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NOT JUST
A GOLDEN STATE

Three Anglo "Rushes"
in the Making of
Southern California, 1880–1920

By Glen Gendzel

Abstract: Three southern California rushes—the health rush, the land rush, and the orange rush—deserve the kind of attention historians have lavished on northern California’s gold rush. The three booms in the southern portion of the state were not only bigger than the gold rush, they concentrated the state’s population in the south. They also played roles in the racially-based social and cultural patterns that developed in the region.

The California history community experienced frustration and disappointment when the much-ballyhooed sesquicentennial of statehood on September 9, 2000, failed to attract much public attention. A planned nautical race of tall sailing ships along the California coast was cancelled at the last minute for lack of funds; the official sesquicentennial commission underwent a legislative investigation and dissolved in acrimony; scattered local observances had to suffice in the absence of statewide events. Despite these failures, however, the sesquicentennial did succeed in enshrining the gold rush as “the founding myth of American California,” as the San Francisco Chronicle proclaimed. Commemorations, publications, speeches, and exhibitions in honor of the sesquicentennial treated the gold rush as the Golden State’s one and only
founding moment because it had led to instant statehood. Thus other migrations in California history were denied equivalent foundational roles. Consider these comments from some leading California historians during the sesquicentennial: state historian Kevin Starr proclaimed that the gold rush “laid down the foundation of our great state” and set “the DNA code of American California.” J. S. Holliday hailed the legendary Argonauts of ’49 as California’s “Founding Fathers.” James Rawls called the gold rush California’s “foundational event.” “We know the Gold Rush as our founding event,” echoed Jeffrey Lustig. Even the novelist Isabel Allende chimed in: “The gold rush created this place we call today California.”

It was understandable that the 150th anniversary of the gold rush would focus attention on this event to the exclusion of others. But anniversaries aside, treating the gold rush as California’s cosmogonic “cornerstone” raises a pair of problems. First, the gold rush founding myth that was revived by the sesquicentennial tends to overlook California’s earlier histories and inhabitants, depriving Indians, Spaniards, Mexicans, and others of “foundational” roles on par with the fabled ’49ers. Second, the gold rush founding myth imposes northern California’s parochial past onto southern California—where the gold rush had relatively little “foundational” impact. To be sure, southern California’s economy experienced a temporary boom, but otherwise, life continued south of the Tehachapi much as before. Anglo Americans predominated in northern California by 1850 while southern California remained mostly Mexican as late as 1870. Then came the deluge: between 1880 and 1920, three overlapping “rushes” of Anglo migration—the health rush, the land rush, and the orange rush—lifted southern California’s population from 64,000 to over 1.3 million. These migrations, if not so storied nor so sudden as the gold rush, were no less “foundational” for California for three reasons: they were much bigger than the gold rush; they completed the Anglo takeover of the state; and they shifted the state’s regional balance of population southward where it remains to this day. Considering the surge of gold-rush hyperbole spurred by the sesquicentennial, these lesser-known rushes that remade southern California deserve our attention even though no one celebrates their anniversaries. Telling their stories does not detract from the unique significance of the gold rush for California, but it should remind us, once again, that not all Californians share the same history.
Southern California's first great wave of Anglo migration has been called the health rush. After the Southern Pacific railroad reached Los Angeles in 1876, thousands of wealthy sick people from back east rode out west in Pullman Palace railroad cars seeking relief from tuberculosis and other chronic respiratory ailments. Followers of the medical fad of climatotherapy, these "coughing pilgrims" believed in the healing effects of sunshine and aridity. Though it is hard to imagine today, in the late nineteenth century the Los Angeles basin could boast of its "clean" air, "uncontaminated by any disease-producing thing," a putatively potent environmental health tonic. The alleged curative powers of southern California's warm, sunny, comfortable climate received frequent comment in national magazines by 1880. Some patients did improve by relocating there; those who died were in no position to warn others. The health rush also included, in addition to the sick, some affluent easterners who were merely growing old and looking to recover lost youth in a more agreeable locale. Comparatively speaking, then, if the gold rush drew young men in the prime of health who sought easy riches, the health rush drew older people of both sexes who were already well-to-do but who suffered from the ravages of illness or old age. "[Health rushers are] people of wealth, those who have reached the meridian of life and now want to lengthen their days and enjoy their too-often impaired health under the most pleasant conditions possible," the Los Angeles Tribune sympathized in 1887.

The first prophet of the health rush was Charles Nordhoff, a famous Civil War correspondent. Visiting southern California in 1871, Nordhoff claimed to have encountered dozens of erstwhile consumptives "restored to health and strength" by "the kindly and healing influences of the climate of southern California." Three years later, Benjamin Truman, a railroad publicist trying to drum up passenger traffic, declared the region's climate "second to none in the world" for healing sickness. "If the eastern invalids . . . could only be made acquainted with the remarkable climate of Los Angeles," he speculated, "... many, many hundreds of lives might be spared yearly." Another early health rush promoter was Mark Twain's friend and neighbor Charles Dudley Warner, who reported in 1890 that he had found in southern California "many persons in fair health who say that it is impossible for them to live elsewhere" because only this region's "equable climate" kept their maladies at bay. Warner stressed the climate's
"rejuvenating effect upon men and women of advanced years," citing "cases of uncommon longevity in natives." Southern California sun, sea, air, and mild seasons, he added, could impart "increased power in all functions of life" as well as "vitality and endurance." Oddly, health-rush boosters like Nordhoff, Truman, and Warner scarcely bothered to describe the climate in terms of weather per se, relying instead upon accounts of its miraculous effects to tantalize the reader.  

As word spread of southern California's supposedly restorative climate, "the wealthy, the growing old, and those whose health was precarious" began flocking there in large numbers, as George Wharton James, one of them, remembered. In 1894, Land of Sunshine, a Los Angeles booster magazine, estimated that between thirty and forty thousand people had already moved to southern California in search of health cures. Doctors followed, eager to ply their trade, until by decade's end Los Angeles could plausibly claim to have more physicians per resident than any other U.S. city of its size. These doctors joined the chorus urging rich, idle, aging, and sickly Americans to give climatotherapy a chance. "The influence of the climate of Southern California on the health of people coming to it, is both potent and peculiar," Dr. Norman Bridge, a prominent Chicago physician, promised. Dr. Bridge relocated to Los Angeles in 1891 after he developed tuberculosis. A decade later, Bridge could personally attest that consumptives would "recover" in southern California as had he. Dr. Peter Remondino, vice president of the Southern California Medical Society, extravagantly predicted that any illness would find a cure there. "[P]aradise, as far as climate can make it, is in this favored region," he gushed. "Here disease and death may be kept at bay and life enjoyed to the end of the term of man's natural existence." Remondino estimated that "at least an extra ten years' lease of life is gained by a removal to this coast from the Eastern States ... with the additional benefit of feeling ten years younger during the time," due to the "rejuvenating influence" of climate.

The health rush, not the gold rush, marked the first substantial Anglo migration into southern California. As miners' tents had once dotted northern California's Mother Lode in the 1850s, convalescent hotels and sickroom boardinghouses sprang up across southern California in the 1870s and '80s. The old Mexican pueblo of Los Angeles became "a community with broken lungs" where Spanish overheard on the unpaved streets was now interlaced with snippets of English: "Well, how do you feel today?" "Did you have a good night?" "Are you trying any new med-
The health rush brought invalids and, in their wake, doctors. Sanitariums sprang up. The Seventh Day Adventists purchased the Glendale Hotel and converted it to a Sanitarium in 1890 (still operating in newer buildings as Glendale Adventist Hospital). Courtesy of The University of Southern California Libraries. California Historical Society Collection.
Visiting magazine writers marveled at the dimensions of the health rush: "But ah, how many there are who are ill!" W. S. Harwood reported for The World To-Day. "You can scarcely find a family . . . some member of which has not left 'the East' on account of poor health." As Los Angeles acquired a lugubrious reputation as "The City of the Unburied Dead," some of the new Anglo residents questioned whether climatotherapy provided an adequate basis for civic growth. A local pamphleteer dismissed such concerns. "We certainly can live on climate, and climate alone," Mary Vail wrote in 1888, "so long as those who want it . . . pay us for it." 

Compared to gold-rush migrants a generation earlier, health-rush migrants were older and wealthier—which then became an additional selling point, beside climate, for southern California. Dr. H. S. Orme, a founder of the Los Angeles County Medical Society and president of the State Board of Health, assured prospective health-seekers that "the sufferer who comes here is surrounded . . . by people of refinement and education, who represent the best social and intellectual conditions to be found anywhere in the United States." President David Starr Jordan of Stanford University believed that "no part of our Union has a better population" than the "one-lunged people" of southern California. But Jordan also found it "pitiful" that health rushers left their friends and families back east to fritter away their money among strangers out west, "perhaps to die on board the train" as they returned home. 

It certainly was not a cheap way to leave this world, thanks to high prices charged by hoteliers, boarding-house keepers, private nurses, and doctors. "California of the South is not the country for a poor invalid," an eastern physician warned. "One must not come here seeking health without sufficient means." Only the climate was free, wrote Agnes Laut in the Saturday Evening Post. She suspected that the impoverished invalid usually died "from want" before disease could take its toll. Comparatively speaking, then, if hard-working gold-rush migrants had once shown a willingness to sacrifice health for wealth, for health rush migrants a generation later it was the other way around.

Health historians John Baur and Sheila Rothman concur that by 1900, about one in four southern California migrants had come for health reasons. Back east, however, word was already spreading that too many health-seekers in California wound up broke, disappointed, dead, or all three. It
finally dawned on wealthy invalids contemplating a change of scenery that, in the words of one reporter, “to be sick, without friends and in a far land, is such a fate as a hard man might wish his enemy!” When scientists established that tuberculosis was in fact highly contagious, even the most ardent Los Angeles boosters came to resent their city’s status as “Capital of the Sanitarium Belt.”

Visiting consumptives, once seen as dispensers of dollars, now appeared as bearers of bacillus instead. A local physician complained in 1906 that “it is injurious to the State that there should swarm upon her soil from the East consumptives... palpably stricken with death.” Isolated desert quarantine stations stayed open, but visibly diseased guests were no longer welcome in Los Angeles hostries. “The attitude of Southern Californians toward incoming tuberculous invalids has undergone a change during the past few years,” an army doctor observed in 1905. “It is now becoming difficult for consumptives to obtain suitable accommodations in hotels and boarding houses.” A few years later, in a stark reversal of medical policy, Los Angeles doctors requested that the State Board of Health deport consumptives out of town.

Southern California could afford to turn back the health rush, thanks to a second, concurrent, and much larger wave of Anglo migration that was already underway: the land rush. This migration began in the 1880s as Gilded Age prosperity and railroad publicity brought growing numbers of wealthy eastern tourists to southern California. These Anglo visitors valued the climate not for health, but for relief from cold winters. California sun and sand appealed to upper-class Yankee socialites accustomed to basking on Mediterranean shores but who now wished to “See America First.”

The opening of luxury hotels like the Arlington in Santa Barbara (1874), the Raymond in Pasadena (1886), the Arcadia in Santa Monica (1887), and the Del Coronado in San Diego (1888) drew well-heeled clientele to the region; so did Helen Hunt Jackson’s blockbuster novel Ramona (1884), which sent thousands of readers looking for locales mentioned in her beloved book, which was set in southern California. For decades, the region enjoyed “an annual influx” of “fat-pursed” tourists who spent money “with an open hand,” as a San Francisco editor noted with envy. Los Angeles hotels had few winter vacancies, thanks to “such a horde of tourists and pleasure seekers as no other section of our country
ever sees,” according to a 1905 report. “By thousands daily they pour in, until by February every chink and cranny of habitation is occupied—hotel and boarding-house, in city and country.” Tourism remained mostly seasonal until the 1920s when the All-Year Club of Southern California sponsored national advertising campaigns that publicized the virtues of the summer as well as winter climate.24

Like explorers planting the flag on foreign soil, Anglo tourists dubbed California “Our Italy” but thankfully one “without the trying features of that exquisite land,” meaning “squalor,” “odors,” and, presumably, Italians. “Here is our Mediterranean! Here is our Italy!” Warner enthused. “It is a Mediterranean without marshes and without malaria.”25 Some well-heeled visitors, after spending a season in southern California, began to consider buying a piece of this wondrous land. Perhaps they were charmed by the legendary climate and the region’s many attractions; perhaps they succumbed to the hordes of real estate agents who swarmed around hotels and boardinghouses, knocking on doors, handing out brochures, displaying maps, and offering free tours. Like the fictional tourists in Stewart Edward White’s novel The Rose Dawn (1920), visitors bored with the usual round of amusements took free carriage rides to remote corners of the Los Angeles basin and wound up purchasing small lots on speculation. “The wealthy tourist . . . ‘took a flyer’ for the fun of it; the man who thought himself shrewd, and was always willing to make his pleasure trips pay for themselves, looked about to see what was likely to rise,” White wrote. “Everybody agreed that there was surely going to be a big population. The world would not be able to resist.” Perhaps, as historian Merry Ovnick suggests, the region had attracted “a disproportionate share of the gullible.”26 In any case, Anglo tourists dabbling in real estate became advance agents for southern California’s land rush.

The land rush really took off with the outbreak of a railroad rate war that opened the floodgates of Anglo migration. In December 1885, the Santa Fe line reached Los Angeles, and the Southern Pacific lost its high-priced monopoly over transcontinental rail traffic into California. “Verily,” crowed the Los Angeles Times, “railway competition is a mighty good thing for the people.” The price of passenger fares into Los Angeles rapidly declined until a southern California tour was no longer the preserve of rich industrialists and society matrons. Within a few months, fares from Kansas City to Los Angeles plummeted from over $70 to under
$5. Now all but the poorest Anglos could afford to visit the region and sample its legendary climate for themselves. The railroads added extra cars and whole trains to accommodate throngs of passengers drawn by bargain fares, but some luckless travelers still had to ride all the way west standing up or sitting in the aisles. 27 Years later, Joseph Netz of Los Angeles recalled that low fares brought “such an avalanche rushing madly to Southern California as I believe has had no parallel,” not even, he guessed, in the gold rush. Charles Dwight Willard, a health-seeker from Michigan, arrived in Los Angeles at the height of the land rush in 1886 and could find no place to stay. “Every thing was full,” he wrote back home, “and where there was a sign of ‘furnished rooms’ up people were standing in line back to the sidewalk.” In 1887, the railroads deposited passengers in Los Angeles at rates in excess of ten thousand per month. 28

The land rush brought more Anglos to southern California than ever before. The new arrivals, blinking in the unfamiliar sunlight, eyed huge tracts of ex-rancho land, now up for sale, recently taken from California landowners by Anglo attorneys, squatters, money lenders, and speculators. 29 Tourists who came to sample the climate imagined the area’s growth potential, and prices began rising fast as the oft-heard prophecy that southern California was destined to support multitudes seemed to be coming true all at once. “Los Angeles was the center of this new activity, and the price of city property began to go up with great swiftness,” Willard later wrote. “Thousands of acres of farms within the city limits were laid out in residence tracts, and sold off.” Soon the projected tracts extended far beyond city limits, across the arid hills, over the rugged mountains, and into the deserts beyond. “One scoundrel,” scoffed Willard, “disposed of $50,000 worth of lots in towns located on the top of the mountains where in all probability no human foot will ever tread.” Some faraway properties, by one account, were only “accessible by balloon and field-glass.” 30 Location, however, did not concern buyers who rarely bothered to inspect their property anyway. “Not one in a hundred of the purchasers had seen the townsite,” local historian J. M. Guinn recalled, “and not one in a thousand expected to occupy the land.” All that really mattered was that each lot, however remote, came with the fabled climate attached so that some future sucker would likely come along and pay even more for it. “New arrivals were charmed with the climate and surroundings, and determined to get a share of it before the shares gave out,” Harry Ellington Brook of the Los Angeles Times remembered. 31
Trainloads of tourists succumbed to the lures of the land rush. They attended auctions like this one where, in spite of the heat and the bleak surrounding landscape, they eagerly bought up the lots indicated by plat maps of new town sites. Library of Congress.
Southern California’s land rush was not unique. By the 1880s, speculating profitably in land taken from Indians and Mexicans was considered an Anglo-American birthright. Indeed, the unearned increment of rising real estate values was the holy grail of the entire westward expansion of the United States—the utmost desideratum of generations of ambitious “frontier” speculators who amassed huge tracts of land by means of varying legality in order to sell it off piecemeal for personal gain. A speculative boom was the first chapter in the history of most western cities, not just Los Angeles. By the time the Santa Fe—Southern Pacific rate war broke out, bringing southern California into play, tens of thousands of sharp-eyed “boomers” were looking for fresh fields of endeavor, having already squeezed quick profits from Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. Historians describe participants in southern California’s land boom as “townsite sharks,” “real estate operators,” “social parasites,” and “Escrow Indians” who hawked empty lots in imaginary subdivisions by conjuring up grandiose promises of future development potential. The usual modus operandi was to acquire land on credit or by option purchase and then to turn it over quickly before interest and taxes fell due.

Southern California’s land rush turned into a stampede in 1886 and 1887 as eager buyers came charging into Los Angeles. Phantom developments with outlandish names overspread far-flung pastures as real estate prices soared higher and higher. Passing through town in the fall of 1887, Henry Finck claimed to have overheard “a mother scolding her baby for putting a handful of dirt in her mouth. Real estate is too valuable hereabouts to be thus squandered.” Harry Carr recalled that, as a boy arriving from Iowa with his family, “I was impatient with my father because he did not hurry faster to buy something before all California was gone.” To optimists, the skyrocketing price of 50-foot town lots, even in uninhabitable deserts, proved that southern California really was the world’s most desirable place to live. “This boom is based on the simple fact that hereabouts the good Lord has created conditions of climate and health and beauty such as can be found nowhere else,” one realtor prophesied, “... and until every acre of this earthly paradise is occupied, the influx will continue.” Such puffery found willing ears among Anglo visitors who knew that they had missed out on the gold rush a generation earlier. They were easily persuaded that the land itself, not what the land contained, represented a new and better way to get rich quick in California. Indeed, Warner reported for *Atlantic Monthly* at the height of the boom that “everybody expects to be rich tomorrow.”
Like the gold rush, the land rush spawned a distinctive literary genre. Anglo writers described the successively rising prices paid by purchasers of given plots of land much as Argonauts had once reminisced about the value of choice gold nuggets pried from the earth. In both cases, the rueful tone of these tales signaled that the story-teller did not profit personally. "I was urged by friends to invest a few thousand dollars in vacant lots," wailed a Boston travel writer. "For what I could have purchased for $3,000 the price is now $10,000." Speculators just wanted "to get enough and then quit," as White, the novelist, understood, but most were never quite satisfied. "Enough was always just a little more than a man had. Of course one should get out; but next week would be time enough. And next week prices were still rising: it seemed a shame not to make just a few dollars more!" Late in 1887, Los Angeles bankers grew alarmed as property changed hands at the fantastic rate of $1 million a day while no one bothered to trace titles or record deeds. Finally, local banks stopped lending money on real estate except at pre-boom valuations. This conservative policy, coupled with higher railroad fares, heavy rains, and a disappointing turnout of winter tourists in 1887–88, brought the whole fragile edifice of speculation crashing down. Still, census figures showed that between 1880 and 1890, even after the bubble had burst, the value of Los Angeles real estate rose some 950 percent. Former rancho land in Anglo hands became too valuable for pasturage. Never again would southern California merit the nickname of "cow counties," which northern Californians had bestowed when Indian and Mexican vaqueros still worked the land.

The land rush marked the turning point in the gradual overthrow and displacement of Mexican culture and society in southern California—a process that occurred faster and sooner in northern California. All through the 1850s and 1860s, as the gold rush drew legions of eager Argonauts from around the world and propelled San Francisco’s population toward one hundred and fifty thousand, the city of Los Angeles still had fewer than five thousand residents, most of whom were Mexican by birth or descent. Long after the gold rush had come and gone, southern California remained only "semi-gringo," with Spanish still spoken in many shops, classrooms, and courtrooms. Horace Bell remembered Los Angeles in the 1850s as more "Spanish" than American. Benjamin Truman found Los Angeles still a "Mexican town" when he visited in 1867, and Californios remained prominent in politics and commerce at that time. W. J. Sanborn, who settled in
Ventura County in 1873, had to speak Spanish “like a native” just to transact daily business. Businessman William Lacy arrived in Los Angeles in 1875 and recalled his dismay that the city had only “a few typical Mexican stores with sacks of beans sitting in the front and strings of chiles and garlic and Mexican sausage covered with flies.” In 1877, a New York visitor pronounced Los Angeles “distinctly Spanish,” pitying its American residents who lived “almost in a foreign land.”

With the land rush, though, everything changed in southern California, just as it had almost four decades earlier in northern California. The population of Los Angeles county tripled in the 1880s, almost entirely due to Anglo migration from other states. By 1900, Hispanics accounted for less than 10 percent of southern California’s population and less than 3 percent of Los Angeles residents, “a flip-flop of stunning magnitude and speed,” as historian William Deverell points out. Spanish- and Mexican-era adobes gave way to Yankee business blocks downtown as the public effacement of Spanish language and Mexican culture began in earnest.

What the gold rush began in the north, then, the land rush finished in the south—much to the sorrow of prior inhabitants who were now belatedly conquered, inundated, dispossessed, and shoved aside. Many of the region’s Mexican residents, whether native-born or immigrant, had to eke out a living laboring in fields, groves, orchards, ranches, gardens, kitchens, stables, and streets. Southern California developed a “segmented labor market . . . in which the best jobs were reserved for Whites,” Martha Menchaca has shown. “People of color were relegated to unskilled jobs paying the lowest wages.” Mexicans of southern California showed communal pride, ethnic solidarity, and political activism, but with proletarianization came barrioization in poverty-stricken, unsanitary, disease-wracked enclaves such as “Sonoratown” north of the old plaza in downtown Los Angeles.

Before the land rush, when Anglos were still a minority in southern California, the newcomers had recognized some diversity in the local Mexican population. It was still possible for Anglos to perceive a ranchero as different from a vaquero even though both might be dark-skinned and Hispanic. Despite frequent outbreaks of interracial violence in Los Angeles in the 1850s and '60s, which Deverell has dubbed “the unending Mexican War,” some of the first Anglos to arrive in town had eagerly married the daughters of Mexican rancheros in hopes of gaining
entry into Californio society, which brought access to wealth, status, and land. Once the land rush made Anglos dominant in southern California, however, they no longer sought connections to or made distinctions among Mexicans already living there. By the end of the 1880s, in Anglo eyes, Mexicans had become an indistinguishable mass of “greasers” with whom equal social relations were neither necessary nor desirable. A few elite rancheros managed to retain some of their land and status, but generally the place reserved for Mexicans in the new Anglo-dominated society was as low-paid labor—the same place, ironically, that Mexicans themselves had once reserved for Indians when California was still a Mexican province. Now the despoiled victims of Yankee conquest wound up on the margins of a world that once they had ruled but that was theirs no more. 43

III

Southern California’s new masters hoped to attract a third wave of Anglo migration and generate still more real estate profits. Once the land rush had subsided, the challenge facing local landowners was how to restart the westward movement of affluent Anglos willing to pay premium prices for a chunk of southern California. Climate remained the essence of the region’s appeal—but how could sunshine and ocean breezes be repackaged to draw permanent settlers instead of just health-seekers, tourists, and speculators? Who might want to farm a patch of Eden? For years the Southern Pacific railroad had been praising California’s agricultural potential in hopes that farmers could be induced to settle on some of the company’s vast land grants. The effort, however, was uncoordinated and diffuse: Southern Pacific land advertisements in the 1870s and 1880s were sent “throughout the United States and abroad,” concentrating on eastern states and Europe, according to historian Edna Monch Parker. In 1882, company president Charles Crocker announced that the railroad planned on “settling the southern portion of the State” with “immigrants from Europe,” which never happened. After the land rush subsided in 1889, the Southern Pacific railroad shut down its promotional “literary bureau” entirely. According to historian Richard Orsi, selling land to farmers “was no longer as important in the company’s total operations.” Indeed, in some years the Southern Pacific sold less land to new buyers than it took back from old buyers in default. 44
Anglo bankers, businessmen, and landowners in southern California realized that the fate of their region's real estate market, not to mention their own personal portfolios, was up to them. The key to renewed regional growth, they decided, was to revamp southern California's climatic appeal. Warm sun and sea air, formerly attractions in themselves, would become the backdrop for an idealized lifestyle, centered around growing oranges, and aimed at a new target market: the middle-aged middle class of the Middle West. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce (LACC), after it reorganized in 1888, began to invest heavily in advertising specifically to this audience. A founding director of the LACC explained that southern California needed "an immigration of industrious and intelligent practical farmers, such as were to be found in great numbers in the Middle West . . . ready to come hither as soon as they were convinced that a living could be had from the soil." LACC president W. C. Patterson concurred that the region needed "more people of the right kind," meaning "people with money" who were interested in "careful cultivation of the soil, and honest harvesting of its products." The ultimately successful effort to tap this pool of potential residents launched a third wave of Anglo migration starting in the 1880s: the orange rush. This wave lasted from the 1880s through the 1910s. In sheer size it dwarfed all previous rushes to California, including the gold rush, and it catapulted Los Angeles past San Francisco to become the premier West Coast metropolis.

LACC boosters wanted Anglo-American farmers and small-town folk from the Midwest to sell their farms or businesses and to transport the proceeds, as well as themselves, to southern California. The hope was that these well-capitalized migrants could be persuaded to buy orange groves and take up leisurely lives as gentleman growers. The best advertisements for this scheme were southern California oranges themselves. "If we could pack our climate in boxes and ship it," one local businessman fantasized aloud at a LACC meeting, "... every acre of land . . . would be worth one million dollars." Oranges would serve this very purpose, if not quite so remuneratively. It helped that in the late nineteenth century oranges became luxury goods prized by all classes of American consumers who associated the fruit with health, wealth, and nature. Thanks to the pioneering efforts of Spanish padres and William Wolfskill, citriculture was already well established in southern California by the 1880s. But it was artful LACC propaganda that transformed oranges from cash crops into compact, tangible samples of the region's allure: the "golden apples of the
Hesperides" that southern California dangled before American consumers, inviting them to come west and grow their own. Growers devised splashy, evocative advertising, lavish exhibits for midwestern agricultural fairs, traveling displays of choice produce, and colorful orange-crate labels to link the exotic fruit with the exotic place that produced it.  

An early prophet of the orange rush was the Massachusetts travel writer and Indian advocate Helen Hunt Jackson. After a visit in 1881 she enthusiastically proclaimed southern California "the Garden of the world." Jackson urged Anglo migrants to emulate Spanish missionaries of the last century who had planted California's first orange trees in mission orchards. The work required was not excessive, Jackson thought, once seedlings were planted and trees began to bear fruit. She pointed out that citriculture offered a more substantial economic foundation for the region than continued reliance on invalids, tourists, and boomers. Of course, compared to the land rush, the orange rush would require a certain lowering of expectations. "That the majority of the inhabitants of southern California will become rich by the culture of the orange . . . is an illusion," Warner cautioned in Harper's Monthly. But like Jackson, Warner assured readers that "any one with a little ready money, who goes to southern California expecting to establish himself and willing to work, will . . . steadily improve his condition." William Smythe of San Diego, a leading advocate of western agriculture, pronounced that "there is an absolute guaranty of a living and a competence, to be enjoyed under the most satisfying and ennobling social conditions" in southern California orange groves. Smythe predicted that the orange rush would attract vast numbers of Anglo migrants because it offered a leisurely lifestyle as well as a lucrative livelihood.  

Early experiments with citrus colonies in southern California proved satisfactory to all concerned: Anglo landowners were pleased to invite fellow Anglos to settle on their high-priced holdings, and midwestern migrants enjoyed each other's company in picturesque settings like Riverside, Redlands, Long Beach, Westminster, San Fernando, Alhambra, San Bernardino, Anaheim, Pomona, Ontario, Lompoc, and Pasadena. An early account of citrus colonies noted the desirability of not being "settled among strangers," with access to churches, schools, and other "social advantages." Many colonies also enforced local prohibition of alcohol. By 1886, The Cosmopolitan magazine would report that southern California
had “a collection of colonies settled by people of means . . . grown tired of snow and ice; people that fancy they see in the careful cultivation of a few acres of choice oranges . . . a competence surer and more easily won than in any other pursuit; people that are enamored of a land . . . where the orange hangs on the tree, ready for the table, from January to June.” Already the Los Angeles basin resembled “a vast garden” with “neat rectangular patches” marking the orange groves.  

From such beginnings, southern California’s citrus landscape rapidly spread as landowners switched from hawking empty lots in nonexistent towns to peddling acres of genuine seedlings. Real estate was less often traded and more often planted as fruit-bearing trees sprouted across the hilly “citrus belt.” The region’s dramatic metamorphosis in Anglo hands was made possible by railroad connections, refrigerated freight cars, expensive irrigation, booming markets, government-sponsored horticultural research, and low-wage labor. The cumulative impact of these forces in southern California was that “a giant industry sprang up in a single generation,” as World’s Work reported. California’s citrus crop grew tenfold between 1887 and 1901, by which time the state had surpassed Florida to become the nation’s leading fruit producer. A decade later, southern California oranges filled some forty thousand railroad cars each season. By then, mature groves were selling for $2,000 an acre, rivaling prices even at the peak of the land rush. Geographers declared that “no fruit district is more intensively cultivated or more productive of wealth” than the Los Angeles basin, which soon became the nation’s top agricultural area in dollar terms.  

The orange rush—like the health rush, the land rush, and the gold rush, too—was no sure thing. Shipping costs were high, water expensive, nature unpredictable, and markets unstable. Growers tried to maximize their returns by organizing a producers’ cooperative in 1895. Across the Midwest, the California Fruit Growers’ Exchange (CFGE) advertised the “Sunkist” brand name with obvious appeal for consumers in colder climes. Each delicious orange stamped “Sunkist” became a talisman and a lodestone for southern California itself, not unlike northern California gold nuggets shipped back east a generation or two earlier. This brand name, along with other CFGE advertising, besides selling fruit, also spread enchanting visions of southern California groves as places to live, work, relax, and prosper. Shimmering scenes of sunshine, greenery, and flowers
were about more than oranges alone. With a bite of tasty fruit and a
glimpse of evocative packaging, any midwestern farmer fed up with sum-
mer heat, floods, and tornados followed by winter cold, snow, and ice
could see the wisdom of trading his corn stalks for orange trees.54

The orange rush had little in common with earlier waves of Anglo
migration to California. Instead of chasing after health or wealth, these
“would-be rural escapists,” as urban critic Mike Davis calls them, were
acting out a kind of rustic pastoral yearning. Anglo migrants bought
groves of varying acreages, but the ideal grower inhabited a pleasant, airy
bungalow amid flowerbeds and fragrant trees tended by low-paid workers
of other races who subsidized his lifestyle with their labor and who lived
nearby but conveniently out of sight. Orange-rush migrants, unlike gold-
rush miners, knew that their wealth did not have to be laboriously
wrested from the earth; it quite literally grew on trees—while others did
the picking.55 Chinese immigrants supplied the initial cheap labor force
in southern California orange groves until they were “driven out” by
white mobs. Japanese immigrants and later Mexicans from both sides of
the border took their place.56 California growers preferred not to hire
European immigrants, who were deemed capable only of “a shirking, self-
seeking sort of make-believe work, for which they want the highest
prices,” according to one typical account. No doubt it was also reassuring
to know that employing non-white workers for menial tasks posed no
threat to the racial hierarchy already firmly established in California’s
“factories in the fields.”57

Here we see another key difference between northern California’s
gold rush and southern California’s orange rush: the latter was much more
selective. Los Angeles boosters wanted prosperous permanent residents,
not poor itinerant gold prospectors, to colonize the land. Orange-rushers
were undeterred by the hefty price tag of their dream because it guaran-
teed that their new neighbors would be affluent Anglos like themselves.
Warner warned them that “capital is necessary . . . to the getting of a good
living” in southern California horticulture. Beyond the high start-up
costs of land, water, and seedlings, orange groves would yield no income
until trees began to bear fruit, which took at least five years. “The length
of time between the season of planting and that of gathering the first har-
vest is a sufficient barrier in itself to debar the masses,” Taliesen Evans
assured aspiring growers in the Overland Monthly. For Anglo would-be
The orange rush idealized life in a modest house surrounded by a grove of income-producing orange trees. This is the house and grove of Mrs. E. B. Wakeman near Western Avenue in Hollywood, ca. 1895. Courtesy of The University of Southern California Libraries. California Historical Society Collection.

growers in southern California, this seemingly formidable barrier to market entry was a blessing in disguise. The substantial start-up cost of citrus culture restricted the orange rush to prosperous participants who brought sizeable sums with them, ready to expend on arrival. Less-wealthy Anglos could settle in modest bungalows with a few token orange trees in the yard, but working-class and non-white migrants were welcome only to the extent that their presence increased the cheap labor pool and kept wages low without depressing property values—and they would have to live invisibly some distance away from their employers. Only Anglo migrants who could afford the high price of admission could share the fruits of someone else’s labor—the labor of those excluded from the growers’ lifestyle by barriers of race as well as class.58
If, as William Deverell suggests, Los Angeles is “a city constructed precisely around racial categories and racial exclusion,” then the orange rush helped to create and reinforce that pattern because it was a racially exclusive migration—both by design of those who started it and by desire of those who joined it. “The Right Kind of People” were the only kind joining the orange rush, *Land of Sunshine* assured potential Anglo migrants in 1894. “There is nothing wild and woolly in Southern California,” the same publication promised a year later. “It has filled up with educated and well-to-do people; and . . . it will continue to fill up with the same sort.” A century before the gated community would become southern California’s iconic symbol of racial exclusion, *Land of Sunshine* prophetically reassured Anglo readers: “Barbed wire would not keep out the undesirable classes, but the price of land will—$300 an acre is as tall a fence as is needed around any community.” By 1915, Edward James Wickson, professor of horticulture at the University of California, would note with approval that only “people of culture and of refined tastes” were taking up citriculture in his state. It pleased him that “the population attracted to California by fruit growing has been of an exceptionally desirable class,” meaning (for him) Anglos of substantial means. Prof. Wickson neglected to mention that southern California also had non-Anglo residents, many of whom worked in the citrus industry and whose presence in reality made possible an exclusive fantasy defined in part by their imagined absence.

Like all California rushes, orange rush reality seldom lived up to the dream. Harry Ellington Brook of the *Los Angeles Times* cautioned potential growers: “Don’t imagine that farming in Southern California is all fun—that all you have to do is sit . . . and watch things grow.” Citriculture required capital, labor, water, expertise, years of patience, and a good dose of luck to survive market gluts, pest infestations, winter freezes, summer droughts, and unpredictable shipping charges. “Frequently the grower had only his labor for his pains,” Los Angeles historian John Steven McGroarty recalled. “The middlemen and the railroads devoured his substance.” Elizabeth Ward toured the citrus belt in 1905 and somberly concluded that “the vast majority” of aspiring growers were “doomed to weary disappointment.” “In all too many cases,” mourned C. C. Teague, long-time president of the CFGE, “the hopes and dreams of those who thus trustfully purchased citrus ranches ended in sad disillusionment and tragic failure.” Of course, for orange-rush promoters, the uncertainty of citriculture in reality mattered less than its attractiveness in fantasy. They were
selling a dream, not a fact; once a midwestern migrant bought his orange
grove, success or failure was his own affair. Citriculture historian Douglas
Sackman writes that “the Orange Empire filled its coffers by selling the
fruits of the earth,” but the first coffers to be filled, let it be remembered,
were those belonging to vendors of the earth itself.62

For many orange-rush migrants, the vicissitudes of citriculture may
have been beside the point. Theodore Van Dyke, who witnessed all three
southern California rushes, guessed that even a meager income from
growing oranges was enough to satisfy midwestern refugees “weary of bad
weather” and “determined to have pleasant homes” in a more hospitable
clime. “If at the same time a place could be made profitable as well as
handsome, so much the better.” It seemed to him that a great many south-
ern California growers dabbled in the orange business “merely for plea-
sure, and with no expectation that it would repay the outlay.” Sunset
magazine concurred that the typical Anglo grower expected only “a home
in the warm sun” and little more. “Whether his income be five hundred
or fifty thousand a year, it will go farther, produce more joy, health and
comfort in southern California . . . than in the regions where the cyclone
steps on the blizzard’s chillblained heel.”63 These cheery accounts glossed
over countless individual failures and disappointments, but, still, no
grower’s balance sheet could quantify the intangibles of climate and
lifestyle that surely were part of the bargain. “Sentiment as well as profit
enters into the promulgation of the citrus industry,” Guinn surmised after
watching many growers persist despite setbacks. A successful farmer or
businessman from the Midwest who sold out at a good price could “afford
to toy with an orange grove . . . as a plaything, as a diversion.” Carr under-
stood the bucolic appeal of citriculture, however profitless, for Iowa
refugees like himself: “After a life of getting up at dawn on blizzard morn-
ings to slop the pigs and claw down hay for the freezing animals, an orange
grove was a romantic dream.” For some of the Anglo migrants who joined
the orange rush, then, just living in southern California was at least partly
its own reward.64

IV

The orange rush would complete the transformation of California from a
Mexican province into an American state. It attracted more Anglos than
any previous migration and it channeled them into the southern half of
the state in large numbers for the first time. The population of Los Angeles County exploded from 33,000 in 1880 to over 900,000 in 1920, with the bulk of that growth due to domestic in-migration, chiefly from the Midwest. Census records show, for example, that residents of Los Angeles County born in the states of Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Iowa, and Illinois numbered barely 3,000 in 1880 but over 107,000 in 1920. By that time, more native-born midwesterners lived in Los Angeles than in any other city west of the Missouri River. Of course, Anglos were not the only Angelenos, and bigger and more diverse migrations lay ahead; but for the time being, the sheer mass of their collective presence began making their individual dreams of an Anglo Eden come true.65

Los Angeles boosters were keenly aware that the gold rush had turned San Francisco into a crowded, immigrant-filled, ethnically diverse, conventionally urban city. They wished for their “reluctant metropolis” to follow a different trajectory—and they recruited orange-rush migrants as willing accomplices to that end. Even before they arrived, Anglos moving to southern California shared the boosters’ preference for social homogeneity spread thinly across a green, blossoming landscape stitched together by streetcars.66 If not all the newcomers could actually grow fruit for a living, they could still immerse themselves in what Merry Ovnick calls “a purposely created Garden of Eden” or what Douglas Sackman calls “a garden of worldly delights,” meaning a vast undifferentiated sprawl of detached single-family homes where flower beds, grassy lawns, and one or two orange trees sprouted and where restrictive covenants kept out non-white residents. “Seeking to protect themselves from contact with allegedly inferior cultures,” historian John Laslett observes, “the white Midwesterners moved away from downtown . . . setting up geographical barriers between themselves and all people of color.” The aggregated desires of these orange-rush migrants converged to create a “bourgeois utopia” dispersed into racially segregated enclaves.67

In 1911, observing the orange rush from afar in Berkeley, president Benjamin Ide Wheeler of the University of California thought he detected signs of historical continuity. “California had begun with the gold quest in the mountains,” he reflected, “then it descended into the plain for agriculture and fruit-raisin.” But southern California’s new Anglo majority preferred to construct their own historical identity separate and distinct from northern California’s gold seekers. Speaking for midwestern refugees
like himself, Los Angeles booster Charles Fletcher Lummis dismissed the relevance of the gold rush for his adopted city. Anglo Californians of the north might consider themselves descendants of the Argonauts, but Anglo Californians of the south did not. These new arrivals hailed from the rural and small-town Midwest, not from the urban East or foreign lands; they rode west in railroad cars, not in sailing ships or covered wagons; they lived in flower-bedecked houses, not in rude canvas tents; they came as families, not as men alone; they worshipped God, not Mammon; and, Lummis wrote with pride, “instead of gophering for gold, they planted gold.” Lummis liked to brag that the Anglo rush into Los Angeles was “an immigration to which the gold rush of ’49 and ’50 was not a circumstance,” and, numerically speaking, he was right.68

The striking culture contrast between the two separate “States of California,” north and south, is well known and often remarked upon. Geographer Joel Garreau has even designated California as “two separate nations” with San Francisco and Los Angeles as rival capitals like London and Paris. But the migratory origins of the state’s famously split personality get overlooked on occasions like the sesquicentennial, which focused attention on the gold rush to the exclusion of other migrations. Yet the gold rush was an exclusively northern California event, and hence it does not hold equal “foundational” significance for all Californians. “Historians of California have to pay attention to all the individuals who lived in this state,” western historian Patricia Nelson Limerick has cautioned. Her plea was for racial inclusion but it should apply to regions as well. For southern Californians, the health rush, the land rush, and the orange rush were no less “foundational” than the gold rush was for northern California. These later migrations seldom receive equal consideration, but surely they deserve a place alongside the gold rush in the Golden State’s pantheon of founding events.69
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