The spatial structure of Southern California’s ethnic diversity can be described by maps that show the residential locations of the various ethnic groups. This chapter and the two that follow contain the maps and basic descriptive data on the thirty-four different groups, as well as explanations of their distributions.

The maps for each of the thirty-four ethnic groups are designed to show the relative importance of each ethnic group in the total residential population of each census tract. Chapters 3 through 5 also include maps of the median income of white, black, Hispanic, and Asian households. These four maps appear in the chapters directly after the text treatment of the specific groups within each of the categories.

“Concentration,” “cluster,” “enclave,” and “neighborhood”—can be used to indicate the clustering of an ethnic group. Although other writers occasionally define certain of these words with special precision, we use them in a general sense and synonymously.

Explaining Ethnic Distributions in General

In general, ethnic residential patterns can be explained by: (1) areal variations in the cost and availability of housing; (2) group differences in population size, economic resources, employment locations, timing of settlement, and familiarity with American culture; (3) group differences in attitudes toward various places, environments, and other groups; and (4) past restrictions on minority residential locations. Most of these can be thought of as either economic, cultural, or exclusionary factors behind the distributions.

No simple explanation of ethnic distributions is possible. After all, an individual household’s decision about where to live is usually not simple. The patterns visible on the maps in this chapter represent the cumulative effect of numerous locational decisions.

Explanations for contemporary ethnic concentrations involve details of history. Thus, it is necessary to understand the above factors in the context of earlier decades, sometimes a half-century or more ago. Because we set the 1990 distributions in a historical context, the reader can see the growth and decline of various ethnic concentrations, the partial or almost complete displacement of one group by another in a neighborhood, and the appearance of areas that are ethnically mixed.

However, the process of changing distributions is normally slow. Even though individuals and families may change their addresses frequently, in-movement and out-movement from neighborhoods usually balance each other to some degree. Thus, the distributions for some groups show the presence of ethnic neighborhoods that originated more than half a century ago. Although such enclaves have typically become diffused or blurred, the fact that they are recognizable demonstrates the stability of many of these patterns. Just as most people do not change their ethnic identity quickly, it is likely that the important features of the 1990 group distributions will still be recognizable for decades to come.

Economic factors. Lowest-cost housing tends to be older and located closer to the traditional downtowns, the oldest of which are Los Angeles, Long Beach, Santa Ana, Pasadena, and Pomona. Those groups with lower average incomes and wealth will tend to be concentrated in areas closer to those downtowns. The exception to this occurs when the homes of poor people have been destroyed through urban renewal while the more expensive
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homes and apartments built in their place have attracted residents with higher incomes. In other types of urban renewal, low-income housing is replaced by nonresidential land uses, such as convention centers, shopping centers, offices, parking lots, freeways, or recreation centers. This renewal typically forces the former residents to scatter to other housing, reducing the concentration of poorer people.

Ethnic groups with the highest average incomes or wealth will have higher proportions living in areas of expensive housing. However, in nearly all groups there is a wide range of household income, and many households, regardless of ethnic affiliation, have similar levels of income. This means they qualify economically for housing in the same areas. If income were the sole determinant of residential location, many members of ethnic groups would be thoroughly intermingled in such areas.

Easy accessibility to employment is sometimes a factor, but the presence of freeways and the wide availability of automobiles means that this locational factor is less important now than it used to be. Eighty years ago, immigrants from a particular village or region or members of an ethnic group would often find jobs in the same type of industry located in the same general area of a city. Thus, proximity to past or contemporary employment can be a factor behind the present-day location of ethnic settlements.

Cultural factors. People who are less comfortable in American society usually have a greater tendency to live closer together for mutual support. Among immigrant groups, those that have arrived more recently or are less acculturated typically show more clustered residential distributions. It makes sense that newcomers, especially those who speak little English, look to friends and relatives for assistance in the search for housing and jobs and to help make them feel at home. As individuals become more acculturated and economically successful, they typically leave the ethnic concentration and disperse into areas in which U.S.-born whites are the largest group.

However, residential clustering also occurs among ethnic groups that are highly acculturated if the sense of group cohesion is strong or if the group is concerned about its acceptance in the larger society. For American blacks, the attractions of living in a geographically based black community and a wariness about their reception in predominantly white areas retard the dispersal of some blacks who could financially afford to leave the concentration. In a more subtle way a shared Jewish identity remains a powerful force, binding most Jews to the general sections of a metropolitan area where the Jewish community is strong.

Locational decisions based on the images of certain places or feelings about certain types of environments or other ethnic groups have been little studied but presumably play some role in explaining the varying ethnic distributions. It is difficult to imagine, for instance, that Chinese and other Asian immigrants with strong cultural preferences for urban life are attracted to rural environments on the metropolitan fringe as much as are many U.S.-born whites.

Exclusionary factors. Nowadays, the choice of residential location is mostly the result of household decisions constrained by financial resources and influenced by cultural factors such as those previously mentioned. However, ethnic groups differ in their attitudes toward other groups, and the cumulative effect of widespread ethnic avoidances can affect the geographical separation of specific groups.

In the past, whites often achieved residential exclusion by refusing to rent or sell housing to minorities. This was widespread and legally permissible from about 1920 until after World War II. Discrimination against blacks by white landlords and lending institutions continued well after the 1968 Fair Housing Act. Such discrimination resulted in extremely high levels of residential segregation of blacks and whites between 1920 and about 1980. In 1960 Los Angeles County was second only to Chicago (Cook County) as the most highly segregated large metropolitan county in the United States.

Thus, 1990 settlement patterns of long-settled minorities, especially blacks, show clear effects of past exclusion. Discrimination in housing still exists, although the aggregate spatial pattern of black and other minority population shifts in the 1980s was probably little affected.
Maps of Changing Ethnic Patterns

Two of our maps depict some historical ethnic distributions and directions of residential movement. The first displays the most important and distinctive shifts of group locations during the past half century (Fig. 3.1). It shows the largest concentrations of blacks, Mexicans, Japanese, and Chinese near Downtown in 1940 and the leading directions of movement out of these areas. Whites are not shown as having any area of concentration because they were found nearly everywhere.

The second map is designed to capture evolving ethnic distributions at a single point in time—1960 (Fig. 3.2). In 1960 blacks were moving into what had been all-white neighborhoods to the west and south of the former black ghetto (South Central). Also, Japanese were buying new homes in Gardena, and many sons and daughters of Mexican immigrants were leaving the barrio and moving eastward into the San Gabriel Valley. By that year the proportion of whites in Los Angeles County had dropped to 81 percent but remained much higher in Orange County. The processes which created these distributions are discussed in detail in this and the two subsequent chapters. However, the pervasiveness of whites in the new, low-density suburbs is striking, especially when compared to 1990 distributions.

Non-Hispanic Whites

The United States, representing a white population based far to the east, defeated Mexico in war in the 1840s and officially took over Southern California in 1848. Over the next thirty years that shift of political control, together with the arrival of many more Americans, led to English-speaking white dominance over the Spanish-speaking Mexican residents. Thus, non-Hispanic whites have been the most powerful ethnic group in Southern California for more than a century.

Not all white migrants from eastern states settled in Los Angeles and the larger towns. Some newcomers were particularly attracted to the new little towns that were being planned amid thousands of acres of orange groves in the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains.

Citrus Belt towns. The zone just downhill from the rugged face of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains to the east was a major destination for white settlers as early as the 1870s. A special attractiveness of this foothill climate zone was its potential for growing navel oranges. Navel oranges were already known to grow better on those slopes than on the floors of the valleys or near the coast, where the less valuable Valencias could grow. Groves were lovely and fragrant, and growing oranges was considered a clean, beautiful, and prestigious type of agriculture. However, the cost of setting up these handsome groves meant that their owners had to be wealthy.

Land developers attracted potential owners by building a luxury hotel, museum, or small college as the nucleus of their projected town and then advertising for investors in eastern and Midwestern newspapers. Railroads brought thousands of visitors, and many retired business and professional people bought land and moved to Southern California. A series of exclusive towns was founded in this Citrus Belt, the most prominent of which were Pasadena, Monrovia, Glendora, and Claremont (Fig. 2.2) and Riverside and Redlands farther east.

Many new settlers were members of elite families from New England or the Midwest. They and their children played major roles shaping the character of these foothill towns. Because the towns have retained much of their heritage and their charm, they remain especially attractive to whites, who can often afford to purchase homes. For these reasons the percentage of whites is larger in the higher elevations of Citrus Belt towns like Sierra Madre, Monrovia, and Glendora in 1990 than on the floor of the San Gabriel Valley (Fig. 3.3).

White absence from central sections of cities. Whites formerly lived in the central parts of cities and were the predominant group there in the early twentieth century. However, they began to leave the older areas as newer and less crowded housing was built farther from the city center. They were often able to purchase a new house, which became an important investment. The cumulative effect of such purchases resulted in the transfer of money out of central-city areas. After a time only people with lower incomes remained. As older housing filtered down to poorer people, its price declined.
Whites left the older areas of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Santa Ana to take advantage of the availability of newly built homes, to buy a house in a location where it was likely to increase in value, and to distance themselves from poor people. The fact that the poorer people who were replacing the whites in their old neighborhoods were often black, Asian, or Mexican American meant that discomfort with these groups added to the desire of white residents to leave.

The actual mix of reasons behind white departure from older areas will probably always remain hidden. In the neighborhoods near growing black and Latino settlements, “white flight” may have been the paramount reason for leaving. However, in other, less threatened, areas the more typically economic and housing-related motivations probably outweighed white flight as a motivation. The fact that in more recent decades Asians, blacks, and Latinos have also participated in the same suburban moves indicates clearly that the motivations behind such deconcentration are much deeper and more pervasive than merely white avoidance of other groups.

The net geographical effect of white suburbanization and replacement by minorities over more than half a century is dramatic (Fig. 3.3). A very large area extending south from Downtown has very few whites. Whites used to be the dominant group in almost all of this area before it was filled in by the merging and areal expansion of black settlement concentrations. A second area of lowest white percentages is east of Downtown and the Los Angeles River. In the very early twentieth century whites were enjoying new homes in Boyle Heights, but by World War I the area was declining in value and attracting Eastern European Jews, Mexicans, and other immigrants.

In the 1960s whites were also leaving older suburbs like Inglewood, Compton, South Gate, Lynwood, Pacoima, and Hollywood. By 1990 the exodus from such areas and in-movement by blacks and Latinos had produced a ring of fairly low white percentages surrounding the extremely low percentages of the very oldest, more central areas.

Environmental amenities. In Southern California, many of the more affluent whites would rather live up in the hills than in the more crowded flatlands. The association between income and elevation has existed for at least a century in this area, and some towns had a series of status belts, grading downslope from the wealthy through the middle-class families to the poorest people and minorities on the valley bottoms and often across the railroad tracks. The largest attractive developed area of hill or canyon terrain is the Santa Monica Mountains, stretching from the Hollywood Hills west past Malibu and Calabasas to Thousand Oaks in Ventura County (Fig. 2.1). Other important areas are the Palos Verdes Peninsula, the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains. The San Jose Hills in the San Gabriel Valley, the Puente Hills between eastern Los Angeles and Orange Counties, and the Chino Hills separating northern Orange County from San Bernardino and Riverside Counties are only partially developed as of 1990. Most of the rugged Santa Ana Mountains in eastern Orange County are part of Cleveland National Forest and have not been subdivided. Much smaller sections like the Cheviot Hills and Mount Washington near central Los Angeles and Bixby Knolls in Long Beach are also more expensive than the surrounding flatlands because they have both varied terrain and a location near centers of employment and recreation for people of higher status.

Proximity to the beaches of the Pacific Ocean is also desired by many people, resulting in high housing prices in most coastal areas. Such places are most attainable by whites. Most whites who live near the beaches at Malibu, Pacific Palisades, and Newport Beach are wealthy; the South Bay cities of Manhattan, Redondo, and Hermosa are not as expensive (Fig. 3.11). The latter locations are ideal for many workers in the computer and aerospace industries that are so concentrated in the southern part of the county (Figs. 2.13 and 2.14). But even near the coast a few lower-cost areas exist—Venice, San Pedro, and Huntington Beach—in which white proportions are lower.

Newer suburban developments. The newest residential subdivisions are often located near the outer edges of metropolitan areas, where land is cheaper but freeways provide access to jobs in previously developed areas. The major attraction of moving to such areas is the fact that homes cost much less there than
they do in areas that are more accessible to jobs, shopping, and entertainment. Thus, homeownership is often traded for a long commute. Most such places are too distant to show on the maps in this book, but many of their names are familiar: Lancaster and Palmdale to the north and Rialto, Victorville, and Moreno Valley to the east. Although most home buyers and renters in such areas are whites, the lower prices make these distant areas also accessible to blacks, Latinos, and others.

In contrast, developers can command higher prices for their homes in areas that are not as distant and have attractive environmental settings. Because fewer minorities qualify as buyers, these areas will usually have higher percentages of whites. Eastern Ventura County and southern Orange County are the leading examples (Fig. 3.3). However, cities like Walnut, Hacienda Heights, and Diamond Bar on the floor of the eastern San Gabriel Valley are exceptions. White proportions tend to be lower in such places because large numbers of Asians and Latinos are ready to move into these suburbs from older settlements like East Los Angeles and Monterey Park.

**People of English Ancestry**

An estimated 985,000 Southern Californians listed English as their first or only ancestry in 1990. This group outnumbered all other European ancestries except German. Over the years people of British heritage have intermarried, and their ancestral identities have become blurred. For the sake of simplicity, however, we focus on people of strictly English ancestry. If the 167,000 who reported a Scottish ancestry and the 99,000 who wrote in either a British or a Welsh ancestry were included, people in Southern California whose primary ancestry was British would number 1.25 million.

Despite this large total, this ethnic group is widely scattered (Fig. 6.4.). This is shown by the fact that only 13 census tracts had populations that were more than 20 percent English. In fact, the group’s distribution is similar in many ways to that of the total white population. The blurred spatial patterns parallel the cultural characteristics of people of English ancestry—their pervasive influence, their intermingling with people of other European ancestries, and their almost ubiquitous cultural presence. For these reasons, this interpretation of Figure 6.4 is shorter than the group’s numbers might seem to warrant. Nevertheless, the distribution does have features that illuminate the character of certain parts of Southern California.

People of English ancestry include both English immigrants and others whose ancestors arrived in the United States generations ago. British immigrants were the largest foreign nationality in Los Angeles County in 1937. Many well-known film and music stars have been immigrants from Britain, and numerous British societies and festivals serve that immigrant population. Nevertheless, most Southern Californians of English ancestry are not immigrants. Most have American-born parents and often grandparents, and many families trace their roots to colonial days.

**The traditional elite.** In the United States and in Southern California, this ancestry group has long been the most important one among non-Hispanic whites. Because people of English family heritage were easily the largest ancestry group at the time of the founding of the United States, they were able to dominate subsequent business, political, technical, and cultural development in the United States. The expression “WASP,” for white Anglo-Saxon Protestant, became a widely used acronym acknowledging this group’s traditional influence and power in the United States. It was not until after World War II that WASP control of most of the powerful and prestigious institutions in this country was substantially reduced.

Thus, in Southern California, as of 1990, men and women of English ancestry are probably represented among members of the social, political, scientific, and business elite more than the one-seventh proportion they constitute in the total white population. This is strongly suggested by their distribution (Fig. 3.4). English-ancestry residential concentrations, though never at all exclusive and rarely very strong, most frequently are found in areas of moderate and high incomes.

Despite the association of WASPs with power and their concentrations in certain higher-status areas, the large English-ancestry group contains many millions of people of rural origins and with little formal education.
Anti-urban preferences. Also significant is fact that most English-ancestry clusters are located in suburban areas often far from Downtown. This reflects a widespread antipathy toward high-density cities on the part of this ethnic group and most other migrants from small towns and rural areas in the East and the Midwest. Their conception of the good community was one of “single-family houses, located on large lots, surrounded by landscaped lawns, and isolated from business activities.”

This idealized image helped set the direction of suburban development in America.

Pasadena. Although not far from Downtown, Pasadena contains a concentration of English ancestry (Fig. 3.4). The exceptional presence of this group in Pasadena relates to the city’s special origins, identity, and character, which have made it distinctive from Los Angeles. Founded in the early 1870s as the Indiana Colony, Pasadena later attracted many Bostonians and other New Englanders, who bought land and homes. The first Tournament of Roses in 1889 was organized by a transplant from New England. Wintertime visits by train brought thousands of prospective migrants, and Pasadena was able to entice many business owners and wealthy families from the East and the Midwest. The concentration of old wealth (mostly WASP) in Pasadena was later tapped for the founding of the California Institute of Technology, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and other research-related organizations, as well as the Huntington Library in adjacent San Marino. These activities presumably enhanced an identity for Pasadena and a commitment among its influential families. When Carey McWilliams wrote in 1946 about an “early Bostonian atmosphere, traces of which can still be detected in such communities as Pasadena,” he may actually have underestimated the cultural persistence of this heritage. Despite all the changes that have occurred during the past half century, Pasadena south of Colorado Boulevard has remained an oasis for the old-guard Protestant and Episcopalian elite.

The most intensely English sections of Pasadena are the tract west of the Rose Bowl and Arroyo Seco, where elegant homes are nestled against a backdrop of spectacular hills, and the tract to the southeast, where Ambassador College is located (Fig. 3.4). Other tracts with higher-than-usual proportions of English ancestry stretch eastward past the California Institute of Technology to the Huntington Library.

Rustic hill environments and selected coastal areas. The English-ancestry association with suburban or lower-density settings can be found in Lakeview Terrace at the east end of the San Fernando Valley, La Cañada–Flintridge on the slopes of the San Gabriel Mountains, the city of La Habra Heights, and in the hilly portions of northern Whittier, Brea, and the Tustin area (Fig. 3.4). The Bixby Knolls section of Long Beach, with its Virginia Country Club, also stands out in English-ancestry percentage.

Many places near the Pacific Coast have relatively high proportions of people with English ancestry. Some tracts, as in Costa Mesa and Huntington Beach, are middle-income areas. However, most are expensive: parts of Pacific Palisades, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, the Naples section of Long Beach, and the Palos Verdes Peninsula. In Orange County, English ancestry is overrepresented in the Leisure World communities, in South Laguna Beach, and in parts of East Tustin and Newport Beach. The Lido Isle section of Newport Beach is easily the most strongly English area in Southern California: 29 percent of its people listed English as their first ancestry.

Special situations. Higher English-ancestry percentages in a section of tract homes in Lakewood and Long Beach represent nonelite people. Many of them worked for decades in aircraft assembly and other manufacturing jobs and are now retired.

English-ancestry clusters are not located in places where English immigrants congregate, partly because immigrants generally do not have the incomes or wealth to live in such areas. However, one well-known gathering place for English tourists may have remained in the same locality over many decades. In the late nineteenth century, tourists flocked to the coast, especially at Santa Monica, and a short stretch of Santa Monica Boulevard between Ocean Avenue and 4th Street continues to be popular among English émigrés and other Anglophiles. With its pubs,
People of Russian Ancestry (Jews)

The 639,000 Jews estimated to live in the five-county Southern California region constitute 4.4 percent of the region’s population and 8.8 percent of its non-Hispanic white population. Although Figure 3.5 maps people of Russian ancestry, we argue in chapter 1 that Russian ancestry in Southern California is a useful surrogate for the Jewish population. Moreover, the 1990 distribution of people of Russian ancestry bears a close resemblance to the most recent map of Jewish population based on a privately collected 1979 survey. For these reasons, our interpretation is written in a way that portrays a Jewish distribution.

Early social integration. At least eight Jews were present in Los Angeles as early as 1850, when Southern California was just beginning its transition from a rural, Spanish-speaking portion of Mexico’s northern frontier to a western outpost of the United States. Many Jews who settled in Los Angeles during the next three decades opened small shops to sell clothing and dry goods; and many of the merchants in the city were Jews. Other Jews became wholesalers, bankers, clerks, or salesmen.

Before the 1890s Jews were highly integrated into the social and cultural life of Los Angeles. Many were also active in civic affairs and members of the leading clubs. At the same time, most of them retained their Jewish identity, and marriage had intertwined many of their leading families. During this period most Jews lived near Downtown, and a few had summer homes at the shore in Santa Monica or Wilmington, but no section of town was considered distinctively Jewish.

However, the massive influx of rural and small-town folks brought by railroad from the East and the Midwest, the increased anti-Semitism across the United States, and local resentment at what appeared to be the growing political influence of Los Angeles Jews produced a change of mood in Los Angeles. By the turn of the century some Jews in Los Angeles were finding themselves excluded from influence and membership in the leading organizations and were, consequently, becoming more involved in the affairs of the Jewish community.

Growth and social separation. In 1904 the first wave of Eastern European Jews arrived in the city of Los Angeles. The typical Jewish migrants to Los Angeles between 1900 and 1920 were immigrants who had been born in Russia, Poland, or other parts of Eastern Europe but who had been living in New York, Philadelphia, or Chicago. Most were noticeably Jewish, poor, and conservative in religious ritual. Their Yiddish speech, occasionally exotic dress, and tendency to enter the secondhand junk business aggravated the anti-Semitic predispositions of some Christians. In addition, the established Jewish community found the newcomers embarrassing and worried that they would become overly dependent on charity.
Between 1900 and 1929 the number of Jews in Los Angeles grew from 2,500 to about 70,000. Because Jews flooded into Los Angeles at a much greater rate than did other groups of newcomers, the percentage of Jews in the city’s population increased from less than 3 percent in 1900 to more than 17 percent in 1930.

Extension of the city’s street railway during the first two decades of this century and subdivisions built near those routes opened up homes for Jews and others. Many newcomers, plus those leaving the old and increasingly congested Downtown, moved just west of Downtown near Temple Street, or two miles to the south near Central Avenue. Some could afford the more expensive homes in the Wilshire Boulevard, Hollywood, or West Adams areas. Many others settled in Boyle Heights, which became the most important Jewish enclave in the 1920s.

The 1920s was the decade in which the Jewish community became much more socially separated from the non-Jewish whites (Gentiles), who were Christian in heritage. Jews who had been members of the leading clubs found their sons and daughters not accepted for membership. The tendency for Jewish adults who moved to Los Angeles after 1920 to be the sons and daughters of Eastern European immigrants, and thus more acculturated, did not lead to greater acceptance of Jews in politics or citywide cultural affairs. For several decades the Downtown-based law firms of the Los Angeles elite included no Jewish lawyers. Even in the late 1940s it was almost impossible for Jews to be accepted in medical schools or obtain an internship or residency in Los Angeles hospitals except at the two hospitals sponsored by Jews, Cedars of Lebanon and Mount Sinai. The old-guard elite of Los Angeles excluded Jews from their country clubs and private schools.

Jews socialized more and more with each other, created new fraternal organizations, and founded their own Hillcrest Country Club, just south of Beverly Hills. Through membership in Hillcrest, tensions between the old elite Jewish families of mostly German heritage and the rising Hollywood moguls, who were Eastern European immigrants, were mostly reconciled. Their alliance became the foundation on which Westside Jewish economic and political strength developed during the 1950s and 1960s.

Communication between the Jewish and Gentile elite was at its nadir from the late 1920s until the early 1960s. Much of this was due to resentment by the Downtown-based Gentile business leadership at the development by A. W. Ross and other Jews of the “Miracle Mile” commercial axis along Wilshire Boulevard. That shopping and office area, so clearly oriented to the automobile rather than the street railway, drained much business from Downtown. In retaliation, the Downtown-oriented Los Angeles Times reported almost nothing concerning the Jewish community for the next three decades. This policy changed only when Dorothy (Buff) Chandler, the wife of Times publisher Norman Chandler, approached wealthy Jewish businessmen for support in building the Music Center and did obtain large contributions. Successful completion of the center in 1964 symbolized a partial rapprochement between the elites of the Jewish and Gentile communities.

Geographical concentration. Social separation of Jews and Gentiles was reflected in and reinforced by locational differences: Jews settled in some areas much more than in others. In general, Jews remained closer to Downtown than did other whites, who were often particularly attracted to new subdivisions in outlying areas. This was partly because Jews did not share most Christian whites’ bias against high-density living and partly because Jews were more apt to be employed Downtown. The proportion of white-collar workers, managers, and professionals among Jews began a very rapid increase during the 1920s. Until about 1950 most managerial and professional work was in Downtown. Also, the clothing business prior to about 1950 was predominantly Jewish. Tailors, factory workers, and owners desired easy access to Downtown, where most factories were located.

Discrimination in housing was a minor and short-lived factor in the evolution of the Jewish distribution. However, Gentiles did sometimes attempt to exclude Jews from certain residential areas. During the 1920s and 1930s, when anti-Semitism was widespread, the Ku Klux Klan in places such as Glendale and Inglewood worked to keep Jews as well as blacks out of certain areas. Restrictive covenants that prevented the sale of a house to
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Non-Hispanic White
Percent of Population
1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Number of Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4.2</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 - 57.8</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.9 - 80.7</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.8 - 86.1</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.2 - 88.7</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.8 - 100</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.4

English Ancestry
Percent of Population
1990

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.5

Russian Ancestry
Percent of Population
1990

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.6

Israeli Ancestry
Percent of Population
1990

Number of Tracts | Percent Israeli
--- | ---
2327 | 0 - 0.3
93 | 0.4 - 0.6
60 | 0.7 - 1.0
72 | 1.1 - 3.0
12 | 3.1 - 6.1

| Israeli | 13,488 Persons | 26 Median Age | $42,700 Median Household Income | $15,733 Median Personal Income of the US-born | $24,700 Median Personal Income of the foreign-born |
| Percent of persons 25 yrs+ who are foreign-born | 88.2 |
| Percent of foreign-born persons 25 yrs+ who immigrated 1980-90 | 53.7 |
| Percent of persons 18 yrs+ who speak English only or very well | 72.2 |
| Percent of persons 25 yrs+ who are four-year college graduates | 31.1 |
| Percent of employed in managerial and professional occupations | 37.7 |
| Percent of occupied homes which are occupied by owner | 53.5 |

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.7

Arab Ancestries*
Percent of Population
1990

* Arab includes those of Arab, Egyptian, Iraqi, Jordanian, Lebanese, Moroccan, Palestinian, and Syrian ancestries.

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.8
Armenian Ancestry
Percent of Population
1990

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.9
Iranian Ancestry
Percent of Population
1990

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.10
Turkish Ancestry
Percent of Population
1990

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
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Non-Hispanic White Household Income
1989
Figure 3.12
Black
Percent of Population
1990

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.13
Belizean Ancestry
Percent of Population
1990

Number of Tracts

Percent Belizean

- 0 - 0.3
- 0.4 - 0.6
- 0.7 - 1.0
- 1.1 - 2.5
- 2.6 - 5.6

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.14
Jamaican Ancestry
Percent of Population
1990

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.15
Nigerian Ancestry
Percent of Population
1990

Statistics and percents are for the Los Angeles CMSA (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), 1990.
Figure 3.16

Black Household Income
1989

Number of Tracts | Median Household Income in Dollars
--- | ---
191 | $0 - $15,000
358 | $15,001 - $25,000
465 | $25,001 - $35,000
536 | $35,001 - $50,000
473 | $50,001 - $75,000
541 | $> 75,000

No Less than 100 Black Households

County Boundary
City Boundary
Jews and non-whites were fairly common. In Palos Verdes Estates, incorporated in 1939, for a time limited ownership to “Caucasians and Gentiles.”

**Boyle Heights.** By 1890 the Boyle Heights section of Los Angeles, east of the Los Angeles River, was connected to Downtown by two street railways. The next decade saw the growth of this streetcar suburb, with numerous large, attractive homes built above the bluffs overlooking Downtown. With much additional homebuilding after 1910 and the departure of many of the original homeowners to newer suburbs, Boyle Heights soon became the leading destination for new immigrants. During the 1920s the sheer numbers of Eastern European Jews arriving in Los Angeles meant that Jews became the dominant ethnic group in Boyle Heights.

By the mid-1930s, about 35,000 Jews (almost a third of Los Angeles’ Jewry) lived in Boyle Heights. Mostly Orthodox in their Judaism and Yiddish speaking, they established a neighborhood Jewish presence and an active cultural and religious life. The area boasted ten synagogues, Jewish food and candy shops and bookstores, two theaters showing Yiddish films, an old folks’ home, a Kosher slaughterhouse and restaurants, a Yiddish school, and Jewish social clubs. On Breed Street the Orthodox synagogue (shul) became the symbol of the Boyle Heights Jewish community. The hilly area called City Terrace, just outside the Los Angeles City boundary to the northeast of Boyle Heights, had homes that were newer and more expensive than those in Boyle Heights. It too became Jewish, but the fact that many of its residents were secular and politically active resulted in periodic conflicts with the more religious and traditional Jews of Boyle Heights.

Beginning in the 1920s it became possible for the more affluent Jews to move out of Boyle Heights and City Terrace. They found better homes to the west of Downtown, especially in Hollywood and in the increasingly Jewish Fairfax Avenue neighborhood north of Beverly Boulevard. By 1940 the settlements west of Downtown had more Jews than did Boyle Heights. The contrast between the two general areas was clear. Boyle Heights remained the home of the more Yiddish, Orthodox, and working-class Jews; the more acculturated Jews (particularly the Reform Jews) and the new professionals and managers lived in a completely separate area, to the west of Downtown.

In later decades the Jewish exodus from Boyle Heights continued. As the area became more and more Mexican, most evidence of its Jewish past was obliterated or lost. By the 1990s only the Breed Street synagogue—abandoned and vandalized—remained to suggest the vitality of Jewish neighborhood life in the past. However, many Jews still alive remember “the Heights” with fondness. That area, more than any other in Los Angeles, was a transplantation of the intensely rewarding community life they had experienced earlier in New York, Chicago, and other large Jewish centers.

**Shifts from older neighborhoods.** Between 1920 and 1940 Jews and other whites moved out of the old Central Avenue area south of Downtown, and their places were taken by blacks. The Sephardic Jewish immigrants who had settled two miles to the west in South Central during the 1920s and early 1930s did not leave so soon, but in the 1940s and 1950s most of them also moved farther west or north into the Westside. The many black in-migrants to Los Angeles were being residentially segregated into a ghetto whose focus was Central Avenue, and nearly all whites moved out as the southward-advancing black settlement penetrated their neighborhoods. White flight was delayed from more expensive areas to the west, particularly the West Adams neighborhood west of the University of Southern California, where many large, architecturally distinctive homes dated from the early 1890s. However, in the late 1940s and 1950s most Jews left the West Adams area and moved farther north or west, toward what was coalescing as the Jewish Westside community.

Some Jews who lived in these parts of South Central had important ties to blacks in their area. They employed blacks as servants in their homes and in various menial jobs in Jewish-owned neighborhood stores, at which blacks shopped frequently. Jews and blacks also recognized a common bond in their struggle against discrimination and worked together to eliminate it. In addition, Jews earned a reputation during the years of legalized segregation of being more willing than other whites to ignore
restrictive covenants and sell their homes to blacks.\textsuperscript{37} Later, in the 1950s and 1960s, the connections between Jews and blacks were forged into an influential political coalition that ultimately achieved the election of a black mayor, Tom Bradley, in 1973.

Departure from the Temple Street area occurred as early as 1920, but in this case white flight in advance of encroaching blacks was not one of the motives. The Temple Street area was two miles north of major black areas and was not viewed as being in the likely path of black-ghetto expansion. Out-movement from the Temple Street neighborhood was simply a response to neighborhood aging, a growing affluence among Jewish residents, and the availability and affordability of better neighborhoods elsewhere. Thus, the increasingly low-income Temple Street neighborhood became ethnically diverse rather than black.

Jews who left these disparate sections tended to move into a single large area which would become the large Jewish enclave stretching between Hollywood and the coast. Although Jews continue to live in small numbers in most parts of Southern California, this single concentration within a relatively small part of Los Angeles County is dramatically evident in 1990 (Fig. 3.5). In the next sections we will explore various areas within that Jewish enclave.

**The Fairfax District and Pico-Robertson.** During the 1940s and 1950s many Jews settled near Fairfax Avenue, between Wilshire Boulevard and Melrose Avenue.\textsuperscript{38} This area contained numerous apartment buildings that attracted many Jews who were elderly or not affluent. Fairfax Avenue between Melrose Avenue and Beverly Boulevard emerged as the most important Jewish residential and shopping enclave—an updated and smaller-scale version of Boyle Heights. Fairfax was the symbolic focus of the Jewish community during the postwar years.

Since the 1940s this Fairfax District has been the best-known distinctively Jewish section of Los Angeles. Its Jewish identity is visible in its many Orthodox synagogues, kosher butcher shops, stores selling religious books and music from Israel, newspaper stands with Russian and Hebrew papers, and service centers to help elderly Jews.\textsuperscript{39} Canter’s Restaurant and Delicatessen includes a Kibbutz Room, Bob’s Fish Market sells only kosher fish, and the Diamond Bakery is famous for corn rye, raisin pumpernickel, and Sabbath challah bread. Strolling along Fairfax Avenue was once a favorite pastime in Los Angeles. However, as the neighborhood has declined, affluent and assimilated Jews visited Fairfax less often if ever. As the old generation died, as thrift stores and pizzerias and Chinese restaurants intruded, the district became a relic of the past rather than a vibrant enclave of contemporary Jewish life.

Two miles to the southwest, around the intersection of Pico and Robertson Boulevards, is another Jewish neighborhood. This one, however, has many younger families and is easily accessible to more affluent Jews in the Cheviot Hills. With kosher meat markets, Jewish day schools and bookstores, and several Orthodox and Conservative congregations, Pico-Robertson is an important Jewish enclave.\textsuperscript{40}

**Russian Jewish refugees in West Hollywood.** During the 1940s and 1950s, Hollywood attracted many Jews who left Boyle Heights and others newly arrived in Los Angeles. As in Fairfax, housing in Hollywood has been mostly apartments in large buildings, though some old homes were remodeled into smaller rental units. In subsequent decades most of these Jews departed, their places to be taken by a very different group.

In the late 1970s West Hollywood and adjacent parts of Hollywood became a major destination for Jewish refugees from the Soviet Union. A similar flood of refugees occurred during the Soviet-American détente of the late 1980s, so that in 1990 a great many refugees had just arrived in Los Angeles. All spoke Russian, many were elderly, and most have found it difficult to learn English and adapt to the American economic system.

During the Soviet period religion was strongly discouraged, and Jews were not permitted to conduct religious services. As a result, Russian Jews in Los Angeles have typically arrived with little knowledge of Judaism. However, the close proximity of this area to the Fairfax district and its many synagogues has helped reconnect these Jews to their heritage. In Fairfax some elderly Russian Jews have become acquainted with elderly Jews who migrated many decades ago, although this poses some language
The West Hollywood enclave is located in the easternmost set of tracts with 15 percent or more Russian ancestry (Fig. 3.5). It is precisely these Russian Jewish refugees, rather than a U.S.-born Russian-ancestry population, that distinguishes this area. With the assistance of relatives and local Jewish congregations, many refugees settled elsewhere in the Westside or in the Jewish sections of the San Fernando Valley. However, in the mid-1990s West Hollywood remained an enclave that was ostensibly part of the larger Westside Jewish population but was, in fact, culturally and socially distinct.

The Westside of Los Angeles. Since the 1940s younger Jewish families have been moving into newer neighborhoods, either farther west in what is usually called the Westside of Los Angeles or north into the San Fernando Valley. These two areas encompass the most important Jewish concentration in Southern California (Fig. 3.5).

The Westside is a regional label which is defined as much by the affluence of its predominantly white (and often Jewish) population as by its location (Fig. 2.4). Geographically it extends westward from approximately La Brea or Fairfax Avenue to the Pacific Ocean. Thus, within the Westside are the large, single-family houses of Beverly Hills, Bel Air, Cheviot Hills, Brentwood, and Pacific Palisades, as well as the more modest homes and apartments of Palms and Santa Monica.

The Westside and the San Fernando Valley were attractive to Jews because they were not far from earlier settlements like Boyle Heights and West Adams and were areas where new housing and the higher-status jobs were opening up. The Jewish concentrations in these areas are also partly due to Jewish internal cohesiveness—the desire of many Jews to be part of a geographically based Jewish community. However, the continual and substantial westward shift of the Jewish distribution over the last half century has isolated what was once the most prestigious and important Jewish temple in Los Angeles. At the time of its founding in 1929, the Wilshire Boulevard Temple was reasonably close to its members’ homes. By 1990, however, this historic landmark seemed far out of place in its setting amid modern office buildings in Koreatown. It is certainly poorly located to serve its contemporary Westside congregation.

Jewish proportions, as indicated by Russian-ancestry percentages, are particularly high in Beverly Hills and the area to its south (Fig. 3.5). The latter includes the Cheviot Hills, Beverlywood, and the less expensive Pico-Robertson area. The tract that contains the Fairfax enclave also appears on the map in the highest percentage-Russian category.

Much of the financial strength of Westside Jews has been based on their success in the film industry and, since World War II, in television, suburban real-estate development, and savings-and-loan operations. Jewish residential concentration on the Westside has been reinforced by the area’s commercial growth. This growth has been focused especially in Century City and on the “Miracle Mile” on Wilshire Boulevard between Fairfax and La Brea. These centers of exclusive stores, hotels and restaurants, and office buildings represent mostly Jewish competition with the monopoly of Los Angeles business functions formerly held by Downtown and the old “Anglo” elite. The offices of the largest Jewish community organization, the Federation Council, lie on Wilshire Boulevard at the eastern edge of Beverly Hills, an area with an unusually high percentage of Russian ancestry (Fig. 3.5). The Simon Wiesenthal Center and its associated Museum of Tolerance are also located in the heart of the Jewish Westside—on Pico Boulevard close to the 20th Century Fox Studio in Century City. It is likely that the majority of highly influential Jewish families in Los Angeles reside within two miles of these institutions.
**The San Fernando Valley.** For three decades following World War II this valley was a major focus of new homebuilding in the Los Angeles area. Population growth was rapid, and the number of Jews in the valley in 1979 was seven times what it had been in 1951.45 Most Jews settled near the southern edge of the valley, at first in North Hollywood but later in a corridor that extended west on either side of Ventura Boulevard into Encino, Sherman Oaks, Tarzana, and Woodland Hills.46 Ventura Boulevard, which stretches the length of the valley’s southern margin, became a shopping center for the affluent, many of whom were Jewish.

To the north of the Ventura Boulevard axis of Jewish settlement lies an ethnic and economic transition zone, carefully defined by the price and appearance of housing and by the degree of industrialization, with cheaper apartment rentals commonly occupied by Latinos. To the east, Jewish settlement diminishes sharply beyond the 170 Freeway (Fig. 3.5). Burbank, Toluca Lake, and a few parts of North Hollywood remain to some extent a stronghold of “Anglo” whites. Similarly, the Russian-ancestry percentage is low in the more rugged areas west of the San Fernando Valley because few Jews have been attracted to those rustic but isolated pockets of settlement.

In the 1970s and 1980s the valley became less suburban and more urban. Employment, shopping, and entertainment opportunities became widespread, making trips over the mountains to the Westside less necessary and locations near Ventura Boulevard less advantageous. Jews avoided the low-income areas in the older central part of the valley and selected homes in the better sections of Northridge and near the valley’s western and northern fringes (West Hills and Porter Ranch). During the 1980s many refugees from the Soviet Union settled in the southern corridor of the valley, accentuating the Jewish presence in that zone.

**Santa Monica Mountains.** These rugged mountains may be a barrier to transportation, but they do not divide Los Angeles Jewry geographically or socially (Fig. 3.5). Russian-ancestry percentages continue relatively high through this picturesque and expensive area. In the mid-1990s a highly visible new focus of Los Angeles Jewry was built at a key crossroads in the mountains—where Mulholland Drive crosses Interstate 405. Recent developments there include the Skirball Cultural Center, which stresses the American Jewish experience, and the University of Judaism.

Nearly all people who identify their ancestry as Israeli are Jewish. Christian and Muslim migrants from Israel are much more likely to identify themselves as Palestinian or to use some label other than Israeli, because the latter term is inseparable from the Jewish dominance of Israel. The Jewish nature of Israelis means that Israelis share some characteristics with American Jews.

Jews in Southern California have provided social and economic support for newly arrived Israelis. Residential locations are also similar. Most Israelis live in neighborhoods where there are many other Jews (Figs. 3.5 and 3.6). Their percentages are relatively high in the Fairfax District, the section of Hollywood next to West Hollywood and Fairfax, the Pico-Robertson area, and the adjacent section of Beverly Hills. In the San Fernando Valley Israelis have concentrated somewhat in Sherman Oaks and Tarzana—both on expensive Santa Monica Mountain sites and on the valley floor. Israelis and the Russian-ancestry population share some industry niches although these are also common among other groups (Table 8.6).

Nevertheless, in a great many ways Israelis in Southern California are distinct from other Jews.47 In Southern California (and the United States as a whole) the Reform and Conservative branches of Judaism are numerically much larger and more influential than is the Orthodox branch, but in Israel the Reform and Conservative groups hardly exist. Among Israelis, much of life is
directly or indirectly tied to Orthodoxy and its synagogues. Language is another reason why Israelis typically form independent social networks. They speak Hebrew, but Southern California Jews are rarely able to speak Israeli Hebrew. Israelis in Southern California miss the solidarity of the social community they knew in Israel, and Israeli women work hard to establish informal networks of mutual support and child rearing with other Israelis in order to overcome this deficiency in American life. Israelis and other local Jews have mixed feelings about each other. Israelis frequently consider American Jews to be soft and lacking in self-confidence and pride as Jews, whereas many U.S.-born Jews think of Israelis in Los Angeles as boorish and arrogant.48

American Jews often look critically at Israelis living in the United States, believing that they have too easily forsaken their obligations to Israel for the greater material prosperity of America. And the ambivalence of Israelis themselves concerning their emigration from Israel is indicated by the fact that most Israelis in Southern California agree with American Jews that they (the Israeli émigrés) should return someday to Israel.49

People of Arab Ancestries

People with origins in one of the predominantly Arabic-speaking countries identify with that country. In most cases they also consider themselves Arabs. The pervasive Arab identity throughout North Africa and much of the Middle East may well become stronger in Southern California relative to national identities, partly because there are too few people from any single Arab country to form a cohesive community.50

We combined several national ancestries into a single larger Arab ancestry total (Fig. 3.7). This Arab aggregation includes the following, listed here with their 1990 estimated populations in Southern California: Egyptian (13,584), Moroccan (1,482), Lebanese (24,925), Syrian (7,769), Jordanian (2,504), Palestinian (4,787), and Iraqi (2,373), as well as those who reported their ancestry as Arab (11,791). Other ancestries not included in this Arab aggregation because of their much smaller numbers are Algerian (299), Tunisian (130), Libyan (72), Bahraini (101), Kuwaiti (80), Saudi Arabian (100), and Yemeni (202).

Within our aggregation, Muslims and Christians constitute the leading religious groups, but in Southern California there are also Jews, especially from Morocco, and an active Druze community. No good data on the size of the various religious communities exist, because the U.S. census is not permitted to ask questions regarding religious adherence and no one has surveyed religious identity among Southern Californians of Arab origin.51 Although most immigrants from many Arab countries are Muslim, it may well be that Southern Californians of Egyptian, Palestinian, Syrian, and Lebanese ancestries are predominantly Christian, represented by numerous Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox denominations. The large immigration from Egypt, for instance, has produced a rapid increase in numbers of Coptic Christians.52 Additionally, most Armenians (almost all of whom are Christian) who immigrated from Lebanon or Syria are fluent in Arabic and at home in Arab culture. Although most of them probably identified their primary ancestry as Armenian on the census, their ties to Arabs from those countries are often strong, both socially and politically.

**Distribution.** It seems likely that people of Arab ancestry have long been widely distributed across Southern California. A survey of Christian Lebanese about 1960 found something of a concentration in the Silver Lake–Los Feliz–East Hollywood area, but the majority were living elsewhere.53 During the past thirty years many immigrants arrived first as college or graduate students sent by well-to-do parents, and their subsequent high-status employment has enabled many of them to live in more expensive but widely scattered areas near their work.

Widespread prejudice against Muslims, particularly Arabs, has also prompted many people to be discreet in expressing their identities in public.54 Also, the absence of any distinctive Arab or Muslim enclave diminishes the public’s awareness of local Arabs and Muslims. Although the Islamic Center of Southern California (Vermont Avenue near 4th Street) has become the most influential local media source for Islamic perspectives on a wide range of topics, it is not located near any residential cluster of Arabs or other Muslim populations. Moreover, the other forty
or so other mosques in the Los Angeles and Orange County area are unobtrusive.\(^5^5\) The Arab-ancestry group’s wide scattering is reflected in the varied locations at which formal group functions are held. These range from the Arab American Community Center near Silver Lake, the Beverly Hilton, and the Disneyland Hotel in Anaheim to a Middle Eastern restaurant and night club in Glendora, a banquet center in Monrovia, and a public park in Lakewood.

The location of specific tracts with relatively high Arab proportions may not be very significant because all of the percentages are so low. Nevertheless, the fact that Arab-oriented churches are located in or near clusters suggests possible connections (Fig. 3.7). For instance, there are Arab Protestant churches in Glendora, Pasadena, and Glendale; a Syrian Melkite Catholic Church in North Hollywood; and Coptic Orthodox churches in Arleta, Glendale, and Bellflower, and on Robertson Boulevard in Los Angeles within the tract that shows as at least 3.5 percent Arab ancestry.\(^5^6\) One tract stands out visually at the top of Figure 3.7, less because of its importance in the Arab distribution than because its area is so large. This tract, west of Interstate 5 and Valencia, has 1,700 residents, but nearly all of them live in the new Stevenson Ranch subdivision. The remainder of the tract is rugged, wild country.

Other tracts with slightly high Arab percentages are widespread. It is possible that in 1990 some residential clustering would be more apparent in distributions of specific Arab nationalities because chain migrations and social networks normally tied to one specific country would not be masked by those of other countries. However, we found no evidence that this was the case. For example, the 1960 Christian Lebanese concentration is apparent in 1990 only in a single Los Feliz tract that was no more than about 3 percent Arab ancestry, and the thirteen organized Coptic Christian congregations are widely scattered through Southern California.\(^5^7\)

**People of Armenian Ancestry**

A handful of students, health seekers, and rug merchants were probably the first Armenians to settle in Southern California, beginning in the 1890s. Most of these had lived for several years in the Boston or New York City areas.\(^5^8\) More arrived during the first decade of the twentieth century, from the eastern United States, from the large Armenian colony to the north in Fresno, and directly from the Turkish (Ottoman) and Russian Empires. Most of these early Armenians did not cluster residentially but scattered—some as far as Santa Barbara, San Diego, and Riverside.

**Los Angeles.** The area just south of Downtown was the first focus of Armenian religious institutions. Many of the early Armenian immigrants to Los Angeles were Congregationalists or other Protestant Christians—a result of missionary work in parts of the Ottoman Empire during the mid-nineteenth century. They worshiped initially with the Congregationalists, whose church was at 9th and Hope Streets, before they formed their own church nearby. Later, an Armenian Gregorian (Apostolic) Church, which followed the traditional Armenian religion, was also founded near Downtown.

As Los Angeles expanded, both people and churches slowly left the older neighborhoods. By 1923 Armenians were living in many sections of the city, including some wealthy neighborhoods like West Adams and the Wilshire district. Considering the many decades of urban change in older neighborhoods, it is not surprising that in 1990 hardly any Armenians were living near Downtown or in West Adams.

**Pasadena and Altadena.** Armenian settlement in Pasadena dates from about 1901. Northeastern Pasadena, along Washington Boulevard between Allen and Hill Avenues, became the initial center of a thriving Armenian community. After World War I more immigrants arrived, especially from Turkey, and since World War II many Armenians from Lebanon and Syria have settled in Pasadena. Immigrants typically became shopkeepers, tailors, or barbers. Their more educated sons and daughters often remained in the area but became professionals. Over the past eighty years the Armenian settlement has expanded, especially northward into East Altadena, with its newer homes on large lots (Fig. 3.8). However, during the many decades since the community was first established in Pasadena, the geographical focus of its
churches, shops, and other businesses has changed little.

**Boyle Heights and Montebello.** Before World War I a few Armenians migrated from the section of Armenia within the Russian Empire to Canada but later moved to Southern California. Their letters back to the homeland enticed others, so that by the early 1920s several hundred Russian Armenians were living in Boyle Heights—at that time the major immigrant district of Los Angeles. At first most Russian Armenians settled in a small area near the bluffs not far from the future route of the Interstate 5 Freeway, and many found work in brickyards, foundries, and local railroad shops. Others established themselves in the trucking business. In 1908 a few Armenians began to specialize in rubbish collection, which had previously been done by blacks, and some were highly successful. By the 1940s Armenians were said to control three-quarters of Los Angeles County’s rubbish removal; and the BKK Company, founded by Ben K. Kazarian in 1918, has been prominent in the waste-disposal business.

By the early 1920s the more successful and assimilated Russian Armenians were moving eastward to newer homes and more space. This suburbanization led to the Armenian settlements in and around Montebello and ultimately to the departure from Boyle Heights of virtually all Armenians. Letters back to friends in Russian Armenia (known as Soviet Armenia from 1921 to 1991) directed many people from the same sections of Armenia to settle in Montebello, making for a cohesive community centered on the local Apostolic Church. The Montebello community grew again in the late 1940s and 1950s with the arrival of more than a thousand Armenian refugees from World War II. Most of these were men who had been soldiers in the Soviet army but were captured by German or Italian troops during the war. Under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 they were permitted to leave the temporary camps in Germany and settle in the United States.

**East Hollywood.** In the 1960s and 1970s the section of Hollywood east of the 101 Freeway was the leading point of arrival for Armenian immigrants and refugees from Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, Turkey, and Soviet Armenia. East Hollywood’s Armenian markets, clubs, churches, schools, and social-service centers, located between Santa Monica and Hollywood Boulevards, created a community called “Little Armenia.”

In August 1987 conditions in East Hollywood became still more crowded when thousands of Armenians from the Soviet Union suddenly began to arrive as a result of more liberal emigration under Mikhail Gorbachev’s glasnost. Because these people were poorer than most Armenian immigrants and had not been permitted to bring money out of the Soviet Union, they settled in the more modest apartments of East Hollywood, where they could at least obtain some help in finding jobs, learning English, becoming reacquainted with religious practices that had been forgotten under Communism, and coping with the numerous challenges of survival in America. Since the breakup of the Soviet Union, Armenia has again emerged as an independent country—the source of great symbolic pride and affection for Armenians everywhere but a nation racked by severe unemployment, shortages of supplies, and warfare with neighboring peoples.

**Glendale.** Throughout the 1980s, earlier Armenian immigrants who had established themselves financially found that they could escape East Hollywood and its crowded and somewhat rundown housing. Some moved a little to the north, into the better apartments of the Los Feliz area, but most moved to Glendale.

Although Glendale was home to only a dozen Armenian families in the 1950s, by the late 1970s many business and professional families from Iran and Lebanon had settled there. During the 1980s it emerged as the main destination for newly arriving middle- and upper-class Armenians, particularly those who fled Iran after that country’s takeover in 1979 by a conservative Islamic faction. By 1990 Armenians formed an important part of the residents in most parts of Glendale and in the adjacent valley that stretches from La Cañada–Flintridge to the Tujunga section of Los Angeles (Fig. 3.8).

During the 1980s, as the Armenian population of Glendale grew rapidly, it became more mixed in origin and socioeconomic status. The city was becoming a popular symbol of Armenian immigrant upward socioeconomic mobility. Those who were
stepping up from East Hollywood generally settled in South Glendale (south of the 134 Freeway), where fine, old family homes of a bygone era were frequently remodeled into smaller apartments for Armenians. A larger Armenian church was also needed, and in 1985 this was bought from Christian Scientists. The imposing, domed edifice on Central Avenue became the new St. Mary’s Armenian Apostolic Church. The sheer numbers of Armenian immigrants and their lack of familiarity with American culture have made for major ethnic tensions within Glendale, especially in South Glendale, which has become an intensely Armenian part of the city (Fig. 3.8).

The San Fernando Valley and more distant places. As the children and grandchildren of Armenian immigrants looked for homes for their families, most moved to suburbs in the San Fernando Valley. In the 1940s some Armenians had moved to the eastern San Fernando Valley near Van Nuys, where new homes were offered. During the following decades younger people settled in the newer homes to the west. Some of the more affluent were living in Porter Ranch in the northern fringe of the valley and on the valley’s south side, in and near Encino. The homes of Armenians were scattered, with no residential enclave. For the many who have wished to preserve the cohesive community and strong sense of ethnic identity they knew as children, Armenian private schools have been built, and two large schools (in Encino and Canoga Park) provide instruction for all grades through high school.

Although the San Fernando Valley contains many foreign-born Armenians, its dispersed Armenian residences reflect the greater educational attainment and acculturation of the U.S.-born generations. Those Armenians who in 1990 were living in Orange County, Palos Verdes, Ventura County, and other places quite distant from the major centers of Armenian life are less likely to need frequent contact with the larger Armenian community.

Nevertheless, Armenian identity remains strong and is continually energized by memories of the early-twentieth-century genocide in Turkey, commemorated by the Armenian Martyrs Memorial Monument in Bicknell Park in Montebello.

People of Iranian Ancestry

In the mid-1970s immigration from Iran began to increase rapidly, as many parents who could afford to send their male children to colleges or universities in the United States did so. Iran lacked opportunities for advanced education, which was in demand because of the nation’s rapid development. Also, many families who had benefited from economic modernization recognized that as the power of the shah diminished, their security and affluence were threatened. Anticipating major changes, many Iranians put money into Swiss banks and left Iran, entering the United States under student or visitor visas.

When the shah’s government collapsed in 1979 and members of an Islamic fundamentalist clergy grasped the reins of power, the revolution was both political and cultural. During the next few years the new Islamic Republic instituted severe restrictions in such matters as popular music, singing, women’s clothing, and the use of alcohol. The government persecuted non-Islamic religious groups and individuals who did not support its narrow Islamic, anti-American, and antimodernist views. Entire families, including most of Iran’s upper class and others in the oil industry, fled the country, usually first to Istanbul. The exodus included a large proportion of Iran’s religious minorities—Armenians, Assyrians, Jews, Bahais, and Zoroastrians—as well as rich and more secular Muslims.

The majority of Iranians arriving in Southern California were from the Westernized middle and upper classes of Teheran. Because they had known the good life in Iran, they did not share the motivation of economic betterment that has characterized most immigrants to the United States. Without the reversal of their political fortunes in 1979, most would have been happy to remain at home in Iran. The tendency of many Iranian women in Los Angeles to display expensive and stylish clothes, automobiles, and jewelry may represent their attempt to retain, at least on the surface, the prosperity and elegance they had known in Iran.

Religious and ethnic distinctions. People of Iranian ancestry have traditionally divided themselves into separate com-
munities based primarily on religion. This derives from the pattern found over much of the Middle East, where religions and ethnic groups are socially separate, live in separate sections of cities, and often pursue different, specialized occupations.

To illustrate, a private survey in 1987–1988 found that, if at all possible, most Iranian entrepreneurs in Los Angeles selected business partners and hired workers from among their relatives or from their own religious or ethnic group. The different religious communities also vary somewhat in industry niches, impossible to differentiate with census data but evident in the private survey. Among those who were self-employed, Jews were much more apt to be involved in wholesaling and retailing, particularly of clothing and jewelry. In contrast, Armenians from Iran tended to specialize more in financial and business services, Muslims in construction and durable-goods manufacturing, and Bahais in manufacturing and in health and legal services.

The majority of Iranian Muslims in Southern California do not form a distinct community, in contrast to other groups from Iran. They are also more secular than are Muslims from other countries and do not frequently socialize with even fellow Shi’i Muslims of other national origins. Many still expect to return to Iran and reunite with family members who remained in that country.

Iranian Jews have acculturated more rapidly in Southern California than have Muslims. This is because of substantial contact with American Jews, the emigration of entire families from Iran, and their relative satisfaction with Southern California. Ironically, in Los Angeles there is more social contact between Iranian Muslim and Iranian Jewish women and families than there was in Iran, because both now enjoy each other’s company in the context of their shared Islamic culture.

In general, Muslims and Bahais have more social ties with people outside their own group and with Americans than do Jews and Armenians from Iran. It is not surprising, then, that English is replacing the Persian language most rapidly among Muslims and Bahais.

**Iranian concentrations.** The leading center of Iranian business and cultural activity is Little Teheran on Westwood Boulevard south of Wilshire Boulevard. Signs in Persian and English advertise the varied restaurants, clothing stores, news and cultural centers, and other businesses. Iranian investment and shopping have also invigorated and made more cosmopolitan the fashion scene along Rodeo Drive in Beverly Hills.

The strongest residential concentrations are in Beverly Hills, Westwood, and Brentwood. Iranians are also apt to live in the southern San Fernando Valley, particularly Encino and Tarzana, and in the Santa Monica Mountains (Fig. 3.9). Lesser Iranian concentrations also occur in more affluent outlying areas from eastern Ventura County to the Palos Verdes Peninsula, Laguna Niguel, and Newport Beach in Orange County. The tendency of Iranians to live in more expensive urban and suburban areas reflects both wealth brought from Iran and relatively high incomes earned here. This pattern is not the entire story, however. Some Iranians live in more modest neighborhoods in the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys and in northern Orange County.

Religious subgroup distinctions in residential location are blurred but are sometimes still evident. Armenians from Iran headed primarily to Glendale, where many Armenians from other countries also settled during the 1980s. Glendale became so well known among Armenians in Iran that they talked not of the United States but of Glendale as the hoped-for destination. Glendale is not distinctive on the map of Iranian ancestry because most Armenians reported their primary ancestry as “Armenian” rather than “Iranian.” Similarly, many Assyrians and Kurds from Iran probably reported those specific ancestries rather than Iranian.

A large proportion of Iranian refugees were Jews, many of whom had been very wealthy in Iran. They settled on the Westside of Los Angeles, particularly in Beverly Hills. The wealthier families bought large estates, but many could afford only apartments. Others moved to the Jewish corridor along Ventura Boulevard in the San Fernando Valley, especially Encino and Tarzana, and established businesses Downtown.

Iranian Jews joined temples near their residences, and by the early 1980s three Westside temples and one in Encino came to have largely Iranian congregations. This settlement pattern is
very similar to that of the Russian-ancestry population that represents the American Jewish population. Although many non-Jewish Iranians live on the Westside and in the southern San Fernando Valley, the strong Iranian concentrations in these areas suggest the importance of Jews among Southern Californians of Iranian ancestry.

Many Muslims chose to live in Westside communities, such as in Santa Monica and Palms or, for those who could afford it, Beverly Hills. They were more likely than Iranian Jews to have opened restaurants, grocery or clothing stores, professional offices, or other businesses along Westwood Boulevard south of the campus of the University of California, Los Angeles. Other Muslims settled in Irvine or on the Palos Verdes Peninsula. Bahais often live in West Los Angeles and Santa Monica. The religious focus of the few Zoroastrians has been their large center in Westminster in Orange County.

Because immigrant residential enclaves in American cities have usually been associated with relatively poor and less acculturated groups, the presence of a strong Iranian concentration in the Westside-Santa Monica Mountains area is unusual. Two factors help explain this. First, Iranian immigrants came from an intensely urban environment, and the Westside is one of the few areas in Southern California with both high density and affluence. Second, in 1979 and 1980, when the first refugees were arriving, Iranian Jewish settlement near American Jews may have encouraged other Iranians, regardless of religion, to settle in the same area because so many of them shared language, political ideology, class background, and the experience of persecution in Iran.

People of Turkish Ancestry

Almost all the people who reported this ancestry are ethnically Turkish. This is because Armenians, Kurds, Greeks, or others whose family lived in the country of Turkey were encouraged in the census to write in their ethnic affiliation, not the country of their birth. In Turkey and other multiethnic countries, especially in the Middle East, this ethnic precision makes the data more valuable than they would have been had a question concerning country of origin been asked.

People of Turkish ancestry are scattered over much of Southern California (Fig. 3.10). Such a dispersed distribution reflects their high degree of cultural and economic assimilation. Paralleling this almost complete residential deconcentration is the absence of any enclaves of Turkish restaurants, other businesses, and institutions. There is nothing approaching a Turkish neighborhood which could provide a central place for shopping and socializing. With Armenian feelings concerning the Turkish treatment of Armenians in 1915 still strong, the lack of an identifiable focus for the Turkish community may diffuse potential antagonism.

The actual tracts that represent minor Turkish residential clusters are probably not significant, because the numbers of people in each tract are so small. However, the types of places represented are important. They show a clear association of Turkish ancestry with middle- to upper-income suburban areas, reflective of the advanced education and high status of most Turkish immigrants.

In Orange County the two tracts with the highest percentages of Turkish ancestry are areas of expensive homes: one tract includes portions of Dana Point and San Juan Capistrano; the other is the Turtle Rock section of Irvine. In Los Angeles County the most strongly Turkish-ancestry tracts in the San Gabriel Valley are in the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains, in the more affluent sections of Glendora and Azusa. Other tracts are an upper-middle-class part of Westchester near Loyola Marymount University and the campus of the University of Southern California. Although in the eastern San Fernando Valley two small Turkish-ancestry clusters are in poorer areas, farther west the most evident concentrations are in moderately priced parts of the San Fernando Valley and eastern Ventura County.

Non-Hispanic-White Median Household Income

Figure 3.11 provides the socioeconomic dimension of the total of the previously discussed ethnic groups plus other whites. Three features are striking.

First, there are few whites in the more central areas of older housing. Whites formerly lived there, but most moved away when they could afford to do so or when the presence of minorities in their neighborhood made them uncomfortable.
Second, although no areas of poor whites are extensive in Southern California in 1990, the largest such area shows up in the southeastern part of Los Angeles County. Most of the white industrial workers and their families who once dominated this area have moved away or died, and Latino immigrants eagerly took their places. However, some whites—mostly the elderly—remain. An additional area of poorer whites, also elderly and often living alone, is in the older, central part of Long Beach. They, too, represent the remnants of families who migrated a half-century or more ago from the Midwest.

Third, numerous geographically separated regions of wealth are evident, most of which are located in or near environmental amenities: within hilly or mountainous terrain or near the coast. In Los Angeles County the largest residential area for wealthy whites is the wedge of the Santa Monica Mountains, including the Malibu coast east to the Pacific Palisades. Other affluent areas include parts of Northridge and Granada Hills in the northern San Fernando Valley; portions of Glendale and Pasadena; and much of the Palos Verdes Peninsula. Wealthy households also characterize San Marino, Bradbury, and La Habra Heights in the San Gabriel Valley.

Smaller, distinctively affluent areas appear on the Westside of Los Angeles—the Cheviot Hills and Hancock Park. Near Marina del Rey, whites living in newer housing near Villa Marina have much higher incomes than Latinos and Asians in the older part of the same tract. In Orange County the highest household incomes are found in the Seacliff section of Huntington Beach just south of the Bolsa Chica Ecological Reserve, in Newport Beach, and in the recently built-up southern part of the county.

Segregation, expansion, and dispersal. Historic black residential areas and later changes can be understood as the result of the processes of residential segregation, contiguous expansion, and non-contiguous dispersal to more distant places.

In the early twentieth century the arrival of large numbers of blacks in cities like Los Angeles, combined with white dislike of blacks, led many whites to limit severely the areas available for black settlement. Sharp restrictions on black choices in the housing market produced a change from the more dispersed and mixed black settlement before about 1915. Such exclusion was backed by the law and the courts until various mechanisms for maintaining segregation were weakened by U.S. and California Supreme Court decisions between 1948 and 1967.

During the years of legal residential segregation, Los Angeles had one main black concentration. It was located directly south of Downtown, on either side of Central Avenue. There were also two smaller concentrations—in the West Jefferson area and in Watts (Fig. 3.1). Other cities had smaller but also segregated black populations.

Restricting the areas in which blacks could live was part of a much wider set of discriminatory and separationist practices. In the period from 1915 until the 1960s some whites made intense efforts to prevent blacks from using public facilities, working at better jobs, and joining white unions. Blacks were also denied regular admittance at most movie theaters, restaurants, hotels, playgrounds, and swimming pools.

The areas with high proportions of blacks have changed over time, and the level of racial segregation has diminished. Nevertheless, the effect of exclusion by whites is evident in the high level of geographical concentration of blacks compared with that of other ethnic groups.

The second process—contiguous expansion of black residential areas—has occurred since World War II. Demand for housing on the part of blacks had built up intensely during the 1930s and 1940s because of the large black migration to Los Angeles, prompted by wartime employment opportunities and the relative affluence of California. By 1948 the legal basis for racial restrictions was being demolished, but some whites became violent in their objections to change. In the Allied Gardens subdivision in

Blacks

When the pueblo of Los Angeles was first established in 1781, men and women of part-African ancestry constituted about half of the original settlers. The city has always been the center of the black population in Southern California. A brief statement concerning the general processes of black settlement and change will be useful before we treat the evolution of particular areas.
Compton, for example, whites responded to black home buyers by throwing rotten fruit at the houses and smearing them with paint, tearing out rose bushes, cutting off the electricity, warping floor boards by flooding them with water via a garden hose, and burning crosses.68

In South Central the conditions that prompted blacks to move were most intense. The earlier departure of jobs and larger grocery and department stores to the suburbs, the crime and violence, and the harassment by the police led to poverty and frustration, which was expressed in the Watts uprising (or riot) of 1965. Most blacks believed that racial integration—in schools, housing, and work—was the key to a better life. Such a goal implied escape from the black ghetto, and many blacks made great efforts to leave. A 1967 California Supreme Court ruling requiring enforcement of the state’s fair housing law (the Rumford Act) and the 1968 federal Fair Housing Act may have aided movement into other areas.

Prior to the 1970s blacks who relocated generally moved into nearby areas. White homeowners usually sold to blacks and fled to more distant suburbs. As a result, few areas remained racially mixed for more than a dozen years, and the areas into which blacks moved became resegregated as black. This is why the level of black-white residential segregation dropped only slightly until after 1970.

Dispersal of the black population to distant destinations has occurred primarily since 1970. Southern California has seen a significant scattering of blacks into predominantly white areas, but accompanying “white flight” appears to have been minimal. Cultural and legal changes in American society, a growing black middle class, and a much slower rate of black population growth have made this possible. In the past two decades whites have come to accept black neighbors more readily—though their acceptance may depend on whether the number of new black residents is small and on whether they are concentrated in certain blocks or neighborhoods.

The settlement since 1970 of Mexican immigrants in areas which had been mostly black also led to black dispersal. The immigrants found that the cheapest housing in Los Angeles was in the historic Central Avenue corridor, and by 1990 Latinos came to outnumber blacks in that area. As of 1990 this former black concentration directly south of Downtown appears as only 10–35 percent black (Fig. 3.12).

General dispersal and the Latino settlement have weakened all the black concentrations, including those in outlying areas. Thirty years ago black settlements in Pacoima, Pasadena, Monrovia, Pomona, Long Beach, and Santa Ana—as well as in South Central—had higher percentages of blacks within more sharply defined boundaries. Blacks left these areas when Latinos successfully rented or purchased housing, often by sharing incomes of two or more families. For black homeowners, selling to Latinos offered the chance to leave a concentration of poverty, drug use, and crime.

Los Angeles before 1915. After 1886, when the Santa Fe Railroad established more direct railroad connections with the Midwest, the opportunities Los Angeles offered for health and wealth beckoned both whites and blacks. Most early blacks were craftsmen and laborers. They lived in various neighborhoods but most commonly in rooming houses on 1st and 2nd Streets east of Los Angeles Street.69 That area was where the hiring of construction gangs took place and where black businesses were becoming established. However, during the next twenty years of city growth, the black population shifted southward because of rapidly growing Japanese settlement in that lowest-rent area.

In 1910 a scattering of live-in servants in white homes meant that some blacks were found in nearly all parts of the city. However, most blacks lived on either side of Alameda Street north of Washington Boulevard—an area close to rail yards, warehouses, and industry—or near Central Avenue between 10th and Washington Streets.70

At about this time some whites began to forcefully oppose the movement of blacks (as well as Japanese and Mexicans) into the better neighborhoods to the south. Despite occasional intimidation by whites, the black population continued to expand southward into white residential areas. For example, by 1910 a cluster of a few hundred blacks had formed near 33rd Street and Hooper Avenue, where in 1902 the first black resident had to defend his right to the house against a white mob by waving
them off with his gun. A mile to the south, another black residential focus was developing between 51st and 55th Streets, just west of Alameda, because the developer had welcomed black residents to his tract. In outlying areas black settlement in 1910 was focused in a few neighborhoods: a section of Boyle Heights, West Temple Street between Rampart and Reno Streets, and an area west of the University of Southern California.

Despite obstacles to black settlement, the years before about 1915 were full of hope for black Angelinos, who represented, to some extent, a selective migration which included many blacks who were well-to-do and many from other parts of California. Newcomers riding waves of economic expansion were sometimes able to buy homes a few years after arriving and, like whites, frequently made a great deal of money during real-estate booms. Churches and black businesses were growing; Jews moving out of Boyle Heights willingly sold their homes to blacks; and the shops, men’s clubs, and nightlife on Central Avenue thrived. As the largest settlement of blacks in the western United States, Los Angeles was sizable enough to attract business people and professionals intent on serving the local black community. In 1913 W. E. B. DuBois echoed the optimism of thousands of blacks when he wrote, “Los Angeles is wonderful. Nowhere in the United States is the Negro so well and beautifully housed, nor the average efficiency and intelligence in the colored population so high.”

Segregation and crowding in South Central. However, after about 1915 the black population of Los Angeles grew rapidly, and whites imposed more restrictions on blacks, including restrictions on where they could live. To eliminate black movement into their neighborhoods, many whites added “restrictive covenants” to their property titles or made written agreements among neighborhood homeowners stating that they would sell or rent only to other whites. In 1919 a California Supreme Court decision validated racial restrictions on the occupancy or use of a house and provided a legal basis for residential exclusion until 1948.

Restrictive covenants and intimidation kept most blacks trapped. By 1925 blacks and whites were mixed as far south as Slauson Avenue. Local whites decided to make Slauson a sharp racial boundary so that in 1940 it still represented the southern boundary of the largest black concentration (Fig. 3.1). Restrictive covenants on property all the way south to 92d Street were strongly enforced by threats and violence against the homes of blacks who attempted to move into this area.

The black population of Los Angeles increased from fewer than 8,000 in 1910 to 335,000 in 1960. During the 1940s, as black migrants sought jobs in defense industries, the black population of the city grew by more than 100,000. Crowding became very intense within a sector extending from Downtown southward on either side of Central Avenue. This ghetto came to be called “South Central Los Angeles.”

Between 1920 and the late 1940s the efforts by many whites to keep blacks out of their neighborhoods were never completely effective. Whites occasionally chose to sell despite the restrictions, especially if they were out of work during the Great Depression. Some houses were bought from whites just after old restrictive covenants had been known to expire, and other techniques were devised to weaken white resistance. For example, block busting was used by realtors to drive the opening wedge into white neighborhoods. A realtor might arrange for a white intermediary or a black who could pass as white to buy property for a black in a white neighborhood, and the imminent move-in was well publicized. Many white neighbors panicked, fearing a drop in home prices, and were easily persuaded to sell their own homes to black families at lower-than-market prices. Some Japanese and Mexicans followed blacks into a neighborhood after its all-white status had been broken.

Contiguous expansion and resegregation. Only after World War II did the legal base for racial exclusion begin to crumble. Most significant was the U.S. Supreme Court decision in 1948 to overturn the judicial enforcement of restrictive covenants, which led to later decisions that further weakened racial restrictions.

As of 1950, however, black expansion south of Slauson Avenue had not yet reached west to Broadway or east past Alameda Street. White resistance was especially strong in the small, independent cities such as Huntington Park, Bell Gardens,
and South Gate to the southeast. These cities were populated particularly by working-class whites from rural parts of Texas and Oklahoma, and their residents prevented nearly all blacks from renting or buying until the 1950s.

As the boundaries around the ghetto began to weaken, black settlement advanced neighborhood by neighborhood. Sections that were all white changed over to almost all black, sometimes in three or four years and sometimes over two decades. Over the course of the last half-century the process whereby once-white neighborhoods became resegregated as mostly black has characterized a large portion of Los Angeles as well as some adjacent cities like Compton, Gardena, and Inglewood. Those blacks who first moved into new neighborhoods had typically formed stable families and were employed in steady jobs. They worried about the quality of those who would follow them into the neighborhood.

During the period of legalized racial segregation, blacks of all classes and backgrounds were forced into South Central. Once other housing became available, most of the middle class left. Their departure meant that the remaining residents were more uniformly poor. However, some successful black families have chosen to remain in the geographical heart of the black community, where they have felt more comfortable. Although true to a lesser extent in 1990 than in the 1930s, “poverty and prosperity exist side by side” in South Central.

Poor Watts. At the turn of the century the area called Watts was mostly dusty, vacant fields with some nearby land in farms. Its growth began in 1902, when the Pacific Electric decided to locate its Los Angeles–Long Beach route through the area. Soon afterward, Watts became the junction point of lines to Santa Ana and, later, Redondo, prompting land subdivision into home lots for people who could now commute easily to Los Angeles and many other places. The little town of Watts was incorporated in 1907 and in 1926 was annexed to the city of Los Angeles.

Most settlers in Watts as of 1920 were whites, but the town also included several hundred blacks (14 percent of the total population) and even more Mexicans (Fig. 3.1). Mexican workers had originally come to lay the Pacific Electric tracks and were living in a special section called La Colonia or, among English speakers, the “Latin Camp.” The increasing settlement of blacks in Watts began after 1910, when a developer advertised a tract specifically for black homeowners. That area attracted numerous black migrants directly from the rural South, who found Watts a good stopping place in Southern California. Although Watts was seven miles from Los Angeles, the interurban railway made it fairly convenient for women domestics working in different places and for men who needed to reach the main Southern Pacific and Santa Fe railroad stations in Los Angeles, the base for their work as Pullman car porters and waiters.

Watts was not ideal, however. Its drinking clubs flourished before the beginning of nationwide prohibition in 1919, when neighboring Los Angeles was legally “dry.” In the wintertime, runoff from the rains collected in Watts from the higher lands to the north. The Ku Klux Klan chapter based in nearby all-white Compton occasionally flexed its muscle, and the unpaved streets in the black part of Watts led locals to dub that section “Mudtown.” When jobs opened in the defense industries in the early 1940s, some residents of Watts found jobs in the Long Beach shipyards and the Northrop, Douglas, North American, and Lockheed aircraft factories. Nevertheless, in the minds of Los Angeles blacks, the name Watts continued to connote country hicks and chicken farmers.

Not surprisingly, many people left this semirural town to be closer to work and entertainment in Los Angeles. But with massive black in-migration during the 1930s and 1940s, Watts became more crowded, and by 1950 it was 71 percent black. A few years later black settlement in both South Central and Watts had expanded sufficiently to coalesce (Figs. 3.1 and 3.2). Watts became part of South Central, though it would retain a symbolic distinctiveness because of later events.

As early as 1946 a few developers built tracts of single-family houses specifically for purchase by blacks, many of whom had saved money from military service or defense jobs. Such tracts were exceptional, but they played a role in the dispersal of middle-class blacks out of crowded housing. For instance, Carver Manor was a tract of 250 houses built for black home buyers in the Willowbrook area just south of Watts, and Parkside Manor was a...
similar development in Watts east of Central at 103d Street. A few families have remained in those tracts for decades, providing a stable base for a long-lived community.78

In the mid-1950s the city supplemented the public housing (Hacienda Village) that had been built in Watts in 1942 with three large projects (Jordan Downs, Nickerson Gardens, and Imperial Courts), for a total of more than 7,000 residents. This provided needed housing, but it also accentuated Watts as a focus of poverty. Low home prices and high black unemployment led to an avoidance of the entire area by businesses whose loans and investments might have brought jobs and services. The area’s increasing black concentration made white business leaders even more wary of investment in Watts and the rest of South Central.

High prices charged by local white merchants provoked resentment. The poverty and lack of jobs, grocery stores, banks, and movie theaters led to anger which ultimately exploded in rebellion in 1965. Subsequently, the closure of the Firestone tire and the General Motors automobile factories in nearby South Gate led to a further decline in jobs for Watts residents. When rioting again occurred in South Central in the spring of 1992, the economic frustrations were similar to those of 1965.

However, some major changes had taken place. In Watts the King/Drew Medical Center, the light-rail Blue Line, and a new shopping center had been built in the intervening years. All over South Central, Koreans had replaced the aging white storekeepers, and Latino immigrants made up almost half the population. After the 1992 devastation most of the Korean merchants left and few new jobs appeared, but some supermarkets, stores, and new housing have been built.

**Westward shift of the black elite.** In the first decades of the century a large area called West Adams, which lies north and west of the University of Southern California campus, was a favored residential location for white professionals and business people, partly because of its numerous architecturally distinguished homes.

About a half-mile to the south, in the West Jefferson area, a mostly black neighborhood of teachers, ministers, lawyers, contractors, and community leaders had emerged by the late 1920s (Fig. 3.1). At first this residential center for the black elite was located south of Jefferson Boulevard and on the east side of Western Avenue.79 However, in the early 1930s increased crowding of black families in that area led some to move north almost to Adams Boulevard and west as far as Arlington. Later, as white flight opened up the West Adams area, it came to hold an important concentration of leading black families.

The more affluent and educated black families also spearheaded the thrust into all-white areas farther north and west. For example, between 1940 and 1943 black movie stars (Hattie McDaniel, Ethel Waters, Lillian Randolph, and others) and black business and professional people managed to buy some of the spacious, well-landscaped, three-story homes in Sugar Hill, an especially attractive area just north of Adams Boulevard on either side of Western Avenue.80 Their presence was protested by the West Adams Improvement Association, though ultimately those whites lost.

After World War II white flight opened up Sugar Hill and adjacent neighborhoods to ordinary blacks, but racial tensions over black entry into all-white residential areas remained strong. For example, a few months after the 1948 U.S. Supreme Court decision barring enforcement of restrictive covenants, Nat “King” Cole bought a house in all-white Hancock Park—almost three miles north of the black settlement in Sugar Hill.81 Cole’s purchase led to intimidating letters and telephone calls, offers by whites to buy the house, and threats to revoke the license of the realtor representing the seller.

Black settlement in Sugar Hill has left an important legacy. The area remains the home of the state’s largest black-owned insurance company (Golden State Life) and the city’s most prestigious church within the black community, First AME (African Methodist Episcopal). However, most of the black elite themselves have moved farther westward from Sugar Hill or left the large, contiguous black settlement area entirely. Many three-story houses have been carved up into small rental apartments.

The westward residential advance of black middle-class families has continued for more than five decades (Fig. 3.12). By 1990, the Windsor Hills and View Park areas west of Crenshaw Boulevard were the areas that had most recently changed from
white to black. The adjacent community to the west, Ladera Heights, appeared to be in slow transition between white and black. Reflecting both the forward edge of the black westward expansion and the higher prices of fine homes, these three areas represent the best known concentration of high-income blacks in Southern California.

A corresponding shift of major black institutions also occurred during the 1980s. Political and cultural affairs within Los Angeles’ black community have been refocused in Leimert Park and along nearby Crenshaw Boulevard. This is far west of the Central Avenue axis of black leadership and life forty years earlier. The Los Angeles Sentinel, the city’s leading black newspaper, relocated from Central Avenue to this area in the early 1990s. The Los Angeles Urban League and other predominantly black organizations have their headquarters in or near Leimert Park. In addition, the Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza and the adjacent twelve-screen Magic Theaters (developed by Magic Johnson) have become the leading shopping and entertainment center for middle- and upper-class blacks, thus accentuating the Crenshaw-area focus of the black community in the 1990s.

At the same time, other people were intruding on West Adams—what had once been a neighborhood of the black elite. Latino immigrants rented and bought in what had been almost completely black neighborhoods, and during the 1980s West Adams was partially gentrified as young whites bought up some of the distinguished old houses. Some local black residents appreciated the presence of young, politically connected whites in the area as suggesting possibilities for better city services and the like. However, many others resented what they saw as whites’ attempts to direct and control the West Adams neighborhood and its preservation—a pattern uncomfortably familiar to many older people.82

**Pasadena.** Although Los Angeles has easily been the leading center of black settlement, blacks also settled early in outlying areas. In 1900 the U.S. census, which published counts only for the largest cities, found 218 blacks in Pasadena, 195 in Riverside, 84 in San Bernardino, 60 in Santa Monica, and 58 in Redlands. By 1920 development and population growth had been widespread, creating more openings for work in several places outside Los Angeles (Table 3.1), but the largest black population outside that city was still in Pasadena.

The very rapid expansion of Pasadena, like that of so many other places, dates from the coming of the railroad in the mid-1880s. Blacks followed white settlers into this boomtown. Although it may be that some of the seventy-five blacks who arrived before 1890 had planned to become farmers or independent townspeople, most were soon working as servants in the homes of wealthy people.83 Over the next half-century the black community grew substantially, partly because of advertisements in black newspapers in the East and South that proclaimed Pasadena an ideal destination for black migrants to California. In addition, the surrounding cities (Glendale, Eagle Rock, South Pasadena, San Marino, and Arcadia) effectively prevented home purchase or rental by blacks, so that most of the blacks who worked in those areas were forced to live in Pasadena. Before World War II blacks in Pasadena were typically laborers, truck drivers, and janitors, but others worked for Pasadena’s white families as gardeners, butlers, chauffeurs, cooks, and maids.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 Largest Black Populations in Places, 1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monrovia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census (1922).
In the 1930s Pasadena had several neighborhoods of blacks, Mexicans, and Asians. Only a few minority families lived outside these areas, all but one of which was west of Fair Oaks Avenue. The one such neighborhood south of Colorado Boulevard once had a mixture of black, Mexican, and Asian families but has since been eliminated by the freeway on-ramps that extend south of Interstate 210. A larger and almost completely black neighborhood lay to the north, tightly bounded by Orange Grove Boulevard on the south, Fair Oaks on the east, and Washington Boulevard on the north. Although geographically separate, this black residential area was not a long walk from the homes of wealthy families, where so many blacks were employed.

In the 1950s blacks dispersed eastward and north into Altadena, where by 1990 black percentages were higher than in Pasadena and where more than three-quarters of blacks were homeowners. Hardly any blacks moved to the west, however. The parks of Arroyo Seco and the Rose Bowl are a racial and social-class boundary, so that the much more expensive section west of the parks is only 2 percent black.

During the past three decades the neighborhood shifts of blacks and the arrival of Latinos in Pasadena have mirrored changes in South Central. In the area north of Interstate 210, blacks moved eastward from Fair Oaks Boulevard as Latino immigrants settled into the low-cost housing that blacks were vacating. Although by 1970 not many blacks had moved east of Lake Avenue, the trend continued, so that by 1990 the area another two miles east was becoming more than 10 percent black. Black settlement expansion eastward during this entire period has prompted white flight. South of Interstate 210, such ethnic changes have been minimal, because the affluent white community has retained control of its institutions and residences, many of which are of architectural renown.

Monrovia. This city in the San Gabriel Valley has one of the oldest black communities in Southern California, one with a unique origin. In the mid-1880s the wealthy owner of the Santa Anita Ranch, E. J. “Lucky” Baldwin, was traveling around the United States in connection with his horse-racing operations. He met and hired a black man, John Fisher, to be a blacksmith and to shoe his racehorses. Fisher helped Baldwin recruit additional men to work on the ranch, many as trainers and jockeys. In early 1886, sixty blacks, including some families, arrived by train from North Carolina and South Carolina. Over the next few years more blacks followed this migration chain. Most who were not working with the horses settled in the nearest town, Monrovia, just a few minutes by train from Santa Anita. Men commonly became farm laborers and usually worked in the citrus orchards, but some were employed at Baldwin’s winery. Women were typically laundresses and housekeepers for white families in Monrovia.

By 1889 blacks in Monrovia had established a church, which was their early social and religious focus. Although many more blacks arrived and settled in Monrovia during the twentieth century, the church remains active and the community retains a pride in its distinctive, century-old heritage.

As was true elsewhere, in 1960 the black population of Monrovia was strongly segregated residentially, with one census tract that was more than 50 percent black. More recent dispersal has meant that Monrovia’s blacks are much less evident in 1990 (Figs. 3.2, 3.12).

Post-World War II concentrations: Pacoima. The development of a major black concentration in the eastern San Fernando Valley did not occur until after World War II.

In the early 1940s only a few black families lived in Pacoima, but in 1946 that began to change when military housing was moved from Griffith Park to Pacoima and set up as temporary public housing for low-income people. Called the Basilone Homes, they were located just downstream from Hansen Dam, which had been designed to capture floods on Tujunga Wash. Because a quarter of its 800 households were black, Basilone Homes became the nucleus of a new black community and served to make Los Angeles blacks aware for the first time of the San Fernando Valley.

Then, in the early 1950s, a large tract of modest homes (the Joe Louis Homes) was privately developed especially for purchase by blacks, some of whom worked at the nearby Lockheed aircraft factory. In those years prior to fair-housing laws this was a prized
opportunity for blacks. Two years after that the city housing
authority built the permanent San Fernando Gardens project,
and in the late 1960s two massive, federally-subsidized apartment
complexes (Van Nuys–Pierce Park Apartments) were constructed.
These provided much-needed housing in Los Angeles, but they
also tended to concentrate poor people in Pacoima. On the other
hand, both blacks and whites have bought into the attractive
single-family houses in Pacoima’s Hansen Hills and, in the late
1980s, the gated Griffin Glenoaks condominium complex. The
tensions between the middle class in such developments and the
poorer people elsewhere in Pacoima have continued, but in gener-
al middle-class black families have been following the earlier exo-
dus of white families from Pacoima, where the numbers of poorer
blacks and Latinos have increased.

Post–World War II concentrations: Pomona. In 1900
this town had twenty-seven blacks, working as laborers or laun-
dresses and living close to the railroad tracks.86 The town grew
relatively slowly, and for a half century not many blacks settled
there. However, in the late 1940s the city’s growth took off. New
industrial jobs were snapped up by white residents from Los
Angeles, who then bought homes in the many subdivisions newly
created from former orange groves. With widespread layoffs at
the end of the Korean War in 1953, however, many residents
missed payments on their homes, which were then repossessed
and left vacant. In the early 1960s the Federal Housing
Administration and the Veterans Administration, which had
guaranteed the mortgage payments, fixed up the deteriorating
homes and listed them with local realtors who agreed for the first
time to sell to blacks. Advertisements enticed many black families
to move from South Central and buy these inexpensive homes,
and the 1965 Watts riot encouraged others to come to Pomona
because of less violence and better schools. By 1970 a combina-
tion of black suburbanization and white flight had led to a sub-
stantial shift in the racial composition of the three separate sec-
tions of Pomona in which most of these homes were located.

Since that time, as blacks have moved eastward to places like
Fontana and Rialto in San Bernardino County, their places have
been taken by Latinos. By 1990 only 14 percent of Pomona’s pop-
ulation was black, whereas more than half the city was Hispanic.

People of Jamaican, Belizean,
and Nigerian Ancestries

Immigrants came to Southern California from parts of
Africa, Central America, and the West Indies. Many identified
themselves as black on the census questionnaire, and some migrat-
ed from Spanish-speaking areas. The proportion of blacks and
Hispanics among people whose ancestry lies in those areas varies
from country to country (Table 3.2).

There are relatively few blacks among South Africans,
Cubans, and Puerto Ricans in Southern California (Table 3.2).
Just the opposite is the case among Trinidadians: Trinidad’s popu-
lation includes approximately equal numbers of Asian Indians
and blacks, but blacks easily outnumber Indians among immi-
grants to Southern California. Although more than a third of
Panamanians identified their race as black, their relatively small
numbers do not justify special treatment as black immigrants
apart from coverage as Hispanic Central Americans.

Our interpretation focuses on the three largest predominant-
ly black immigrant groups. Because their countries were formerly
British colonies, most of these immigrants speak English.
Distinctive accents in speech and a familiarity with tropical foods
and spices distinguish Jamaicans, Belizeans, and Nigerians from
U.S.-born blacks. These immigrants’ cultural backgrounds have
emphasized class distinctions more than racial differences.87 Most
of those from the Caribbean Islands—Jamaicans and Belizeans—
refer to themselves as West Indian or Creole rather than black,
and they often speak Creole, a language based partly on English
and partly on African languages.88 However, in the United States
they are identified as black by most whites.

Belizeans in Los Angeles are ethnically varied. Although the
majority are Creole Belizeans, there are two other groups which
are somewhat socially and geographically intermixed with the
Creoles, more so in Los Angeles than in the country of Belize.89
One group is Spanish Belizeans, whose families originated in
Belize’s northern and western parts which border on Mexico and
Guzatemala (Table 3.2). Many are part Mayan Indian. The other group of Belizean origin living in Los Angeles is a mixed black-Carib Indian population which retains a distinctive identity as Garifuna.

**Residential locations.** Belizeans, Jamaicans, and Nigerians show two patterns in their distributions (Figs. 3.13, 3.14, and 3.15). First, those who have low incomes or feel more comfortable living among other blacks typically live in South Central. They are mixed residually with American blacks in areas of low and moderate income and do not settle in enclaves according to their country of origin. A second group of immigrants, discussed at the end of this section, is widely dispersed in predominantly white areas.

Although Belizeans are dispersed over much of South Central, most Belizean markets, restaurants, and other businesses are centrally located on Western Avenue between Jefferson Boulevard and Vernon Avenue (Fig. 3.13). Belizeans tend to meet and socialize at these stores rather than at churches or special ethnic functions. Garifuna Belizeans tend to live east of Vermont Avenue—to the east of most Creole Belizeans. The Spanish heritage of some Belizeans may partly explain their settlement to the east of Jamaicans and Nigerians—closer to the large Hispanic population. Nearly all Belizeans in the strongly Latino cities of South Gate and Lynwood reported themselves as Hispanic. However, within most of South Central, variations among Belizeans in percentage Hispanic are normally not pronounced.

There is a noticeable cluster of Nigerians residing in single-family houses in the middle-income Morningside Park section of Inglewood and in adjacent Hyde Park, within Los Angeles. A few live in the large, gated community on the south side of Manchester Boulevard east of the Forum.

Tracts with relatively high percentages of Jamaicans can also be detected in Inglewood. The larger concentrations are in Morningside Park and to the west, in the tract containing the large Daniel Freeman Memorial Hospital. Jamaican and Belizean niches in hospital employment, especially among women, are pronounced (Table 8.6). The location of Daniel Freeman, Centinela

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2</th>
<th>Racial and Hispanic Identification among Selected African and Middle American Ancestries, 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancestry</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percent White</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belizean</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamanian</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidadian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** U.S. Bureau of the Census (1992).

**Notes:** Some groups listed are not given special table or map coverage in this book because they have fewer than 5,000 members in Southern California. Those that are listed here are known for being racially mixed or containing two or more different groups. Black and white percentages do not add up to 100 because some people reported their race as “Other,” American Indian, or Asian. Because Hispanic persons are identified separately by race in census data, the figures for any one ancestry group often total more than 100.

Where Hispanics and blacks reside in the same neighborhoods (e.g., South Central), percentages of each may be too high. This is because a Census Bureau computer program imputed missing racial and Hispanic identities based on characteristics of nearby households. Because of this, some black persons who did not answer the Hispanic question could be erroneously reported as Hispanic if a Hispanic household was chosen by the computer as the basis for the imputation. In the same way, some Hispanics who did not fill in an answer to the race question may be reported as black when they are not. The problem is illustrated by the Hispanic percentages for Jamaicans and Nigerians, virtually none of whom have some Hispanic heritage.

*This ancestry group also includes the smaller numbers of Tobagonians because the two islands are officially one country.*
Hospital Medical Center, and Hillcrest Medical Center close to attractive residential areas suggests part of the reason for settlement of these black-ancestry groups in and near Inglewood. Other Jamaicans are scattered in the Crenshaw area and north of Interstate 10, near Washington and Venice Boulevards. The Crenshaw area is to some extent a focus of West Indian society, with its shops, restaurants, and “jerk” chicken places.

The higher incomes and greater acculturation of many West Indian blacks, particularly Jamaicans, enable them to live in outlying suburban areas (see also Fig. 9.9). Jamaicans are widely scattered in such areas, although some slight clustering is evident in tracts within Whittier, West Covina, Pomona, and Montclair. Farther east (beyond the map) more than 150 Jamaicans live near other blacks and many whites in Moreno Valley in Riverside County, a suburban city that grew rapidly during the 1980s. Irvine, Santa Clarita, and Woodland Hills are also home to Jamaicans. Jamaicans residing in tracts composed entirely of university property at the University of California at Irvine, and California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, are students in dormitories. The small concentration of Nigerians in Pasadena is near both Pasadena City College and the California Institute of Technology, where some may be enrolled as students.

**Black Median Household Income**

Figure 3.16 accentuates important areas of black settlement because only tracts with 100 or more black households are included. Numerous additional black households of varying incomes are actually dispersed in tracts that are not shown on the map. Nevertheless, the large area with tracts of fewer than 100 black households reflects the lower incomes of blacks compared to whites and past exclusion of blacks by whites. In Orange County and eastern Ventura County, the historic absence of black farmworkers in California agriculture helps explain the small black population of those areas.

The lowest-income area is the oldest part of South Central, with its Central Avenue corridor extending south from Downtown and the adjacent Skid Row (Fig. 3.1). At the opposite extreme, upper-income blacks are found in several areas, three of them on the western and southern fringe of the large black-settlement concentration in Los Angeles: the Windsor Hills–View Park–Ladera Heights area, just uphill from Leimert Park and the Crenshaw area; Morningside Park in Inglewood and adjacent areas, which include several gated neighborhoods; and Carson, where black suburbanites are more apt to be living in multiracial neighborhoods. Middle-class and more affluent blacks also live in Altadena, the San Fernando Valley, and in western San Bernardino County.

The map is complex in the area around Pomona and adjacent San Bernardino County, reflecting both long-established black settlement in poorer areas and the black presence in newer suburban areas. Farther east (and not shown) is the city of Moreno Valley, which symbolizes the dispersal of both blacks and whites to distant, affordable developments.

At the top of the map is the old, rural, black settlement of Val Verde, founded in 1924 by black leaders as a resort and retreat from city life and discrimination. Since then many black families have vacationed here or bought property here, some building year-round homes. During the 1940s and 1950s, when an unofficial policy led to black exclusion from Los Angeles city swimming pools except for the day before scheduled cleaning, Val Verde Park, with its open pool, clubhouse, and numerous outdoor activities, was an important summer oasis for black families in Los Angeles. Although by 1990 most of Val Verde’s year-round residents were whites, whose incomes were much above those of the older community of blacks, Val Verde remains a well-known symbol of the era of segregation for black families whose roots are in Los Angeles.

**Notes**

1. The general tendency for immigrants who live in ethnic concentrations to be more recently arrived and less acculturated is part of a general model of immigrant spatial assimilation explained by Massey (1985) and Portes and Rumbaut (1990), chapter 2. For a test of a modified version of this model for 1990 in Southern California, see Allen and Turner (1996b).

2. The theory has been most developed by Schelling (1971) and tested in Los Angeles by Clark (1991, 1992).
5. The extent of contemporary housing discrimination is difficult to measure because many people do not realize they have been subjected to it. One technique for identifying discrimination is called testing or auditing. This involves matching minority and white prospective renters or buyers by similar characteristics and recording the nature of the reception given each by realtors, landlords, or apartment managers. Research based on this technique has demonstrated that housing discrimination of one sort or another is still significant and widespread (Turner, Struyk, and Yinger 1991). Janet Sohm, program compliance director of the Los Angeles Fair Housing Congress, estimated that racial and ethnic discrimination in housing, especially rental housing, remains widespread (interviewed January 1993). However, it is more difficult to detect because it is less overt now than it was in the past. Differential treatment by lending agencies is also an issue. Any discrimination involves the application phase of the tenant-selection or mortgage-lending process rather than refusal at initial entry. See Grigsby (1994) for research on the residential-mobility situation facing blacks in different parts of Los Angeles County. Interviews with regional fair-housing directors make it clear that during the 1980s a common type of discrimination involved an apartment manager of a particular immigrant group pressuring tenants who were not members of that group to leave, in order to open up spaces for members of the group.

6. The concentrations in 1940 are based on detailed maps in Hanson and Beckett (1944), which also includes previously unpublished race and ethnic counts by census tract.

7. As of 1960 Asian immigration had just begun to increase, but Asians (primarily Japanese at that time) and the few American Indians were grouped together in these census data as “Other Races.” Because no dot is shown in a tract if the ethnic group in that tract numbers fewer than 150, the map slightly underestimates the scattering of ethnic populations within areas dominated by other groups.

8. The origin of these foothill towns is described in McWilliams (1973), 150–154, 205–226.
11. McWilliams (1973), 147, 159.
12. McWilliams (1973), 144; Starr (1985), 98–107; Davis (1990), 55–57.
13. McWilliams (1973), 150.
14. McWilliams (1973), 141.
17. Russians who are Christian tend to live in the same general areas as some Jews, although the two groups are completely separate socially and impossible to distinguish on the map. In the 1920s several hundred Russian anti-Bolshevik aristocrats from the Czarist period settled in Hollywood (Day 1934), where three Russian Orthodox churches remained active as of 1995. Another Orthodox church is in Tarzana in the San Fernando Valley, where Russian-ancestry adherents are far outnumbered by Russian-ancestry Jews. Contemporary Protestant Christian refugees from the Soviet Union are also too few in number to distinguish in the census data, and members of a non-Orthodox fundamentalist Russian sect known as Molokans who settled on the flats below Boyle Heights in the early twentieth century have long since dispersed (Young 1932).

Also, we treat Jews as an ethnic group rather than as a religious one. Jews vary a great deal in religious perspective, from the majority who do not practice their religion to others who are intensely religious and are affiliated with the Reform, Conservative, or Orthodox branches of Judaism.

18. Sources for early history are Newmark (1970); Vorspan and Gartner (1970); and Stern (1981).
24. Dr. Max Vorspan, University of Judaism, interviewed September 1996.
27. Jews founded the garment industry in Southern California after their earlier experience in New York, and before 1950 many workers in Los Angeles, especially men, at the various cutting and sewing machines were Jewish (Vorspan and Gartner 1970, 116, 124–26.
29. Vorspan and Gartner (1970), 204.
30. Senn (1948).
34. The historical shift of Jews out of their old Westside neighborhoods is described in Vorspan and Gartner (1970), 203–4.
35. Many Sephardic Jews from Turkey and the Greek island of Rhodes settled initially to the southwest of the University of Southern California, near Vermont Avenue and between Vernon and Slauson Avenues. See Chammou (1976), esp. 108, 119.
37. Arnett Hartsfield, long-time resident of South Central Los Angeles, interviewed February 1992.
40. Sandberg (1986), 44.
42. Rabbi Berel Saltzman, a refugee who arrived in the neighborhood in 1980 and runs the storefront Chabad-Lubavitch center on Santa Monica Boulevard, interviewed in May, 1990.
43. The pattern of Russian-ancestry concentration on the Westside is very similar to that found in a 1979 survey of Jews in Los Angeles County (Phillips 1986, 140). Bruce Phillips, research director at the Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles, shared unpublished findings regarding the estimated distribution of Jews according to zip codes. The area within Los Angeles County with the highest percentage of Jews was southeastern Beverly Hills and the adjacent parts of Los Angeles to the south and the east as far as Fairfax Avenue. That area, comprising zip codes 90035, 90048, and 90211, was estimated to be between 61 and 68 percent Jewish. The same survey revealed that Beverly Hills as a whole was 50 percent Jewish. Jewish proportions in these areas probably increased during the 1980s, with the arrival of many Jews from Iran.
44. Davis (1990), 71, 123–25.
46. The 1979 survey of Jews in the Los Angeles area indicated variations in Jewish proportions within the Valley (see note 43 above.) The most intensely Jewish area was zip code 91423 in Sherman Oaks, which was estimated to be 44 percent Jewish.

The next leading areas were North Hollywood, Encino, and Sherman Oaks, where Jews constituted about one-third of the total population. Jewish percentages have probably increased because many Russian and Iranian Jews settled in the same areas during the 1980s.
47. Gold (1994b) and Gold (1995) are the major sources for the Israeli interpretation.
50. Hammam Shafie, West Hills resident and member of the Arab American community, interviewed, June 1996.
51. Two Christian groups from Middle Eastern countries are identifiable by distinctive ancestries in census data and are not included with the Arab aggregation. The first is people of Assyrian or Chaldean ancestry, who represent a large Christian group in Iraq and Iran. Also, Armenians originating in these countries are Christian, but the strength of their Armenian identity makes it highly likely that they would report their ancestry as Armenian rather than the Arabic-speaking country from which they migrated. Despite private efforts by Islamic leaders, no good estimates on the size of the Muslim population in Southern California exist (Kelley 1994, 136).
55. Kelley (1994), 156, 166.
58. A general introduction to Southern California Armenians which stresses their differing national origins is Der-Martirosian, Sabagh, and Bozorgmehr (1993). Sources for the very early years in Los Angeles are Yetzetian (1923) and Minasian (1982). The material on Montebello is based partly on a telephone interview in 1990 with Dr. Richard Hovannisian of the Department of History, University of California, Los Angeles. In addition, in 1992 and 1993 research by California State University, Northridge, geography students Marsha Otchis, Joanne Quinn, and David Deis uncovered aspects of Armenian communities in Montebello and Pasadena.
60. Mehdi Bozorgmehr, sociologist at the University of California, Los Angeles (interviewed June 1990), and Zorah Ramsey of Tarzana (interviewed April 1990) provided comments on both Iran and Iranians in Southern California. Also helpful as background was *Iranians in Los Angeles*, in which aspects of Iranian life in Southern California are explored in depth, in both text and photos (Kelley and Friedlander 1993).


64. Bozorgmehr, Sabagh, and Der-Martirosian (1993), 77.


67. The forms of discrimination used against blacks in Los Angeles are detailed in Bass (1960), 69-94.

68. Senn (1948).

69. See Mason and Anderson (1969) for details.

70. Distributional details are from a map based on race counts by enumeration district, as reported in the manuscript schedules of the 1910 U.S. census. The map was produced by Christopher Bruce, Department of Geography, California State University, Northridge.

71. Bond (1936), 70.

72. De Graaf (1970). Bunch (1990) and Moss (1996) also provide fine historical discussions of the evolving black community in Los Angeles. The black concentration in South Central Los Angeles before 1940 is best covered by Bond (1936) and de Graaf (1970); Spaulding (1946) treats the World War II years.


75. Interviews with realtors and black home buyers, as well as details of changes in specific neighborhoods during this period, are reported in Bond (1936). Bass (1960), 95-113, discusses in detail the mechanisms of housing discrimination in Los Angeles and the struggles to counter them.

76. Bond (1936), 144.

77. Early Watts is described in Ray (1985) and Lopez (1994). The importance of this “Red Car” junction point and its little station on 103d Street was appropriately recognized in the recent renovation of the station as a symbol of the early Watts.

78. See Oliver (1992) and Bennett (1993) for Carver Manor and Parkside Manor.

79. Many details of the families in this area are found in Bond (1936), chapter 3.


81. Senn (1948).

82. The conflicts over gentrification in West Adams are described in McGee (1991).

83. The situation of blacks in early Pasadena is based substantially on interviews with elderly long-term residents, both black and white, recorded about 1940, in Crimi (1941). The locations of minority families in 1935 are based on a Pasadena Planning Commission map in Crimi’s thesis.

84. The recruitment of blacks by “Lucky” Baldwin is covered in Snider (1987), 28. Stephen R. Baker, historian of the city of Monrovia, has examined late-1880s issues of the Monrovia Messenger and the 1900 census manuscript schedules. He shared his findings on the origins of Monrovia’s black community in telephone conversations, March 1996.

85. Early black settlement in Pacoima is traced in Huling (1978) and to some extent in Mohan (1994). Additional information was provided by Bill Huling, interviewed January 1992; and Ed Kussman, former head of the Valley chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, interviewed February 1996.

86. The material on blacks in Pomona is based on Lothrop (1988).


88. Arnold (1987). The processes of Trinidadian and Belizean migration to Los Angeles, particularly the role of women, have been explored in depth in Ho (1993) and Miller (1992).

89. Most of the description of Belizean settlement is based on Straughan (1992).


91. The distribution as mapped may have omitted many people of Garifuna heritage. This is because people who identified their ancestry simply as Garifuna were coded by the Census Bureau as West Indian rather than Belizean. There are also Garifuna people from Honduras in Los Angeles.

92. These findings are based on our analysis of PUMS data.

93. The historic evolution of the black community in Orange County is clearly presented in Tolbert and de Graaf (1989/1990).