Advisory Editors

Richard D. Alba
Diana L. Eck
Nancy Foner
Steven J. Gold
Philip Kasinitz
Nazli Kibria
Ewa Morawska
Joel Perlmann
Rubén G. Rumbaut
Roger Waldinger
Xiao-huang Yin

The New Americans

A Guide to Immigration Since 1965

EDITED BY

Mary C. Waters & Reed Ueda
with Helen B. Marrow

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England 2007

Copyright © 2007 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Publication of this book has been supported through the generous provisions of the Maurice and Lula Bradley Smith Memorial Fund

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 2006048524
ISBN-13: 978-0-674-02357-4
ISBN-10: 0-674-02357-9

Contents

THE NEW AMERICANS

Davis, J. *Who Is Black: One Nation's Definition.* University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991.
Diouf, Sylviane. "The New African Diaspora." The Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, www.inmotionaame.org/texts.
Eissa, Salih O. "Diversity and Transformations: African Americans and African Immigration to the United States." Immigration Policy Center, www.ailf.org/ipc.
Fears, Darryl. "A Diverse—and Divided—Black Community." *Washington Post,* Feb. 24, 2002.
Global IDP Database, *Profile of Internal Displacement: Sudan.* Compilation of information available in the Global IDP Database of the Norwegian Refugee Council, www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RSDCOI&id=4059b7044.
Holtzman, John D. "Nuer Journeys, Nuer Lives: Sudanese Immigrants in Minnesota." In Nancy Foner, ed., *New Immigrant Series.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.
Leigh, Swigart. "Extended Lives: The African Immigrant Experience in Philadelphia." Philadelphia: Balch Institute for Ethnic Studies, 2000.
Logan, John R., and Glenn Deane. "Black Diversity in Metropolitan America." New York: University of Albany, Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research, 2003; mumford.albany.edu/census/report.html.
Waters, M. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1999.
———. "Immigration, Intermarriage, and the Challenges of Measuring Racial/Ethnic Identities," *American Journal of Public Health* 90, 11 (2000): 1735–37.

Africa: South Africa and Zimbabwe

Helen B. Marrow

Leaving South Africa

Historically, South Africa is best known as an immigrant-receiving rather than an emigrant-sending country. Originally inhabited by indigenous nomadic tribes, it was settled by Bantu tribes from central and east Africa, Dutch, Huguenot, and British settlers, and East Indian laborers. England occupied the area during the Napoleonic wars, and in the 1830s farmers of Dutch descent (Boers) moved in and established two republics within the country. In the 1870s and 1880s, mineral discoveries in these two republics attracted immigrants from all over the world, including some from the same European countries also sending migrants to the U.S. After the Boer War (1899–1902), Britain annexed the two Boer republics and in 1910 established the Union of South Africa. After joining the British Commonwealth of Nations in 1934, the Republic of South Africa gained independence in 1961. As the country industrialized during the 20th century, white immigrants from Europe, black immigrants from neighboring countries, and white immigrants from Rhodesia (which became Zimbabwe in April 1980) and other neighboring countries all made South Africa their home.

Very few South Africans migrated to the U.S. before 1950 (less than 230 annually, according to the historian Stanley Moss) because of the restrictive immigration policies of the Immigration Act of 1924. However, since World War II there have been five distinct phases of emigration from South Africa. The first four were relatively short-lived, corresponding closely to periods of intense economic, political, and racial strife. In the first phase (1949–1951), South Africans left the country for political reasons; among them were both voluntary immigrants opposed to the new apartheid regime established by the Afrikaner National Party (which came to power

in 1948) and political refugees whose lives were threatened by its racial policies. In the second (1960–1961), third (1976–1979), and fourth (1985–1988) phases, emigrants left the country because of new periods of intense political and racial unrest. Since 1994 (the fifth phase), South African figures again show a net population loss due to emigration—that is, more emigrants have left the country than immigrants have entered it. Moreover, while official figures show a net gain of immigration over the past half-century—545,642 emigrants compared to 1,220,863 immigrants between 1945 and 1999—it is only during the post-1994 period that South Africa has witnessed a sustained net loss of immigration for more than six years in a row. This recent emigration from South Africa is polarized; some commentators argue that emigrants are simply seeking lower rates of crime, better working conditions, and better futures for their children, while others connect emigration with white discomfort in post-apartheid South Africa and a belief that their children's futures will be better in majority-white societies.

Today South Africans' top five destination countries are the U.K., Canada, the U.S., Australia, and New Zealand. All are English-speaking countries with high standards of living. South Africans are reported to prefer Australia because of its sunny climate; the U.K., Australia, and New Zealand because of their cultural affinities with South Africa; the U.K. because of its historical ties to South Africa (some 800,000 South Africans currently hold British passports); the U.S. because of its many economic opportunities (especially in the information technology sector during the 1990s); and Canada for its high quality of life and proximity to the U.S. South African Statistics (SSA) show approximately 82,900 South Africans emigrating to these five countries between 1989 and 1997, while the South African Network of Skills Abroad (SANSA) project at the University of Cape Town puts the figure closer to 233,600, based on those countries' records of incoming immigrants. In a 1998 survey by the Southern African Migration Project (SAMP), 24 percent of skilled South Africans indicated that the U.S. would be their preferred destination if they were ever to leave, compared with 22 percent who named Australia, 15 percent who named the United Kingdom, 12 percent who named New Zealand, and 11 percent who named Canada. Thus, while the U.S. was not a major destination for South African emigrants earlier in the 20th century, today it is one of their primary ones.

Leaving Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe shares with South Africa a legacy of British colonialism and minority white rule over a majority nonwhite population. After UDI (unilateral declaration of independence from Britain) in 1965, black nationalist opposition to Ian Smith's white-controlled government in Rhodesia intensified. For 14 years Robert Mugabe's ZANU and Joshua Nkomo's ZAPU organizations waged a bloody guerrilla war on

the Smith government (and on that of his surrogate, Abel Muzorewa, after 1979), with violence stemming from both sides. As the security situation steadily deteriorated, emigration (mostly of whites with the financial resources to leave) began to rise in 1972, and a net loss of immigration was recorded beginning in 1976.

In 1980 the Smith-Muzorewa government agreed to a ceasefire and entered into negotiations with the guerrilla opposition (which by that time was an alliance between the ZANU and ZAPU organizations called the Patriotic Front). Although power was transferred peacefully in internationally monitored elections in February of that year, the early 1980s saw a large-scale emigration of white citizens, many of whom were unwilling to live under a new black-majority government committed to establishing a socialist state. The white population of Zimbabwe fell from a peak of 280,000 in 1978 to 100,000 in 1980, and emigration levels stabilized only in 1987, largely because the white population base had been heavily depleted by past emigration. In 2000, Zimbabwe's white population stood at a mere 70,000 (of whom an estimated 20,000 had British passports and another 20,000 could lay claim to one).

As in South Africa, emigrants from Zimbabwe have historically been well educated, highly skilled, and predominantly white, a characteristic Lovemore Zinyama describes as characteristic of migrants from "those African countries where movements are frequently determined by political circumstances and are underpinned by racial or ethnic differences between rulers and the ruled." Most emigrants went either to South Africa (because whites perceived it to be geographically, culturally, and sociopolitically similar to their home country, especially during the apartheid era, and because blacks could find contract work in the mines there) or to the U.K. (Zimbabwe's former colonial power). Others went to Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. According to Stanley Moss, some white Rhodesians migrated to South Africa and then to the U.S. as early as the 1970s.

Southern African Immigrants in the U.S.

Overall, there is remarkably little research on emigration out of South Africa, Zimbabwe, and elsewhere in southern Africa. Moreover, what research there is is more concerned with the impacts of the emigration of skilled workers on those countries than with migrants' experiences in their places of destination. For example, the "brain drain" has disproportionately affected several industries within South Africa and Zimbabwe, including the education and health sectors, business services, banking and finance, computer and information technology services, and the high-tech industrial sector. Researchers and government officials in both countries are concerned about how to manage and compensate for this loss of skills, whether by restricting residents' options for emigration, encouraging emigrants abroad to maintain contact with (and even invest in) their home countries, or recruiting highly skilled immigrants to come to the region to offset the negative effects of emigration.

Table 1 Selected foreign-born Central and South Africans, by country of birth, 1980–2000

Country of birth	Population in U.S. census year (percentage of total U.S. foreign-born population in each year) 1980	1990	2000	Percent growth, 1980–2000
5 percent sample				
South Africa	18,180 (0.1)	37,713 (0.2)	67,733 (0.2)	273
Zimbabwe	3,920 (0.0)	5,222 (0.0)	12,148 (0.0)	210
1 percent sample[a]				
DRC (Zaire)	2,020	4,112	6,995	246
Zambia	1,620	3,448	5,974	269
Congo	—	—	5,613	—
Angola	1,140	2,833	3,317	191
Rwanda	—	—	2,744	—
Mauritius	700	1,449	2,164	209
Malawi	—	—	2,031	—
Mozambique	600	600	1,233	—

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses, 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, weighted data.

a. Because of small population sizes, 2000 figures are available only from the 1% Public Use Microdata Sample and have a larger margin for error than figures from the 5% sample. Figures for Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Lesotho, Madagascar, Namibia, Seychelles, and Swaziland are not available.

They are also concerned with how to ensure adequate provision of social and medical services among their general populations, especially as more teachers and medical personnel are leaving.

Because of the dearth of knowledge about these migrants' experiences after leaving southern Africa, here I paint a portrait of them using data from the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the 1980–2000 decennial U.S. censuses. Some attention is also paid to immigrants from other southern (and even central) African nations, about whom little is known in the U.S. immigration literature. However, South Africans and Zimbabweans are the only southern and central African immigrant groups with significant numbers in the U.S., although as Table 1 shows, they accounted for no more than 0.2 percent of the total foreign-born U.S. population in 2000. Immigrant groups from other southern and central African nations are so small that 5 percent sample data from the 2000 U.S. Census are not publicly available for them. Instead we must rely on 1 percent sample data, which have a larger margin for error and therefore must be interpreted more cautiously.

The U.S. Census counted 67,733 South Africans and 12,148 Zimbabweans in 2000, up from 37,713 South Africans and 5,222 Zimbabweans in 1990 and

18,180 South Africans and 3,920 Zimbabweans in 1980. Other southern and central African immigrant groups are smaller in number but exhibit similarly high rates of growth between 1980 and 2000. Table 2 shows that legal immigration from both South Africa and Zimbabwe remained fairly stable over the 1990s (at approximately 2,000 and 300 per year, respectively), dipping somewhat in the late 1990s and then rising again in the early 2000s. Also notable is that immigration from the Congo increased significantly over the 1990s.

In 2000 the majority of legal immigrants from South Africa (58.0 percent) entered the country under employment-based preferences, while a third (33.1 percent) entered as immediate relatives of U.S. citizens and a small fraction (6.0 percent) entered through the Diversity Immigrant Visa Program, which was enacted in 1990 to increase immigration from countries with low rates of immigration to the U.S. (see Table 3). Figures for legal immigrants from Zimbabwe are similar, although a lower proportion (36.5 percent) entered under employment-based preferences, a higher proportion (50.0 percent) entered as immediate relatives of U.S. citizens, and a slightly higher proportion (9.8 percent) entered through the Diversity Program. Legal immigrants from Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, and Madagascar (and to a lesser extent Angola and Botswana) exhibit similar entry profiles. However, higher proportions of legal immigrants from the Congo, Rwanda, and the Democratic Republic of Congo (formerly Zaire) have entered as refugees or asylees or through the Diversity Program. Little information about them is available in the

Table 2 Number of Central and South African immigrants admitted to the United States, by country of birth and year of entry, 1989–2002

Year	South Africa	Congo	Zimbabwe	Zambia	Rwanda	DRC (Zaire)	Burundi	Angol
2002	3,880	678	492	312	217	178	121	92
2001	4,100	313	476	296	148	148	79	95
2000	2,833	191	323	211	73	124	28	88
1999	1,580	190	184	143	98	88	16	57
1998	1,904	118	186	213	52	155	51	66
1997	2,093	31	274	262	170	414	59	75
1996	2,966	23	385	226	118	433	36	125
1995	2,560	11	299	222	41	355	26	81
1994	2,144	11	246	198	16	237	14	75
1993	2,197	10	308	225	25	233	13	92
1992	2,516	9	296	210	10	196	11	107
1991	1,854	22	261	228	12	238	16	132
1990	1,990	9	272	209	6	256	5	141
1989	1,899	10	230	259	7	140	9	143

Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, *Statistical Yearbook,* 2002, Table 3 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice). Figures for Botswana, Comoros, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, and Swaziland are negligible.

Table 3 Percentage of immigrants admitted by selected class of admission, by country of birth, 2002

Country of birth	Number of immigrants	Percentage of immigrants admitted by selected class of admission: Family-sponsored preferences	Employment-based preferences	Immediate relatives of U.S. citizens	Refugee and asylee adjustments	Diversity programs
All countries	1,063,732	17.6	16.4	45.7	11.9	4.0
All Africa	60,269	4.6	10.3	35.4	22.3	27.1
South Africa	3,880	2.5	58.0	33.1	0.2	6.0
Congo	678	2.8	6.3	16.5	50.3	24.0
Zimbabwe	492	3.7	36.4	50.0	0.2	9.8
Zambia	312	9.9	32.7	43.6	2.2	11.5
Rwanda	217	—	6.0	4.6	86.2	3.2
DRC (Zaire)	178	1.1	7.3	19.7	71.9	—
Angola	92	14.1	12.0	65.2	8.7	—
Malawi	56	5.4	30.4	53.6	—	10.7
Mozambique	55	14.5	25.5	49.1	5.5	5.5
Madagascar	43	2.3	25.6	65.1	—	7.0
Botswana	30	6.7	20.0	46.7	6.7	20.0

Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, *Statistical Yearbook,* 2002, Table 3 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice).

U.S. immigration literature, and more research on their experiences in the U.S. is warranted.

For the most part, South Africans and Zimbabweans in the U.S. today are recent immigrants. Table 4 shows that 51.8 percent of white South Africans, 50.5 percent of black South Africans, and 83.4 percent of black Zimbabweans living in the U.S. in 2000 had migrated to this country in the previous decade. Notably, a higher proportion of white than black Zimbabweans migrated to the U.S. in the 1970s and 1980s than in the 1990s; this difference is likely a product of the great white exodus from Zimbabwe between the 1970s and the mid-1980s, which was followed by increasing black frustration and emigration during the 1990s. Also notable is the relative recency of immigration from other southern and central African countries; approximately 80 percent of immigrants from Rwanda and Mauritius, 75 percent of immigrants from the Congo, and over 60 percent of immigrants from Malawi living in the U.S. in 2000 had migrated in the 1990s. All of these southern and central African immigrant groups have a younger median age than foreign-born immigrants in general (with the exception of immigrants from Mozambique, many of whom entered the U.S. in the 1980s). The sex ratios among these groups are either roughly equal (in the case of immigrants from South Africa, Zambia, the Congo, Rwanda, Mauritius, and Malawi) or more heavily male- than female-dominated (in the case of immigrants from Zimbabwe, the Democratic Republic of Congo, An-

Table 4 Age, sex, citizenship status, and decade of entry characteristics, selected foreign-born Central and South African groups, 2000

National origin	Median age	Percentage male	Percentage noncitizen	Percent arriving by decade: 1990–2000	1980–1989	1970–1979	1960–1969	Before 1960
5 percent sample								
All foreign-born	37.0	49.8	56.3	41.7	26.7	15.3	8.6	7.7
South Africa	35.0	49.3	58.3	52.6	24.5	14.7	4.3	3.9
White (82.3%)	36.0	49.2	55.5	51.8	23.9	15.2	4.8	4.4
Black (5.9%)	34.0	48.3	62.3	50.5	32.3	12.7	2.4	2.1
Zimbabwe	32.0	54.6	65.9	61.2	18.6	13.2	5.2	1.8
White (40.9%)	39.0	59.4	48.7	36.4	30.0	20.9	8.8	3.9
Black (48.7%)	27.0	49.8	79.2	83.4	8.5	5.7	2.4	—
1 percent sample[a]								
DRC (Zaire)	30.0	58.4	48.0	58.4	28.3	6.1	4.3	2.9
Zambia	36.0	51.9	53.0	54.1	17.9	23.8	4.2	0.0
Congo	35.0	50.2	77.8	74.1	20.5	1.0	1.9	2.5
Angola	35.0	57.9	63.5	48.7	21.5	27.0	2.8	0.0
Rwanda	29.0	49.4	70.3	79.0	12.1	4.7	4.2	0.0
Mauritius	31.0	51.4	64.0	79.0	12.6	8.4	0.0	0.0
Malawi	32.0	48.6	58.6	63.6	12.0	24.4	0.0	0.0
Mozambique	38.0	60.0	40.0	51.6	31.4	8.4	8.5	0.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census, 5% Public Use Microdata Sample, weighted data.

a. Because of small population sizes, 2000 figures are available only from the 1% Public Use Microdata Sample and have a larger margin for error than figures from the 5% sample. Figures for Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Lesotho, Madagascar, Namibia, Seychelles, and Swaziland are not available.

gola, and Mozambique). Rates of U.S. citizenship vary, with high proportions of immigrants from the Congo, Rwanda, Zimbabwe, Mauritius, and Angola still not naturalized in 2000. Greater numbers of black than white South African and Zimbabwean immigrants lack U.S. citizenship.

South Africans and Zimbabweans are among the most highly skilled and professionally employed immigrants in the U.S. today (see Table 5). Among South African immigrants in 2000, 57.4 percent had a bachelor's degree or higher, while only 4.8 percent had not completed high school; among Zimbabwean immigrants, the corresponding figures were 50.3 percent and 3.0 percent, respectively. Also among South African immigrants in 2000, 59.1 percent were employed in professional or managerial occupations, while just 4.5 percent were employed in service occupations and 8.6 percent in production, craft, and repair occupations; among Zimbabwean immigrants, the corresponding figures were 50.7 percent, 7.9 percent, and 11.8 percent. These figures are consistent with the contention that highly skilled professionals are leaving southern Africa to pursue higher education and professional opportunities elsewhere.

At the same time, important racial disparities are evident within both national-origin groups, with white South African and Zimbabwean immigrants faring significantly better along socioeconomic indicators than their black counterparts. Whereas 59.9 percent of white South African immigrants and 53.7 percent of white Zimbabwean immigrants had a bachelor's degree or higher in 2000, only 45.2 percent of black South African immigrants and 45.0 percent of black Zimbabwean immigrants did. Conversely, whereas only 3.2 percent of white South African immigrants and 2.0 percent of white Zimbabwean immigrants had not graduated from high school in 2000, 11.3 percent of black South African immigrants and 4.5 percent of black Zimbabwean immigrants had not. In terms of occupational concentration, whereas 61.6 percent of white South African immigrants and 52.4 percent of white Zimbabwean immigrants were employed in professional or managerial occupations in 2000, only 43.8 percent of black South African immigrants and 41.5 percent of black Zimbabwean immigrants were. Conversely, whereas only 3.9 percent of white South African immigrants and 4.7 percent of white Zimbabwean immigrants were employed in service occupations in 2000, and only 7.9 percent of white South African immigrants and 10.9 percent of white Zimbabwean immigrants were in production, craft, or repair occupations, 7.7 percent of black South African immigrants and 13.4 percent of black Zimbabwean immigrants were employed in service occupations in 2000, and 17.7 percent of black South African immigrants and 17.0 percent of black Zimbabwean immigrants were in production, craft, or repair occupations. In terms of median wage/salary income, whereas white South African and Zimbabwean immigrants earned an average of $39,900 and $38,000 in 1999, respectively, black South African and Zimbabwean immigrants earned averages of $28,000 and $25,600, respectively. Finally, whereas only 2.8

Table 5 Selected labor market characteristics, selected foreign-born Central and South African groups, 2000

National origin	Percentage with a bachelor's degree or higher	Percentage employed in managerial/professional occupations	Percentage employed in service occupations	Median wage/salary income, 1999	Percentage living below the poverty line
5 percent sample					
All foreign-born	26.0	29.7	16.3	$21,000	10.9
South Africa	57.4	59.1	4.5	$36,000	3.5
White (82.3%)	59.9	61.6	3.9	$39,900	2.8
Black (5.9%)	45.2	43.8	7.7	$28,000	7.1
Zimbabwe	50.3	50.7	7.9	$32,070	7.3
White (40.9%)	53.7	52.4	4.7	$38,000	4.2
Black (48.7%)	45.0	41.5	13.4	$25,600	13.2
1 percent sample[a]					
DRC (Zaire)	35.6	41.2	2.9	$32,000	0.0
Zambia	40.5	55.5	13.2	$20,000	0.0
Congo	39.8	50.9	23.8	$13,200	29.3
Angola	28.7	28.3	29.4	$24,000	0.0
Rwanda	54.0	50.5	12.8	$15,000	29.4
Mauritius	21.4	42.8	27.3	$19,800	0.0
Malawi	44.6	57.4	12.5	$38,000	11.0
Mozambique	24.8	32.2	0.0	$45,000	0.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census, 5% Public Use Microdata Sample, weighted data. Figures for education are for persons aged 25–64; figures for labor market, for persons aged 25–64 in the labor force.

a. Because of small population sizes, 2000 figures are available only from the 1% Public Use Microdata Sample and have a larger margin for error than figures from the 5% sample. Figures for Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Lesotho, Madagascar, Namibia, Seychelles, and Swaziland are not available.

percent of white South African immigrants and 4.2 percent of white Zimbabwean immigrants were living below the poverty line in 1999, 7.1 percent of black South African immigrants and 13.2 percent of black Zimbabwean immigrants were.

Race even differentiates these groups' residential patterns in the U.S., with white South African and Zimbabwean immigrants more geographically dispersed in 2000 than their black counterparts. For example, not only did more white than black South African and Zimbabwean immigrants live in nonmetropolitan areas, but among those who did live in metropolitan areas—that is, in U.S. central cities and suburbs—whites lived in a broader range of them than blacks did. Moreover, there were slight differences in the concentration of white and black immigrants in their top U.S. metropolitan destinations. Whereas in 2000 white South African immigrants lived primarily in the greater metropolitan areas of Los Angeles (6.7 percent), San Diego (5.4 percent), New York (4.0 percent), Houston (3.1 percent), Orange County, California (3.0 percent), Atlanta (2.9 percent), and Dallas–Fort Worth (2.9 percent), black South African immigrants lived primarily in the greater metropolitan areas of New York (13.5 percent), Washington, D.C. (11.0 percent), Philadelphia (7.1 percent), Los Angeles (6.7 percent), Houston (4.9 percent), Chicago (4.9 percent), and Boston (4.8 percent). (Notably, these figures are more dispersed than they were in 1970, when Stanley Moss found that half of all nonwhite immigrants from South Africa lived in New York City.) Similarly, whereas white Zimbabwean immigrants lived primarily in the greater metropolitan areas of Los Angeles (6.4 percent), San Diego (5.5 percent), Philadelphia (3.7 percent), Dallas–Fort Worth (3.6 percent), Houston (3.3 percent), Tampa (3.0 percent), and Atlanta (2.7 percent) in 2000, black Zimbabwean immigrants lived primarily in the greater metropolitan areas of Washington, D.C. (10.5 percent), Atlanta (6.1 percent), Dallas–Fort Worth (6.0 percent), Benton Harbor, Michigan (5.4 percent), Charlotte, North Carolina (4.5 percent), Baltimore (4.1 percent), and Indianapolis (3.6 percent). This residential dispersion probably reflects the high degree of educational attainment and professional occupational concentration among immigrants from South Africa and Zimbabwe, especially whites.

Because most immigrants from South Africa and Zimbabwe speak English upon arrival, either alone or in addition to another language, they exhibit very low levels of linguistic isolation in the U.S. In fact, 97.4 percent of white South African immigrants, 90.3 percent of black South African immigrants, 96.2 percent of white Zimbabwean immigrants, and 89.3 percent of black Zimbabwean immigrants reported speaking English "only" or "very well" in 2000. These rates are high despite the fact that 21.9 percent of white South African, 17.1 percent of black South African, and 9.2 percent of white Zimbabwean immigrants reported speaking Dutch in their homes, and over 70 percent of black Zimbabwean and over 30 percent of black South African immigrants reported speaking a "Nilotic" language (the term used by the 2000 Census) in their homes.

Whereas Stanley Moss found no evidence of white South African associations in the U.S. in the 1970s, and political activity and organization mainly among black South African immigrants working for majority rule in South Africa during the apartheid era, a host of South African cultural and social associations exists today, welcoming members of all backgrounds. Social and sport clubs exist across the country, from the South African Club of Atlanta and South African Tarheels in North Carolina to the Arizona Springbok Club in Phoenix, the Provo Cricket Club in Utah, the NYNJ Springbok Club in New York/New Jersey, Amaboston in Boston, the South Africa Association of Indiana, the Springbok Club of Kentucky, the Braai Connection in Orlando, South Africans in Austin, and the Baybokke Springbok Club and Sacramento South Africans in northern California. These associations illustrate an incipient social organization among South African immigrants in the U.S., who are coming together in groups where they can share information and provide each other with social support in their new country. Additionally, South African restaurants, bars, and other businesses have opened up across the U.S. They cater primarily to South African immigrants longing for home country activities and tastes—for example, by showing rugby and cricket games on TV, serving boerewors, or selling Marie biscuits and Mrs Ball's chutney—but most are open to the general public as well. Southern African immigrants in the U.S., although relatively small in number, are increasingly making a social and cultural as well as an economic impact on American life.

Bibliography

Brown, Mercy, David Kaplan, and Jean-Baptiste Meyer. 2001. "Counting Brains: Measuring Emigration from South Africa." Southern African Migration Project (SAMP), Migration Policy Brief No. 5, www.queensu.ca/samp.

Chikanda, Abel. 2005. "Medical Leave: The Exodus of Health Professionals from Zimbabwe." Southern African Migration Project (SAMP), Migration Policy Series (no number), www.queensu.ca/samp.

Dodson, Brenda. 2002. "Gender and the Brain Drain from South Africa." Southern African Migration Project (SAMP), Migration Policy Series No. 23, www.queensu.ca/samp.

Haldenwang, B. B. 1996. *Migration Processes, Systems, and Policies: With Special Emphasis on South African International Migration.* Occasional Paper No. 25. Bellville, South Africa: University of Stellenbosch, Institute for Futures Research.

Mattes, Robert, and Wayne Richmond. 2000. "The Brain Drain: What Do Skilled Africans Think?" In Jonathan Crush, ed., "Losing Our Minds? Skills Migration and the South African Brain Drain," pp. 9–35. Southern African Migration Project (SAMP), Migration Policy Series No. 18, www.queensu.ca/samp.

McDonald, David, and Jonathan Crush. 2002. "Thinking About the Brain Drain in Southern Africa." Southern African Migration Project (SAMP), Migration Policy Brief No. 8, www.queensu.ca/samp.

Moss, Stanley. 1980. "South Africans." In Stephan Thernstrom, Ann Orlov, and Oscar Handlin, eds., *The Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, pp. 942–44. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Polonsky, M. J., D. R. Scott, and Hazel T. Suchard. 1989. "A Profile of Emigrants from South Africa: The Australian Case." *International Migration Review* 23, 4: 933–44.

Tevera, Daniel S. 2005. "Early Departures: The Emigration Potential of Zimbabwean Students." Southern African Migration Project (SAMP), Migration Policy Series No. 39, www.queensu.ca/samp.

Tevera, Daniel S., and Jonathan Crush. 2003. "The New Brain Drain from Zimbabwe." Southern African Migration Project (SAMP), Migration Policy Series No. 29, www.queensu.ca/samp.

Van Rooyen, Johann. 2000. *The New Great Trek: The Story of South Africa's White Exodus.* Pretoria: Unisa.

Zinyama, Lovemore M. 1990. "International Migrations to and from Zimbabwe and the Influence of Political Changes on Population Movements, 1965–1987." *International Migration Review* 24, 4: 748–67.

Canada

Donna R. Gabaccia

Although 820,000 people born in Canada lived in the United States in 2000, few would identify themselves as "new Americans." Some are not even immigrants and hold temporary visas. Most Canadians who enter the U.S. to live or work already regard themselves as Americans; most probably resent the fact that for over two centuries the U.S. and its citizens have uncritically appropriated the term "American" for their own nationality. Nor do citizens of the U.S. typically view Canadians as different enough from themselves to qualify either socially or culturally as "real" foreigners, even when legally they are among the immigrant groups most likely to retain their original citizenship. With the current attention of the U.S. fixed firmly on economic relations along the border with Mexico, few worry much about the much older northern border, which has both divided and joined Canada and the U.S. and their respective residents.

Nevertheless, Canada has provided one of the most important and persistent streams of immigration into the U.S. Only in the past half-century have the numbers of Canadians fallen drastically—to below fortieth place—in census counts of foreign-born residents of the U.S. Although scholars have characterized the Canadian border as one of ongoing exchange—Marcus Lee Hansen and Robert Bremner in 1940 labeled it a "mingling" of two peoples—Canadians have viewed the exchange as decidedly unbalanced, while their southern neighbors have remained unaware of it.

A Short History of the "Mingling" of Canadians and U.S. Americans

In 1900, when Canada's resident population numbered scarcely 5 million, over a million people born in Canada lived south of their border, making Canadians slightly more than 10 percent of the foreign-born population of the U.S. The much