

The Racial and Ethnic Transformation of the U.S

Tables by Joseph Fallon

Table 1 United States Census: 1790-1990 — Ethnic Distribution Percentages

Census Year	Population	Non-Spanish White ^c	Non-Spanish Black	Asian ^d	Hispan. ^e	Other ^f
1790 ^a	3,929,214	80.7%	19.3%			
1800	5,308,483	81.1%	18.9%			
1810	7,239,881	81.0%	19.0%			
1820	9,638,453	81.6%	18.4%			
1830	12,866,020	81.9%	18.1%			
1840	17,069,453	83.2%	16.8%			
1850	23,191,876	84.3%	15.7%			
1860	31,443,321	85.6%	14.1%	0.1% ^g		0.2%
1870	38,558,371	87.1%	12.7%	0.2%		
1880	50,155,783	86.5%	13.1%	0.2%		0.2%
1890	62,947,714	87.5%	11.9%	0.2%		0.4%
1900	75,994,575	87.9%	11.6%	0.2%		0.3%
1910	91,972,266	88.5%	10.7%	0.2%	0.4% ^h	0.2%
1920	105,710,620	89.0%	9.9%	0.2%	0.7% ^h	0.2%
1930	122,775,046	88.7%	9.7%	0.2%	1.2% ^h	0.2%
1940	131,669,275	89.8%	9.8%	0.2%		0.2%
1950	150,697,361	89.5%	10.0%	0.2%		0.3%
1960 ^b	179,323,175	88.6%	10.5%	0.5%		0.4%
1970	203,211,926	83.3%	10.9%	0.7%	4.5% ⁱ	0.6%
1980	226,545,805	79.6% ^k	11.5%	1.6% ⁱ	6.4%	1.0%
1990	248,709,873	75.6% ^k	11.7%	2.9%	9.0%	0.8%

^a Conterminous U.S. This excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and all out-lying possessions.

^b This includes the 50 states, but excludes all out-lying possessions.

^c "Non-Spanish White" includes North Africans and Southwest Asians — i.e., Arabs, Iranians and Turks.

^d "Asians", which includes Pacific Islanders, was made a separate category in 1980.

^e "Hispanic", which can be of any race, was made a separate category in 1980.

^f "Other" refers principally to American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts. In 1990, 52% of "Hispanics" listed their race as "White" and 48% as "Other", whereas in 1970, 93% of "Hispanics" had identified themselves as "White."

^g The first Asians to be officially listed by the Census were the Chinese in 1860. The Japanese were added in 1870, the Filipinos in 1930 (estimating that population for 1910 and 1920), the Koreans first in 1930 (also estimating that population in 1910 and 1920), and then since 1970.

^h "Mexicans" were classified as "White" prior to 1930, as "non-White" in 1930 (revising the 1910 and 1920 statistics accordingly), once again as "White" from 1940-1970, and again as "non-White" since 1976.

ⁱ Based on the 1970 Census special "Persons of Spanish Origins" report.

^j The 1980 Census enumerated 3,500,439 Asians which would represent 1.5% of the U.S. population. This figure, however, was an undercount. The revised number for the Asian population is 3,726,440 or 1.6% of the total population.

^k Prior to 1965, the terms "White" and "European-American" were synonymous. After 1965, "White" came to include Hispanics, North Africans and Southwest Asians. While "non-Spanish White" officially distinguishes White Hispanics from other Whites, it still lumps European-Americans with people of North African and Southwest Asian origins. In 1980 there were 894,000 North Africans and Southwest Asians and a total "non-Spanish White" population of 180,256,366. Therefore, European-Americans were 79.2% of the U.S. population. In 1990, there were 1,539,970 North Africans and Southwest Asians and a total "Non-Spanish White" population of 188,128,296. European-Americans were now only 75.0% of the U.S. population.

Sources: All decennial Censuses from 1790 to 1990, U.S. Census Bureau. Stanley Lieberson and Mary C. Waters, *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988) page 34, Table 2.1, "Ethnic and Racial Composition of the United States, 1980."

Table 2 United States Population: 1995-2050The Census Middle-Series Projections
Ethnic Distribution Percentages

<u>Year</u>	<u>Population (in thousands)</u>	Non-	Non-	<u>Asian</u> ²	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Other</u> ³
		Spanish	Spanish			
		<u>White</u> ¹	<u>Black</u>			
1995	263,434	73.6%	12.0%	3.5%	10.2%	0.7%
2000	276,241	71.6%	12.2%	4.1%	11.3%	0.7%
2005	288,286	69.7%	12.4%	4.8%	12.4%	0.8%
2010	300,431	67.7%	12.6%	5.4%	13.5%	0.8%
2020	325,942	63.9%	13.0%	6.5%	15.7%	0.8%
2030	349,993	60.1%	13.4%	7.7%	17.9%	0.8%
2040	371,505	56.3%	13.9%	8.7%	20.2%	0.9%
2050	392,031	52.5%	14.4%	9.7%	22.5%	0.9%

¹ "Non-Spanish White" lumps together people of European origin with people whose origin is North African/Middle Eastern — i.e., Arab Persian, Turk, etc.

² "Asian" represents both Asians and Pacific Islanders.

³ "Other" represents principally Americans Indians, Eskimos, and Alerts.

SOURCE: *Population Projections of the United States, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1993 to 2050*, Current Population Reports, P25-1104, November 1993, U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census, p. xxii, Table J, "Percent Distribution of the Population by Race and Hispanic Origin."

Table 3 Growth Rate of U.S. Population and Selected Ethnic Groups: 1960-1990

	<u>1960-1990</u>		<u>1980-1990</u>
Chinese	727%	Asian-Indian	126%
Japanese	226%	Vietnamese	135%
Filipino	1222%	Cambodian	819%
U.S. Overall	39%	Laotian	213%
European-American	19%	Thai	102%
		Hmong	1631%
		Pakistani	415%
		Other Asians	482%
		U.S. Overall	10%
		European-American	4%
	<u>1970-1990</u>		
Hispanic	146%		
Korean	1032%		
U.S. Overall	22%		
European-American	12%		

SOURCE: The decennial Censuses for 1970, 1980, and 1990, U.S. Census Bureau. Also "Census Bureau Releases 1990 Census Counts on Specific Racial Groups," CB91-215, U.S. Department of Commerce News, Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census, Wednesday, June 12, 1991, pages 3 and 4, Table 1, "Race and Hispanic Origin for the United States: 1990 and 1980"; Table 2, "Other Asian or Pacific Islander Persons by Group: 1990 and 1980."

Linda H. Thom is a budget analyst in the Office of the County Administrator, Santa Barbara, California. The views expressed in this paper are solely those of the author.

Where Are All of These Poor People Coming From?

By Linda H. Thom

On October 6, 1994, the Census Bureau reported that despite a growing economy in 1993, the number of people in poverty had increased to the highest level in a decade. Between 1992 and 1993, 1.3 million more people fell into poverty. According to the *Los Angeles Times* of October 7, 1994, "Daniel Weinberg, chief of the Census Bureau's Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division seemed baffled as he tried to explain why two years after the government announced the end of the recession, the resulting recovery is not progressing according to the traditional economic pattern." The *Times* story also stated that officials noted that California experienced a "statistically significant" change in the poverty rate which climbed 11% in 1993 to a rate of 18.2% for the state as compared to 15.1% for the nation as a whole.

Although Secretary of Labor Robert Reich and Census officials seemed perplexed by the poverty statistics, many in California found the increase neither surprising nor difficult to explain. Immigration, both legal and illegal, is a significant contributor to the increased numbers of poor. Immigration is not the only factor, of course, but it is a very important factor.

The decade of the '80s saw the largest immigration inflow in our nation's history. In California, the economic consequences of immigration are particularly pronounced because the state represents

only 12% of the nation's population but is home to almost 50% of the nation's immigrants. As the data being presented here will show, many of the immigrants are poor. Because many have children, the public costs associated with providing services to them are not offset by increased tax revenue.

To understand this, we first examine the state's most current available tax data where we see very large increases in the number of dependents at very low income levels. Table 1 shows the change in dependents claimed on state income tax returns between the years 1987 and 1991, recalling that the Immigration Reform and Control Act was passed in 1986.

Sixty percent of the total increase in dependents on tax returns for the entire state were on incomes of \$20,000 or less per year. This contrasts with a 36% increase in tax returns at this level. (This means that there were 11% more tax returns filed on incomes of less than \$20,000 per year but 36% more dependents.) In contrast the filers with incomes over \$100,000 increased by

14% and accounted for 12% of the increase in dependents.

The largest revenue source for California's General Fund is personal income tax — a tax which is very progressive. Table 2 shows state tax data for 1991. In 1991, 49% of the tax returns were reporting incomes of less than \$20,000 per year and accounted for 1.6%

Table 1.
Changes in Dependents on Tax Returns
1987 to 1991

Income Level	Dependent Change	Percent of Total Change
Up to \$10,000	748,658	39%
\$10,000 to \$20,000	419,504	22%
\$20,000 to \$30,000	43,808	2%
\$30,000 to \$40,000	(33,910)	-2%
\$40,000 to \$50,000	32,850	2%
\$50,000 to \$100,000	503,908	26%
Above \$100,000	226,968	12%
Total for the State	1,941,786	100%