

in other tabulations, and in various special surveys, they are regarded as an "ethnic" group. Furthermore, the Census Bureau uses three different criteria for identifying them, and in the 1970 Census used different methods in different parts of the country, which resulted in the non-tabulation of statistics for about a million "persons of Spanish heritage," other than Puerto Ricans, in the Northeastern part of the country.

Despite the conceptual and statistical limitations, the Census data on per capita incomes contribute towards understanding the comparative economic status of different racially and nationally oppressed groups.

TABLE 7

PER CAPITA INCOME, SPECIFIED NATIONAL/RACIAL GROUPS, 1969

NATIONAL/RACIAL GROUP	POPULATION 1970 (Thousands)	PER CAPITA INCOME, 1969	PERCENT OF WHITE ANGLO
White Anglo	168,823	\$3,383	100
Black	22,550	1,818	54
Chicano (part)	4,667	1,850	55
Puerto Rican	1,391	1,805	53
American Indian	764	1,573	46
Japanese	588	3,602	106
Chinese	432	3,122	92
Filipino	337	2,790	82
Others of Spanish Heritage	3,237	2,487	72
All Others	439	2,337	69

SOURCES: U.S. -85, 94; PC(2)-1D, TC1, 12; NY, NJ, PC(2)-1E, T. 1, 9; PC(2)-1F, T. 1, 9; PC(2)-1G, T. 1, 9, 16, 24, 31, 39.

NOTES: Data for Chicanos cover only those with Spanish surnames residing in five southwestern states. Data for American Indians, as most other data in this table, are based on a 20% sample. The full Census count gave a substantially larger total American Indian population. "Others of Spanish Heritage" include Chicanos not covered above, Cubans, peoples of other Latin American, Caribbean, and Spanish "heritage." "All others" include Hawaiians, Koreans, Eskimos, Aleuts, and people of unspecified "races."

The two other largest oppressed national groups, Chicanos and Puerto Ricans, had per capita incomes close to those of the Blacks, and are subject to economic discrimination roughly comparable in severity. However, these national averages conceal one important difference. Most Puerto Ricans are concentrated in the New York metropolitan area, where living costs are considerably higher than the national average. There the per capita income of Puerto Ricans, \$1765, was 27% lower than that of Blacks, and only 39% of the per capita income of "white-Anglo" people, as compared with a 54% Black/white Anglo ratio.⁷

The American Indians are the most economically oppressed, with a per capita income of \$1,573, or only 46% of that of "white-Anglo" people. The most severe oppression is suffered by Indians living on reservations. On about half of these, the per capita income was under \$1,000. On the largest reservation, that of the Navajos, the per capita income was only \$776, and on the important Navajo/Hopi joint-use reservation in Arizona, the per capita income was an incredibly low \$472. On the second largest reservation in terms of population, the Pine Ridge reservation in South Dakota, the site of bitter liberation struggles in 1972-73, the per capita income was \$1,042. The situation is less severe for Indians living off the reservations. In most cases their per capita incomes were equal to or higher than those of Blacks living in the same areas.⁸

The per capita incomes of the Asian and Oceanic peoples are considerably higher than those of other oppressed groups. The per capita income of Japanese people was 6% *higher* than that of white Anglo people, while that of the Chinese people was only 8% lower, and of the Filipino people 18% lower, than that of "white-Anglo" people. While exact figures are not available, comparable data indicate that the per capita income of Koreans was between that of Japanese and Chinese, and of Hawaiians between that of Chinese and Filipinos.⁹

However, the Asian and Oceanic peoples remain subject to significant economic discrimination. To some extent, the per capita income figures exaggerate their real status, since these people are concentrated in high living-cost areas. Thus, one-third of all the Japanese resided in the Honolulu metropolitan area, where living costs are higher than in any other metropolitan area except Anchorage, Alaska. Moreover, the situation is uneven geographically. Chinese people are relatively well off in Hawaii, and not too badly off in California but in New York the large Chinese population is afflicted with poverty and discrimination. Their per capita income in the New York metropolitan area was only \$2,655, which was but 10% above the Black per capita income, and 41% below the per capita income of "white-Anglo" people.¹⁰

Asian people were brought into this country in the last century virtually as indentured workers, subject to the most barbarous discrimination and exploitation, or, in the case of the Hawaiians, treated as colonial subjects on their native soil. The Asian peoples were subject to extremely vicious chauvinistic attacks and victimized by special discriminatory legislation. Yet, it is obvious from the income statistics and