized.

In Philadelphia, Italian immigrants, along with Slavic and Jewish immigrants arriving in large numbers at the same time, were racialized by dominant institutions. The three groups entered unskilled industrial jobs while sharing tenement space clustered in South Philadelphia. Yet each group was stereotyped differently by social workers (Jullani 1978) and social scientists (DiLeonardo 1986:19-20). Italians were described as inclined to criminal behavior and unable to extend moral obligation beyond their own families. Their diet was seen as primitive, heavy, and unhealthy. Ironically, today, the fish, vegetable, and olive oil complex of the Mediterranean diet is extolled as light and nutritious as it ascends to the aestheticized world of high cuisine.

Initial racialization is exemplified by the experience of one group of immigrants who were recruited to an industrializing town outside Philadelphia. Stonemasons and their families, recruited from Calabria in the early 20th century, were brought to build industrial sites, public institutions, and elite housing. The immigrants were segregated across the railroad tracks. Occupationally they were forbidden to work in the factories and limited to heavy construction and other menial work (Goode, Curtis, et al. 1984).

Today, in both California and Philadelphia, in the wake of postwar “whitening” and middle-class ascendance, many Italian Americans have been absorbed into corporate jobs and suburban spaces. They are situational ethics whose ethnic consciousness is limited to special occasions and major life events. Yet, in both California and Philadelphia, there are many Italians who are still involved in small businesses and local politics in which extended family cooperation and interfamily solidarity is key. For them, the many reinterpreted cultural practices of Italian ethnicity are still salient in everyday life. The following description of difference in three social spaces in Philadelphia illustrates the importance of local experience in the formation of ethnic boundaries, cultural practices, and identities.

Many of the formerly racialized stonemason migrants from Calabria have remained in the same town, now a service center for surrounding suburban housing developments. As they moved across the tracks to middle-class housing, their former housing became occupied by African Americans. They have also moved into positions of control in the local business strip, the local real estate market, and local municipal politics. This local power has been reinforced by preferred Italian American endogamy and an array of strong formal associations and informal clubs which maintain an ethnic boundary. Some children who marry non-Italians move away, but a large number with their outsider spouses and newly formed households remain incorporated. Within the boundary, significant but reinterpreted cultural practices are strongly maintained through everyday domestic practices, life-cycle celebrations, and an annual patron saint’s fiesta (Goode, Curtis, et al. 1984).

South Philadelphia, just south of Philadelphia’s metropolitan downtown district, is social space marked as “Italian” by most Philadelphians. The large open area “Italian Market” which takes up many square blocks is one significant marker of this space although its vendors and customers are increasingly
Vietnamese. Ironically, this area was never demographically dominated by people of Italian origin. Initially, this was the antebellum residential space shared by Irish and black residents described by Ignatiev (1995). During the turn-of-the-century immigration wave, it served as the initial settlement for southern and eastern Europeans. Italian immigrants who initially emphasized their regional identities, over time took on a pan-Italian ethnicity. Local institutions which promoted this sense of pan-Italian community were the nationality parishes with mass in Italian, related parochial schools, and the market. The market was a place for daily interaction, a distribution point for Italian greens produced in Italian-owned truck farms of southern New Jersey, as well as imported cheeses and olive oil and locally produced bread, sausages, dried fruit, and herbs, etc.

With the postwar extension of whiteness to the descendants of the mass immigrant wave, marriage between white Catholics from any national background became common in this space (Dubin 1996). Nonetheless, many intermarried households retained a strong Italian American self-identification. There were local advantages to Italian American identity and symbolic capital in practicing reinterpreted Italian culture. These were key to belonging to the local community and gaining access to networks of support and opportunity. Italians had dominated local ward politics for generations. A large number of people held patronage jobs. Italian institutions were dominant in the area. In contrast, the institutions for eastern Europeans, for example, were located in a distant neighborhood. After World War II, many families entered professional and managerial jobs and moved to the suburbs. Others remained in local owner-occupied housing and were embedded in common workplaces and networks of work and exchange.

A study of Italian American households in both the suburban town and South Philadelphia in the late 1970s found that both everyday and celebratory food practices symbolically marked households as "hyphenated" Italian Americans. Food patterns were shared across households, even those with mixed national origins. Mothers-in-law taught their non-Italian daughters-in-law how to keep an Italian home. If the woman was Italian, she maintained the cuisine of her family, recognizing that Italian cooking and the rhythm of eating events had symbolic value for many neighborhood young men.

Yet the food system found in the 1970s was very different from that found among the immigrant generation. Contrasts between cultural food practices in a study done in the 1930s, and those of the 1970s demonstrate that the pattern of meals and celebrations had shifted from one which reproduced Old World practices to the creation of a truly hyphenated food system to parallel a growing hyphenated American identity.

Italian initially used food to recall the homeland and to mark Italianness in contrast to their established neighbors who were pejoratively described as having food with no taste or texture such as white bread and mayonnaise.

Today, an elaborate pattern of alternating Italian and Anglo types of meals throughout the week is maintained. This involves the systematic alternation of Italian meal formats called "gravy" meals (pasta dishes with spicy, slow-cooked tomato-based sauces) with "American" meals rigidly structured around sege-

gated meat, starch, and boiled vegetable components of English origin. Celebratory meals also represent a hyphenated identity as equal parts of Italian and Anglo content are presented through elaborate buffets or sequences of courses (Goode, Cartts, et al. 1984; Goode, Theophano, et al. 1984).

Included in these practices are significant inter-household food exchanges which cement the political and economic bonds across local households identified as Italian American. In these social spaces, unlike the households of situational ethics, women who increasingly work outside the home continue to practice an elaborate pattern of everyday food preparation, celebratory events, and exchange. The study of these two communities as well as DiLeonardo’s work in California reveals the importance of women in producing and reproducing ethnic practices.

In a third neighborhood which is today the most diverse in the city, new immigrants from Asia, the Caribbean, and Latin America share space with established descendants of turn-of-the-century immigrants. Here there had never been concentrated Italian settlement, nationality parishes, or Italian-oriented small businesses such as those found in the other two sites. Everyone knew of some descendants of Italian immigrants, but they were not self- or publicly identified as Italian American. The systematic patterning of meals and celebrations was missing.

When multicultural festivals came to this increasingly diverse neighborhood in the 1980s, people were pressured to accept single ethnic identities. In response, families joked about their hybrid nationalities. In fact, at one church’s diversity festival, all the Euro-American (or white) women rejected the priest’s attempt to organize food by nation of origin, tearing down the national flags and uniting their tables under one American flag. While several of the women were Italian or married to Italians, there was no Italian food. This was predominately American: cold roast meats, and mayonnaise-dressed salads with a few exotic central European items like sausages and sauerkraut included. Over several decades, these women of the parish had developed this way of diminishing nationality markers in parish food events. As they resisted nationality labels in the festival, they asserted their seniority as Americans (“whites”) over their new neighbors. Italian identity was submerged.

Different waves, different "cultures"

Cases in which immigrants from the same nation state arrive in different immigrant waves point out the fallacy of ascribing fixed, "timeless" "cultures" to nations of origin. Two interesting comparisons are between the Poles of the turn-of-the-century immigrant wave and the post-Solidarity refugee wave, and the late-19th-century wave of Chinese labor migration in contrast to the current wave (Chen 1992; Kwong 1998).

Polish-origin peoples have been studied in Philadelphia (Goode and Schneider 1994) and Chicago (Erdmann 1993). In both cities, the historic moment of immigration produced entirely different experience and practice. The earlier wave consisted of largely peasant agrarian workers who moved into industrial and mining work. Over many generations, they created the symbols and
practices of Polonia (the community of Poles in America) with such food symbols as kielbasa and pierogies and such musical forms as the polka. Their Catholicism was based on community parish life where everyone contributes to maintain and reproduce the parish.

In contrast, contemporary refugees are university professionals (intellectuals) and skilled artisans who have lived urban cosmopolitan lives. They have also experienced socialism and the Solidarity movement and see the church as a site for political action and social service.

This leads to differences in class position as well as cultural ideas and practices. Nevertheless, in Philadelphia, new Poles were settled by state-sponsored refugee agencies in the dominant Polish American space based on assumptions that they shared culture. New Poles value cosmopolitan, urban lifestyles and the high culture of Chopin and Polish writers and artists. Polish Americans see Polish culture in their special foods and dances which they proudly locate in a timeless agrarian peasant past. Such differences engendered conflict over defining Polish culture in the displays for the new Polish museum in Philadelphia. Such differences also create class resentment and an emerging boundary as ideas about the role of the church and parochial education clash. New Poles often leave the neighborhood when they can afford to, thereby negating the U.S. pluralist discourse that constructs both Polish refugees and Polish Americans as part of a homogeneous culture.

Contrasting Chinese waves involve similar differences in class backgrounds and historical experience. In the 19th century Chinese were recruited to the United States for a brief period for menial labor. In 1882 they were restricted from further entry. Those who had settled were excluded from citizenship and encouraged to return home. Today, Chinese immigration from Hong Kong, Taiwan, and the People's Republic of China has resumed since the immigration reforms in 1965. Chen (1992) describes the differences between the community formations of the 19th century and today. The current wave includes both those with significant capital (Horton 1995) and poor workers recruited to work in an enclave economy (Kwong 1998).

**Transnationalism**

While earlier Polish and Chinese refugees were part of a turn-of-the-century transnational labor migration to expanding industrial and plantation economies seeking cheap labor, today's immigrants are part of a broader process of postindustrial economic restructuring.

The mobility of people, capital, information, goods, and services today has facilitated permanent, durable, and intense transnational ties. The U.S. master narrative of one-way migration to freedom and opportunity reinforced ignorance of the substantial degree of return migration and remittances for earlier waves of immigrants. Nonetheless, early 20th-century European immigrants were restricted in contact with their homeland by world wars and the cold war. Today, the extraordinary degree to which people participate in the life of their nation of origin has given rise to the term transnationalism, which denotes the double nature of the fields of social, political, and eco-

nomic activity in which today's immigrants live and the dual nature of their subjectivities.

The creation of new immigrant wealth in the United States has played a major role in the nation-building projects of many of the sending nation states (Bash et al. 1994). This includes funding economic projects in the homeland and participating in politics. Immigrants located in the multinational finance capital sector of the global economy alternate between U.S. or homeland interests.

These structural relationships in turn have an effect on the ways in which those residing in the United States define, value, and act on the possibility of U.S. citizenship (Chavez 1988; Hagen 1994; Ong 1996; Goode 1998). For today's transnational immigrants who remain embedded in more than one state and move back and forth between them, "becoming American" is interpreted in a different way than it is in the master immigrant narrative. This has an effect on both boundaries and cultural practices.

**Future Possibilities Depend on Contingencies**

What are the future possibilities for diversity? To what extent and under what conditions will we continue to see white privilege extended to some populations and a continued exclusion of others? To what extent and under what conditions will panethnic movements among racialized groups succeed in creating strong coalitions based on official categories? To what extent and under what conditions will national cultural heritages continue to be evoked and affect boundaries and cultural practices? To what extent and under what global circumstances will transnational community boundaries continue to create dual identities and allegiances? Answers to these questions depend on the contingent workings of economic and political power at the local, regional, and national level which change the status quo as well as the way in which people organize responsive social movements.

Class ascendance can contribute to "whitening" as we saw in the case of descendants of turn-of-the-century immigrants. Alibhai Ong (1996) and Goode (1998) discuss the circumstances in which economic power partially whitens Asian immigrant capitalists, allowing them access to some privileged occupations and residential spaces while other Asians continue to be negatively racialized.

An overemphasis on racial and ethnic categories masks commonalities in class position and exploitation. Birosi (1995a) in an analysis of Lakota Sioux tribal law suits has argued that the legal context of reservation rights has limited political space to issues of protecting Indian sovereignty. This emphasis masks commonalities in class constraints and limitations vis-a-vis the poor white farmers on allotment (reservation) land. This has created racial hostility between the two populations, thereby precluding any class-based political alliances just as the extension of white privilege ruptured the potential alliance between the Irish and freed Blacks in the 19th century. Yet in other circumstances, local cross-racial class-based movements have had some success (Saniek 1994: 121; Goode and Schneider 1994:254-260).
NOTES

1 Most Americans are not aware that the belief in clearly bounded racial groups among Homo sapiens has been scientifically discredited. This is because discomfort with the concept of race leads to avoidance of its use in texts and classrooms leaving the assertions about "natural" racial boundaries intact (Mukhopadhyay and Moses 1997). Materials that deal with these issues can be found elsewhere in this volume. Viveswaran (1998) comments that Bosz, by leaving the race concept whole and placing it in the domain of science (as opposed to denying its reality) played a significant role in legitimating race as a concept.

2 "Official multiculturalism" permits limited areas of difference in authentically cultural practices. It is very different from multiculturalism as a critical movement that concentrates on alternative history. However, the critical movement can also be co-opted and transformed into simplifying and homogenizing cultures.

3 Bosz' major intervention to separate race from culture was developed to combat biological racial thinking. Yet culture soon became closely linked with the growing importance of psychoanalytic theories of personality. For many of Bosz' students, enculturation through early childhood socialization often revolved toward the fixed, natural, and essence-based definition which appears in studies of national character and Lewis' culture of poverty.

4 This kind of understanding of "culture" also ignores the way in which marginalized people actually use forms of expressive popular culture as a way of asserting resistance and collective autonomy (Lipset 1990; Galroy 1993) which will be discussed further below.

5 For example, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 prohibited the naturalization of Chinese, and tenant slaves were granted suffrage through the Fifteenth Amendment after the Civil War. In 1914, the Jones Act awarded a contradictory set of citizen's rights to Puerto Ricans, under U.S. control after the 1898 war with Spain.

6 For example, in Pennsylvania, a contested new state constitutional revision limited voting to whites in 1847.

7 Reoder borrows this concept from the work of W. E. B. DuBois.

8 While the East and Midwest industrial centers were important in this Great Migration, poor white southerners also migrated to midwestern cities during this period.

9 Native Americans are the only group today subject by the state to using biological measurements (blood quantum) in establishing group membership. Blood quantum and degrees of "racial" belonging were applied earlier to African Americans but that gave way to the "one drop" rule which regarded anyone with one drop of Black blood as Black.

10 "Sovereignty" in the traditional sense was undermined by later court decisions which interpreted the Contract Clause of Article I of the U.S. Constitution as giving the legislature increasingly broad powers to regulate commerce with "Indian Tribes" (Frickey 1990) and created a theory of "guardianship" with a federal right to regulate Indian affairs.

11 Armstrong (1998) has demonstrated that the powwow circuit in which Native American craftsmen and performers travel in an annual cycle of events is a contemporary site for developing a continuing paradigmatic movement.

12 Asian immigrants were not allowed to become citizens until 1953.

13 Many cases illustrate that ideal cultural practices which are declining in their places of origin can be reinterpreted and intensified in the United States in the face of immigrant uncertainties and perceived dangers. This can lead to increased boundary protection, control of children's social relations, arranged endogamous marriage, etc.

14 Family-owned Italian restaurants are ubiquitous in cities in the Northeast and northern California. Those enterprises emerged in the "Little Italys" within these cities in the 1920s and are about elsewhere.
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Appendix: Teaching Strategies

Why is this important?

We have all had experiences teaching this material and know the terrain is full of minefields. Nonetheless, we must get students to explore and understand the structures and processes that shaped our discourses of difference and to understand that there are and always were other possibilities. This should be an important thrust in teaching U.S. diversity.

Strategies for overcoming resistance to these new ideas focus on using local situations and personal experience in classroom debates and discussions as well as in essays and projects. This enables teachers to engage students by using their own environment and experience and tailoring the message to the particular student population at your institution.

In the classroom

(1) Problems with imposed categories: Collect and distribute a set of the forms requiring self-identification that students are likely to fill out, including those used by the university for admissions, financial aid, employment, etc., by the government (census surveys, etc.), and the private sector (employment applications, loan applications). Compare the forms in terms of their similarity and differences in the use of social categories. Discuss how different qualities are emphasized for different reasons. Collect several forms from other regions with different racial hierarchies for comparative purposes. Have students fill out the forms and then discuss their thought processes as they did this. Have them describe the contradictions between the forms and their own self-identities.

(2) Have the class read Org (1996), Goode (1998), Urcioli (1996), and Sanjek (1994). Have a discussion about several future scenarios for hardening, softening, and realigning group boundaries and the political and economic conditions that would support them.

Out-of-class assignment

Often it is difficult for students to discuss these issues in class, but it is effective to have them write about their own experience and try to move them to where they can analyze this experience through the new frameworks of the class. Using peer evaluation of written work also extends the discussion. Students should be
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given a choice in assignments so that they are not forced to work on an issue which they really resist.

(1) Critiquing multicultural programs. Use local and on-campus events and programs. Have students locate sites and spaces in the university or larger community such as multicultural events and multicultural training. Using participant observation, interviews, and documents, have students critically evaluate the degree to which these programs reinforce culturalist essentialism.

(2) Transnationalism. Have students interview both new immigrants and their descendants of turn-of-the-century mass migration, asking questions about the ways in which the student's family visits, maintains communication, social ties, economic exchanges, and intercultural participation in the politics of the homeland. Have them then write an essay about similarities and differences in the salience of the homeland in each case. Are connections instrumental links or more imagined/nostalgic? Tie these differences to historical processes.

(3) Panethnicity. Have students explore the degree to which the categories Asian, African American, Latino/Hispanic, and Native American are used to organize curriculum and student life at the university. Who established these structures? To what degree do all potential students in the category participate? What markers (icons, performances, historical events) are used to symbolize collective identity?

(4) Contextual variation. Have students analyze the differences in the racial and ethnic hierarchies of different contexts in their lives, such as the university, the workplace, the personal world of family and friends. Have them keep diaries and record event observations and conversations in which the cultures or others are compared in terms of behavioral and moral superiority or inferiority. In what way are these differences described as essential and immutable? In which setting does the student feel the most comfortable or uncomfortable? (Note: Have students do an early essay about this and reanalyze their experiences towards the end of the semester.)

Afterword:
Understanding U.S. Diversity – Where Do We Go From Here?
Louise Lamphere

The major message of this collection is that diversity in the United States is culturally and socially constructed. This insight informs not only anthropological research on diversity and multiculturalism, but our teaching as well. Anthropology is a discipline particularly well suited to make this point whether in articles and books or in the classroom, primarily because we approach diversity from many different angles. The four fields within anthropology – biological anthropology, archaeology, linguistics, and cultural anthropology – each utilize different kinds of data to argue for construction, making the case especially strong. In addition, anthropologists are able to demonstrate the importance of social construction both historically (through archaeology and documentary evidence) and in the contemporary period (through ethnographic observation and other kinds of qualitative material). Finally, we are able to examine the processes of social and cultural construction from the point of view of individual lives and from the point of view of social groups. Indeed, these essays demonstrate that there is not only a rich tradition of writing within anthropology about the United States and diversity, but over the past twenty years there has been an explosion of new studies.

One of the products of cultural construction is the creation of bounded categories – those of race, ethnic group, class, and gender, as well as the categories of culture itself. Thus ethnic or racial groups are seen as bounded entities, each one having a “culture.” Eric Wolf has warned us against this “pool ball” notion of culture, where cultures are seen as discrete and stable, bounded and unchanging, where “the entities spin off each other like so many hard and round billiard balls” (1982:6). Judith Goode (in Chapter 25) reminds us that this view of culture is still presented in many of our introductory textbooks and undermines our attempts to illuminate issues of diversity when we are teaching in our classrooms.