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ABSTRACT

This paper provides an introduction to social science and historical materials on Asian Americans. The first part examines perspectives which guide recent research and some of the limitations of existing work. The second part contains two extensive lists of materials: 1) a list of bibliographic sources and literature reviews dealing with Asian Americans and, 2) a list of over 200 selected titles.
Social science and historical research on Asian Americans has been conducted for decades, but the number of studies has increased significantly since the late-1960's. Part of this might be attributed to the heightened sense of ethnicity and increase in activism among Asian American groups which has both made them more generally visible and lead to the development of ethnic studies programs and Federal or locally-funded research/service projects that encourage the work of investigators. Some of the current research is also stimulated by an academic climate that now confers greater—though often still limited—legitimacy, recognition, and funding on racial and ethnic group studies.

Recent research differs from its predecessors in important respects. A larger amount is being carried out by Asian Americans themselves. Somewhat more attention is being paid to community social problems and to groups other than the Japanese and Chinese such as the Pilipinos, Koreans, Pacific Islanders, and Vietnamese. However what is most notable is that a higher proportion of contemporary work is based on nonassimilationist perspectives concerning the experience of Asian American groups and the nature of American society. These perspectives are diverse and usually fall well short of being complete theoretical frameworks, but they are different from the premises that underlie much previous research. Although the overall number of studies on Asian Americans is still relatively modest, the recent increase in research and the emergence of new perspectives may be taken as signs of the intellectual growth of this field.

This paper will provide a brief introduction to social science and historical materials on Asian Americans through several general comments and two bibliographic lists. The comments will address: (1) perspectives which guide contemporary research, and
(2) a few of the limitations of existing materials. While these observations are meant to apply more widely, they will be most applicable to sociologically-oriented work.

Research Perspectives

There are major controversies and debates concerning the extent to which research is "objective." Given usually imperfect—and sometimes class or culturally-biased—data gathering and measurement techniques along with possible investigator error, most social and historical information is only reliable and valid to a certain degree. Depending upon the specific problem and research situation, particular qualitative or quantitative techniques might enhance yet not completely assure the quality of the data. However even if "good" information, by whatever criteria, can be collected, it still must be organized in some manner into descriptions or explanations of events. This is accomplished with the help of explicit or implicit perspectives such as collections of assumptions, paradigms, models or theories, whether held prior to the collection of the information, or inductively suggested by patterns emerging from the data, or both. These perspectives help construct views of reality. They direct all analytic and interpretive work and even impinge on the earlier information gathering and measurement process, most basically by determining the kinds of research questions that are to be answered and by what sources. Any evaluation of research descriptions or explanations should include an examination
of the underlying perspectives and the way they account for the collected data. Many of the earlier studies of Asian Americans were guided by an assimilation model of race relations. Some current work still reflects this influence, but an increasing amount is being based on a variety of different perspectives. Before discussing these other perspectives, the assimilation model and a few of its problems will be reviewed.²

Most of the earliest pieces of writing on Asian Americans were blatantly racist derivations of Social Darwinist thought which rationalized or justified prejudice, discrimination, and exclusionary policies. These will not be discussed here. More serious pioneering research conducted from the 1920's through the 1950's, especially within sociology, frequently reveals the influence of Robert Park.³ Park's writings span a forty year period, though a representative collection of his work can be found in Race and Culture (Park, 1950). Park developed one of the earliest systematic explanations of race relations based on general sociological principles. His ideas are organized around the concept of a race relations cycle which involves contact, competition/conflict, accommodation, and assimilation. Briefly, sustained contact between groups occurs because of economic expansion or immigration within a specific context of world political and economic events. Groups which are culturally and behaviorally distinct develop a collective sense of identity, ethnocentric attitudes, and often racial definitions of group differences. Competition arises over the struggle for scarce resources and this can intensify into conflict as one or more groups employ force, coercive measures, and prejudice to dominate others and preserve their privileges. All parties may eventually seek some reduction of conflict through institutionalized forms of political/dominance or accommodation. Subordinate groups might wish to escape
the destructive effects of continual conflict while dominant groups may find accomodation a more efficient and effective means of control. Accomodation does not eliminate exploitation—it could involve caste relations or slavery—yet, over time, it can lead to less conflict, more intergroup contact, a decrease in prejudice, and eventually assimilation. Assimilation is not necessarily synonymous with cultural homogenization or widespread inter-marriage but is a stable condition where ethnicity and race are not major factors determining individual achievement. Exploitation may still persist although it will be based on other dimensions such as class.

Park’s work is important because it is an attempt at systematic analysis and because of its emphasis on the exploitative and dynamic aspects of race relations. However, like many cyclical explanations, it leaves out possible alternative phases or outcomes, for instance genocide or physical isolation, and it doesn’t clearly specify all the variables or conditions producing changes from one phase to another. Lyman (1968) has questioned the inevitability and irreversibility of the cycle, particularly the move from accomodation to assimilation. He notes that Park was never able to empirically verify his ideas and refused to modify them even when presented with contradictory evidence from a 1926 race relations survey he directed of Chinese and Japanese on the Pacific Coast. Lyman concludes that Park’s work is better viewed as a developmental model with four ideal types that organize a vast amount of information. Geschwender (1978), on the other hand, argues that Lyman has misinterpreted Park by drawing on isolated pieces of his writings. Geschwender feels that Park was more concerned with processes rather than static forms linked in a cycle and that Park viewed accomodation as an unstable situation which could lead to new conflicts or a sense of nationhood on the part of
oppressed groups. Takagi (1973) maintains that many of Park's views originated during a period of intense antiJapanese agitation in California and that they are basically racist in nature.

Despite the debates over his work, Park's ideas did contribute to the notion of assimilation as a desirable, if not always attainable, stable outcome. When it failed to occur, researchers looked for explanations. For example, Rose Hum Lee (1960) was disappointed that the Chinese, despite acculturation, were not fully assimilated and that Chinatowns still existed. She attributed this to a lack of desire and to Chinese elites that wished to preserve their vested interests within Chinatowns.

The assimilation model was best articulated by Milton Gordon in Assimilation in American Life (Gordon, 1964). Gordon's ideas influenced a number of studies of Asian Americans during the 1960's and occasional references to his work still appear. Gordon considers ethnic groups to be subsocieties with their own distinct cultures and networks of institutions and organizations. Assimilation is a process with component stages. The first, acculturation or cultural assimilation, is the learning of the culture of the dominant society so that ethnic group behaviors are no longer distinct. Structural assimilation means that ethnic group members participate on a primary level in the friendship cliques, organizations, and institutions of the dominant society. Amalgamation or marital assimilation means widespread intergroup marriage. Identificational assimilation is the adoption of the identity of the dominant society. Three additional conditions must be met for complete assimilation. Attitude-receptational assimilation means the absence of prejudice, behavioral-receptational assimilation is the absence of discrimination, and civic assimilation means the end of intergroup conflict. All of these stages form a
sequence of events, but not necessarily a rigidly linear one. Acculturation in the key to the sequence and should occur first. Gordon regards structural assimilation as the major barrier. Once beyond that point, an ethnic group is well on its way to complete assimilation.

In addition to this conceptualization, Gordon also outlines three "theories" of assimilation: Anglo-conformity, the melting pot, and cultural pluralism. Anglo-conformity means that ethnic groups are to adopt Anglo-Saxon culture and institutions either because of their superiority or because that was the background of the immigrants who established the basic structure and culture of this nation. The melting pot model describes America as a blend of the cultures and institutions of all groups. Cultural pluralism is a system where all groups are integrated into an economic and political whole while still retaining distinct cultures and institutions in the absence of discrimination and prejudice. Gordon characterizes the United States as having Anglo-conformity at the cultural level and three structurally separate groups based on religion--Protestant, Catholic, Jewish--within which ethnic differences blend.

Gordon and other assimilationists have some difficulty explaining the experience of blacks. Gordon feels that they are basically acculturated but that segregation has kept them from structural assimilation. Others such as Glazer and Moynihan (1970) argue that blacks are among the most recent migrants to urban areas and that they, like previous immigrants, will start at the bottom and work their way up.

The assimilation model has fallen into general disfavor in race relations. Criticisms of it are extensive and numerous, perhaps in part because of its earlier preeminence and also because of its easy association
with the interests of the dominant society. The model is largely based on the experience of pre-1880 European immigrant groups and has more limited applicability for others because of differences in group backgrounds and sociohistorical contexts. Studies using this model tend to expect assimilation as an outcome and examine processes through which incompatible ethnic group characteristics, especially cultural values, diminish. In certain instances these differences are viewed as "deviant" and their continued presence as social problems. Often, ethnic groups are automatically assumed to desire assimilation rather than the survival or development of separate cultural or institutional forms, or they are seen as having no alternative. Their attitudes and behaviors are therefore not examined except as they indicate reactions or adjustments to the dominant society. When assimilation fails to occur, various factors are identified as inhibiting the process including ethnic group characteristics. Racial differences and racism, important for Asian American groups, come to be treated as impediments to assimilation rather than as part of the historical and institutional basis for domination. The exploitation of less powerful subordinate groups, a major feature of American race relations, is not a central concern of the assimilation model.

Questions can be raised concerning the key first stage of acculturation. Some Asian American groups, for instance Japanese Americans, may experience a good deal of structural assimilation in institutional areas like the economy without being completely acculturated (Endo, 1978). Discussions of acculturation usually assume that a group's culture (and also that of the dominant society) is homogeneous whereas variations due to differences in background might exist, as in the case of the Chinese and Pilipinos. Acculturation
implies a simple process through which a group's distinctive characteristics are gradually replaced. Another view is to see group culture as self-generating into new forms (Kagiwada, 1973; Tong, 1974) which may or may not eventually become more like that of the dominant society. Conceptually, these new forms can be described as complex mixes of cultural elements (values, etc.) retained unchanged or in modified form from traditional group culture, along with elements selectively taken unchanged or in modified form from the culture of the dominant society, and completely new elements which evolve out of group experiences. Over time, changes in this mix, including the possible reintroduction of previously rejected elements, will produce different cultural forms.

The concept of acculturation has lead to the idea of value compatibility as a primary explanation for subordinate ethnic or racial group mobility. For example, Caudill (1952) contends that the basic similarity between traditional Japanese and core American values has helped Japanese Americans to adapt and compete successfully in American society. While this type of argument might have validity, the major importance ascribed to value compatibility can be questioned (Takagi, 1973), especially when there is little consideration of the social structural and historical features of intergroup relations. Also, the actual degree of value compatibility may be hard to determine. For instance, traditional Japanese and core American values might appear compatible on the surface but have different underlying implications. The opposite phenomenon, value incompatibility, is often seen as contributing to cultural conflicts and/or marginality. Again, the emergence of the latter conditions probably depends on the specific sociohistorical characteristics of a given situation. An extensive discussion of marginality and cultural conflicts, along with other
ideas in a typology of Chinese American personality patterns by Sue and Sue (1971) has generated a good deal of debate (Tong, 1971; 1974; Surh, 1974; Sue, 1974).

One legacy of the assimilationist perspective has been the recent media depiction of Asian Americans, primarily Chinese and Japanese, as successful groups that have worked their way up from the bottom to attain high levels of education, occupation, and income. Asian Americans are viewed as examples of non-European racial groups that have overcome high barriers of prejudice and discrimination. Their apparent success partially validates the idea of assimilation and the possibilities available for other groups. This depiction stresses the importance of Asian American cultural values which have produced admirable characteristics such as hard work, thrift, morality, self-help, patience, close family ties, and quiet-restrained behavior. Asian Americans are seen as more than success stories; they are also "models" of how progress can be made in American society.

This media depiction has been vigorously criticized by Asian Americans themselves. While some of the contemporary research on Asian Americans is still based on the assimilation model, a growing proportion is being influenced by other perspectives. The latter are hard to describe because they are varied and often very sketchy. However, there are a few relatively common themes. Non-assimilationist perspectives frequently raise direct criticisms of the assimilation model (like those discussed above) and are therefore composed of readily apparent assumptions that have the opposite or entirely different implications. Of course, such perspectives openly challenge the premises behind much of the earlier work on Asian Americans. One result of this situation is an increasing reluctance by investigators to accept previous (or even present) studies at face value. A few are actively reevaluating large bodies of past research which may help to bring a new sense of order to the field of Asian American studies.
Nonassimilationist perspectives usually emphasize the persistence of aspects of Asian American communities, cultures, or identities. This can be seen in studies of contemporary community problems and in much of the current historical, sociological, and psychological work. The persistence of Asian American groups is sometimes taken as one manifestation of successful strategies employed to survive in an essentially hostile environment or to resist assimilation.

Nonassimilationist perspectives that guide recent research are often critical of the image of Asian Americans as successful model groups. This is particularly evident in studies which examine the failure of societal institutions to provide equal opportunities and to address the continuing needs and problems of Asian Americans. These kinds of perspectives can best be understood by reviewing some of the criticisms that have been directed at this success image. Criticisms question the applicability of Asian American experiences for other groups and point to the historical price Asians have had to pay for any progress. Criticisms question whether success can be defined only in socioeconomic terms and note the limited nature of Asian American occupational mobility and the lack of correspondence between education, occupation, and income. Criticisms point to the existence of social problems as indicators of less than complete success, for instance in employment, housing, health, and mental health, delinquency and drug abuse, education, the availability of social services, and continued discrimination. Specific segments of the Asian American population suffer special difficulties such as ghettoized new immigrants, migrant farm workers, the elderly, and war brides. The discussion of such problems is not meant to promote a view of failure but to indicate the need to view Asian Americans as legitimate, and perhaps oppressed, minorities.
Some nonassimilationist perspectives explicitly view Asian Americans as active participants in the events that make up their history and experience. This has at least two important implications. First, race relations are no longer defined just from the viewpoint of the dominant white society. Asian Americans are self-conscious actors and their interaction with the dominant society, not just their passive reactions, are what define intergroup relations. The behavior of Asian Americans must be examined in detail rather than assumed. These can vary from protest and overt resistance to more accommodating and passive actions. Different investigators might emphasize one type over another and may disagree on the precursors or motivations for each. However in any given situation, Asian Americans are seen as making choices between alternatives, albeit sometimes limited, in order to minimize the destructive effects of racism, maximize their own gains and dignity, and obtain a measure of control over their own lives.

A second implication of the view of Asian Americans as active participants in their history and experience is that their story consists of even more than a record of Asian-white relations. This can again lead to a greater emphasis on what Asian Americans themselves did or are doing, but also less concern without totally ignoring what others were or are doing to them. In a sense this places Asian Americans on center-stage in their own story. Within the context of their social and historical situation, Asian Americans may be viewed as complete and potentially self-actualizing peoples.

Nonassimilationist perspectives that underlie contemporary work on Asian Americans are not always made explicit. Biases and premises must then be inferred from the nature of the problem and the way information is presented and interpreted. In general there needs to be more articulation of perspectives in individual pieces of work. Also, nonassimilationist perspectives may have themes that vary by
academic discipline. For instance, sociologically-oriented work is sometimes guided by perspectives that focus on the exploitative nature of intergroup relations and on exposing the structural features of society that generate and maintain inequality. Finally, nonassimilationist perspectives tend to be relatively undeveloped and not complete models or theories that provide any type of comprehensive analytic framework. Such perspectives frequently consist of a set or sets of related assumptions about Asian American groups and the nature of intergroup relations in American society. The few better-developed perspectives are often more general models or theories taken from one of the social sciences which are then applied to the Asian American experience. One sociological and socio-historical example is the internal colonial model.

The internal colonial model is discussed in the work of Carmichael and Hamilton (1967), Allen (1970), Tabb (1970), and Blauner (1972). It uses the analogy of European colonialism and applies it to the experience of blacks in urban ghettos of the North. White-black relations are seen as those between a colonizer and the colonized. The model points out that blacks have been segregated from the rest of society, that they serve as a source of cheap labor and as a captive market for goods produced by others, that they are not allowed to develop their own communities--especially businesses--and thus remain economically and politically dependent and powerless, and that they are generally exploited for the advantage of whites. Unlike classic colonialism, this model describes a situation where inequalities are perpetuated among groups sharing a common territory. Tabb (1970) contends that internal colonialism must involve economic control and exploitation, and political dependence and subjugation. Blauner (1972) shifts the emphasis from form to the process of colonization. This process has five parts: the involuntary forced entry of the subordinate group, the alteration or destruction of subordinate
group culture, the administration of laws and control of government by dominant
group representatives, a separate labor status for the subordinate group, and
the development of racism to justify exploitation. Blauner argues that recent
black ghetto revolts are a consequence of this process and may be compared to
colonial uprisings. Blacks are trying to resist oppression and gain a measure
of control through group identity and solidarity, cultural nationalism, and
community control of institutions such as schools, businesses, and social
services. Organization along racial lines is a means of promoting basic societal change.

Unlike the assimilation model, internal colonialism emphasizes exploitation,
group conflict, and the significance of racism. It has been applied to the
experience of other groups including Chicanos (Almaguer, 1971; Barrera et al., 1972;
Flores, 1973) and Asian Americans (Blauner, 1972; Fujimoto, 1972). Blauner (1972: 54-55)
sees Asian Americans as semicolonized. There were, he notes, coercive pressures which
forced many early immigrants to migrate, particularly as contract laborers,
and the size and status of Asian American groups were controlled by restrictive
and exclusionary laws and practices. Fujimoto (1972) feels that
the internal colonial model presents a way of viewing Asian Americans
that accounts for phenomena not well explained by
the assimilation model, for example the persistence of social problems, the
nonassimilation of Asian groups, and past and present Asian activism. Through
a comparison of classic and internal colonialism, John Liu (1976) discusses
interpretations of the internal colonial model that encompass a number of
racial groups. He also points out the model's failure to address the relation
between race and class.

The concept of class is central to Marxian and other "left" theories, but
it is usually accorded much greater significance than race (Cox, 1948; Baran and Sweeney, 1966; Boggs, 1970). Racism is presented as a byproduct of the development and expansion of capitalism which is used to divide subordinate and dominant group workers who share similar class interests. An emphasis on racism diverts attention from the exploitation of the entire working class and the issue of class conflicts. Struggles by subordinate groups are seen as temporary aberrations or as part of a larger class struggle. However despite the increasing prominence of Marxist theories, no systematic class analysis has yet been applied to the experience of Asian Americans. Such an analysis will probably have to reconceptualize the relation between class and race.

Future sociological perspectives will undoubtedly include or at least complement general comparative macrolevel theories and formulations of race relations (cf. Schermerhorn, 1970). Of course, well-developed perspectives will not be exclusively sociological. Sue (1977) for instance is working on the use of the psychological theory of learned helplessness to interpret recent Asian American activism and feelings of alienation despite socioeconomic mobility. The critical work of Daniels (1974), Ichikawa (1976) and others contributes to better historically-based perspectives on Asian Americans.

Limitations of Existing Social Science and Historical Materials

Even with recent increases, the amount of contemporary research being conducted on Asian Americans remains relatively low. The reasons behind this are numerous but include the comparative recency of widespread interest in this field, a distribution of research resources that favors the study of other larger or more visible groups, and the difficulties entailed in developing culturally, linguistically, and even politically
sensitive research techniques. One consequence of this situation is that the pool of available social science and historical material on Asian Americans continues to be rather modest in size and, as a whole, suffers from various limitations, examples of which will be described below.

Research is frequently based on impressionistic or fragmentary narrative or quantitative evidence which provide only simple descriptions of events, compilations of baseline data, assessments of group problems and needs, reviews of existing literature and secondary sources, or suggestions for new lines of inquiry. While the latter are valuable, there is also a need for more explanatory investigation based on systematically collected and analyzed primary data whether that be quantitative, observational, or historical. Currently, most individual pieces of research are confined to small samples or segments of one or two Asian American groups and even to specific age/generation, area, class, and/or sex subpopulations within those groups; findings, however, get generalized more widely despite repeated cautions that differences between and within Asian American groups must be respected. While again not minimizing the importance of this type of work, there is a need for more intra- and intergroup comparative studies and nationally-based (or even cross-cultural) research. In addition, longitudinal social science studies are rare, and some existing pieces of work should be replicated with culturally and linguistically appropriate procedures.

A number of investigators have identified specific informational gaps in existing social science and historical materials. For instance Ichioka (1976), in a review of research on Japanese American history, notes that past studies have concentrated on what happened to the immigrants especially by looking at the causes and development of exclusionary movements. Recent work is usually based on secondary sources and repeats known facts, and it tends to be preoccupied with the World War II internment period. Ichioka
argues for more research based on primary sources that will uncover new facts about the activities and reactions of the Japanese. In an appraisal of sociological materials, William Liu (1976) suggests the need for research on the role of ethnic institutions like restaurants, language schools, and newspapers; interethnic relations; immigrant underemployment; Asian Americans outside of major East and West coast urban centers; kin obligations and solidarity; and socialization and personality. A report by the Federal Office of Asian American Concerns (1974) points out major shortcomings in the available information on the health, education, and welfare status and problems of Asian Americans. Bell et al. (1976) and the Pacific Asian Elderly Research Project (1978) describe in detail the paucity of data on the Asian American elderly. Sue and Chinn (1976) discuss the need for psychological research with a mental health emphasis in areas such as personality, the psychological aspects of social situations, and mental disorders.

The examples given above barely begin to illustrate the informational gaps in existing social science and historical materials. Two other items should be mentioned. Much more data could be collected on the experiences of new Pilipino, Korean, Pacific Islander, and Vietnamese immigrants. And greater attention could be given to the recent history of all Asian American groups. For instance, there is little detailed historical information on postwar Japanese Americans and the emergence and impact of post-1968 Asian American activism, has not been well documented. Hopefully it will not be left to researchers years from now to look back and reconstruct and interpret events from then incomplete accounts and records.

A good deal of the contemporary quantitative work on Asian Americans uses or
depends upon Census materials: The Census is the most reliable source of national data on Asian Americans, but it does have certain limitations. In the 1960 and 1970 Censuses, respondents classified themselves with respect to race; this could lead to differences with specific standard definitions sought by Census users, for example in the case of respondents of mixed parentage. Since 1910, Pilipinos and Koreans have only appeared intermittently as a separate racial category in the Census; other groups including those from Southeast Asia and the Pacific Islands have never been individually identified. Census data on Asian American groups are available only for certain metropolitan areas and only for a limited number of specific census tracts. Also, Census data are scattered throughout many sources though attempts have been made to consolidate information (cf. Office of Special Concerns, 1974).

As of this writing, the 1970 Census is the most recent source of national data on Asian Americans but it is very outdated. Characteristics of groups have changed in the intervening years, and the 1970 Census does not take into account recent immigration, particularly of Chinese, Koreans, Pilipinos, and Vietnamese. From 1970-1973 alone, 390,477 Asian immigrants entered this country which represents an increase of 23 percent over the 1.7 million Asians in the 1970 Census (Office of Asian American Affairs, 1974). Owan (1975) projects the Asian population to increase to over three million by 1980.

One additional problem with the 1970 Census is that it may have underestimated the number of Asian Americans, especially those in low income, high density urban neighborhoods. The Census Bureau has estimated an underenumeration of 6.9 percent for the nonwhite population, but this figure may be low (Office of Special Concerns, 1974: 4). A significant undercount of low income Asian Americans would mean that socioeconomic data
would be misleadingly skewed upward. There are a number of possible reasons for an undercount (Office of Special Concerns, 1974: 4-5). In sixty metropolitan areas, the Census Bureau used mailout/mailback forms therefore potentially missing transients and/or those persons crowded into rooms or units in poor neighborhoods without official addresses or where mail delivery tends to be poor. Some Asian Americans could have been reluctant to participate because of historic suspicions about government forms or the fear of deportation. Difficulty with the English language may also have prevented Asian language speakers from completing Census forms; the forms were printed in English except in New York and San Francisco where they were only translated into Chinese. One other factor may have contributed to a general undercount. In cases where a child's race was not clearly defined, they were classified according to the race of their father. Since at least one third of all Japanese and Korean women had nonAsian husbands in 1970, a large number of children of mixed parentage may have been classified as nonAsian.

Lists of Materials

Two lists of primarily social science and historical materials on Asian Americans are presented in this section. The first contains bibliographies and literature reviews. This should be regarded as an alternative to a more complete listing of the thousands of individual items on Asian Americans. The reviews provide critical contexts within which to view certain materials. Some of the bibliographies may not be widely available but might be obtained through interlibrary loan procedures.

The second list contains about 200 selected titles. Lists like this one usually reveal a few of the intellectual biases of their compilers. Without going into detail on my own sometimes idiosyncratic ways of viewing these materials,
I will make a few comments about the selection process. I obviously tried to include items that I felt made at least some important contributions, but also attempted to achieve a balance by subject area. I did, however, give preference to more recent publications, to books as opposed to articles, and in certain instances to materials with a sociological or historical emphasis. The list does not begin to include everything that I would personally consider "good," and it does contain many things with which I can find much to disagree. Some of the titles are not products of research, even as that term is very broadly defined. For instance four anthologies of creative writing were included, though they are only a small part of the extensive work in this area.

Two additional things should be noted. The research on the wartime internment of Japanese Americans is much greater than the few listed items would appear to suggest. And the last section on national and state level socioeconomic data does not include available sources of similar types of information for metropolitan areas, cities, and local Asian American communities.
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Footnotes

1. Portions of this paper were originally prepared for presentation at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Western Conference of the Association for Asian Studies.

2. For an extensive discussion of the perspectives behind sociological work on Chinese Americans see Hirata (1976).

3. Not all early work was influenced by Park. Two important exceptions include Ichihashi (1932) and Miyamoto (1939).


5. For example see Kim (1973), Endo (1974), Sue et al. (1975), Owan (1975).


7. See Sugimoto (1972) and Okamura (1976).
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