プロジェクト報告

The Influence of International Relations on Discriminatory Public Policy in the United States

Andrew L. Aoki
Augsburg University

INTRODUCTION

This article is a study in the boundaries that have defined and separated racial groups in the United States. While many other scholars have examined this, few have looked at the influence of international factors. My specific focus is on how concerns over foreign relations shaped policies that affected Asians and Asian Americans.

Boundaries have powerful effects on life chances. Boundaries can exclude some populations from major life opportunities, while favoring others. One part of American racial politics has been the struggle over where and how to draw the boundary lines.

In this paper, I discuss two ways that international relations influenced the creation of boundary lines drawn when passing immigration policy. First, international relations directly influenced specific provisions that were included or excluded from immigration measures. Second, the international system shaped the racial categories that were used in policy making. Defining categories is critical in public policy, since it helps determine who is and who is not affected by a given policy.

Groups and Boundaries

For decades, scholars have been studying the boundaries that can define groups. Fredrik Barth was the first to point out that ethnic groups are defined more by the boundaries that separate them from others than by the characteristics that group

members have in common (Barth 1969). Cultural characteristics can change, but the group will persist as long as the boundary persists.

This can be seen with American racial groups. The dominant racial group has changed members and cultural characteristics, but the group has maintained the same "white" identity. In the late 19th century, people from eastern or southern Europe were not considered to be in the dominant racial group, and some even doubted that they were white (e.g., Ignatiev 1995; Jacobson 1998; Roediger 2007). Today, though, Americans of southern and eastern European ancestry are universally assumed to be in the dominant white racial group. The cultural characteristics of whiteness have shifted to include a wider range of people, expanding the boundary lines, in a sense, but there continues to be a powerful boundary separating white from non-white (especially white from black).

Boundaries can contribute to advantage and disadvantage. As Dina Okamoto points out, "Ethnic boundaries . . . are associated with patterns of exclusion, inequality, and discrimination" (2014, 6). The same can be said for racial group boundaries.

In the United States, cultural boundaries define who is black, helping to perpetuate inequality and discrimination. The boundaries defy logic. If a baby is born to a white mother and black father, that baby will be considered black. But, if a baby is born to a black mother and a white father, that baby will not be considered to be white, but will still be considered to be black. But, regardless of their illogical nature, these boundaries continue to play a powerful role in influencing life chances, putting those categorized as black at a tremendous disadvantage.

Racial Categories in America Today

For the last four decades, the United States Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has set a minimum number of ethnic and racial categories to be used when government agencies collect data on racial groups, with a minimum of five groups specified as of 2017 (see Table 1). Agencies are allowed to use more categories, but, in practice, they usually use the minimum.

Table 1 : OMB Minimum Racial Categories

African American or Black
American Indian and Alaska Native
Asian
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander
White

SOURCE : Office of Management and Budget, http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg_1997standards.

A possible sixth category, "Hispanic," is defined by the OMB as an ethnic and not a racial category. Therefore, those who identify as Hispanic can place themselves in any racial category. Because this classification system is used almost everywhere in the U.S., most Americans think only of these categories when they think of race.

FLEXIBLE AND RIGID NOTIONS OF RACE

However, the word "race" was long used in another, much more flexible way in the United States. For many decades, the word could be used as a synonym for the word "group." Any collection of people who had a common characteristic could be referred to as a race : people who shared a common occupation, such as bankers, could be referred to as a race. Nationality groups could also be referred to as races, so one might speak of the English race or the Chinese race.

At the same time, "race" was also defined in the more rigid way that the OMB uses the term, referring only to what could be called color-coded race. This more rigid definition emphasized physical features such as skin color, although the OMB tried to base its categories on geography. This more rigid definition was initially developed around the claim that color-based racial differences were deeper and more fundamental than the differences between other types of groups. This idea of race was developed by those who wanted to justify enslaving Africans (Bennett 1975, chs. 1-2 ; Handlin and Handlin 1950 ; Morgan 1975). Even in colonial times, European norms could not easily justify arbitrarily putting other human beings into slavery, so a new idea was developed, claiming that some humans were so fundamentally different that they would benefit from being enslaved.

The more flexible concept of race allowed room for different races to have important characteristics in common. The interaction of different races at the most intimate levels was unlikely to raise concerns, when race was thought of in the more

flexible way. However, color-based racial groups were once thought of as so genetically and culturally different that they could not or should not mix.

This rigid racial classification system began with two racial categories：black and white. Over time, as the indigenous peoples of the Americas were overrun by Europeans, the native peoples came to be seen as a third racial category, and so the rigid racial classification system expanded to three groups：black, white, and red（red referring to the native peoples, who were also called American Indians or just "Indians"）.

For a long time, Americans used *both* the rigid definition and the flexible definition of race. As a result, Americans sometimes spoke of the black and white races, but at other times spoke of an Chinese or Italian or Mexican race. The variation in the way the word was used was unlikely to matter in everyday conversations, but could make an important difference in public policy, where legislation had to clarify which people were affected by a bill.

AMERICAN RACIAL CATEGORIES AND ASIANS

Immigration helped to show this lack of clarity about what the word race meant in America. Because of the fuzzy ideas about race, it was unclear where Asian immigrants fit in the racial order（Haney Lopez 1996）, and the different definitions of the word made things more confusing.

One frequent question was whether Asians were one race or many? The logic of the rigid black-white-red racial scheme would suggest that Asian immigrants should be classified as a single race, or, at most, as two races. However, the more flexible language of race could divide Asians into many races：the Chinese race, the Japanese race, the Korean race, and so on.

In his study of World War II—era immigration actions, Neil Gotanda（1996）observed that Asians were sometimes "treated as a single racial entity . . . akin to black and white racial categories," but "[a]t other times, the different Asian groupings were treated as ethnic groupings," but ethnic groupings that differed from European ones（Gotanda 1996, 311）.

My research finds this as well. Some members of Congress tried to treat Asians as a single racial group. Other members, often influenced by foreign policy concerns,

drew distinctions between different Asian populations, placing them in different racial groups.

Immigration Restriction and Foreign Policy

This uncertainty over classifying Asian immigrants took place as debates grew over *restricting* Asian immigrants. Large-scale Asian immigration to the United States began in the latter half of the 19th century, a time when the American national government passed a series of increasingly restrictive immigration laws. Asian immigrants were usually among those targeted for restrictions.

At the same time, though, U.S. international ambitions were growing. As the American economy became increasingly globalized, the treatment and depiction of immigrants became an issue of concern for American foreign as well as domestic policy.

A growing body of scholarship has shown how American domestic policy has been influenced by foreign policy concerns. Foreign policy concerns were an important influence on federal government responses to the civil rights movement (Borstelmann 2001; Dudziak 2000), and shaped policies in areas such as housing as well (Brooks 2009, 2015; Cheng 2013). My research finds that foreign policy considerations restrained some of the dominant preferences regarding Asian immigration.

Early Asian Immigration Policy : A Brief Overview

This paper looks at debates over three immigration bills in the first half of the 20th century. A fourth bill, passed in the 19th century, serves as an important backdrop.

Major immigration restriction in the United States started with the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882. As Asian immigration began to grow, Americans disagreed greatly about the desirability of Asian immigrants[1]. When the numbers of migrants

1) There has been lively debate among scholars over the degree to which national organized labor groups joined the anti-Chinese movement. Some, such as Alexander Saxton (1971) argue that workers nationwide were a significant part of the anti-Asian movement, while others, such as Andrew Gyory (1998), assert that workers beyond California had little concern over Asian immigrants, and that opportunistic politicians fueled much of the anti-Chinese

was small, they attracted relatively little attention, but, as their numbers increased, opposition increased as well. Periods of economic problems helped to build more opposition to Chinese immigration. In 1882, the United States Congress passed a measure that became known as the Chinese Exclusion Act, which banned the immigration of Chinese laborers for ten years. The act was renewed a decade later, and, a few years after that, was extended indefinitely.

This exclusion act greatly reduced immigration from China, but those seeking more immigrant labor turned to other Asian countries, most notably Japan. Japanese immigration also began to be met with strong opposition, but the key restriction on Japanese immmigration was produced not by legislation but through high-level discussions between the United States and Japan, leading to what became known as the "Gentlemen's Agreement." This pact, primarily negotiated in the winter of 1906–1907, led to Japan agreeing to prohibit the immigration of laborers, while the United States agreed to continue to admit other Japanese immigrants, such as students, scholars, and religious figures. The agreement still required Congress to pass some enabling legislation, however, and so members of Congress had an opportunity to debate the agreement in early 1907. With the implementation of the Gentlemen's Agreement (and the earlier passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act), Asian immigration was greatly reduced, although there were still significant numbers coming from other countries.

The Immigration Act of 1917 ended most of the remainder of Asian immigration. That law is also known as the Barred Zone Act, because it cut off Asian immigration by defining a zone—which covered much of Asia—and then barred immigration from that zone. These three measures—the Chinese Exclusion Act, the Gentlemen's Agreement, and the Barred Zone Act—created most of the limits on Asian immigration during that period, although some other major pieces of legislation also addressed immigration from Asia.

World War II saw a significant shift in American immigration policy. Although opposition to Asian immigration remained high, military and strategic concerns led to a push to repeal Chinese exclusion, and, in 1943, the Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed, with a tiny quota of about 105 people per year granted to Chinese who

movement outside of California.

wished to immigrate to the United States[2]. The act—which was often referred to as the "Chinese repealer" —marked an important symbolic turning point in American immigration policy toward Asia, although the most consequential change did not come until two decades later, in 1965.

DATA AND METHODS

My research focuses on the debates over the Gentlemen's Agreement in 1907, the Barred Zone Act in 1917, and the Chinese repealer in 1943. My data are the debates recorded in the *Congressional Record*, the official journal of the United States Congress.

I focus on the *Congressional Record* because I am interested in public pronouncements of members of Congress. There is always the possibility that members of Congress have personal views different than those expressed in public debate, but my interest is in the ways that Asians and Asian immigrants were depicted publicly. The *Congressional Record* is a particularly good source for this, because members of Congress have considerable control over its contents. With permission, they can add extended remarks that aren't actually spoken on the floor, and can also edit remarks before they're published. Given that, it is reasonable to assume that remarks in the *Congressional Record* are ones that members of Congress are willing to express to the public.

FOREIGN POLICY AND ASIAN IMMIGRATION

There is little question that foreign policy concerns explicitly influenced debates regarding immigration from Asian countries. In addition, though, the international context shaped the way that groups were categorized, a less-obvious effect that continues to this day. I first describe the explicit effects of foreign policy, then turn to the less obvious effects on the ways that racial groups were categorized.

2) This very brief overview omits two other important developments, the creation of national and racial quotas in immigration acts in the 1920s, and the act that granted independence to the Philippines but also greatly reduced immigration once independence was granted. I do not review those here because neither plays a role in my analysis.

Explicit Influences of Foreign Policy

The Gentlemen's Agreement was triggered by a 1906 effort by San Francisco school officials to segregate Japanese schoolchildren, requiring them to attend the schools that had been designated for the Chinese. The Japanese government expressed deep offense at this implication that the Japanese were inferior, and President Theodore Roosevelt's administration moved aggressively to find a resolution to the controversy. China had also complained about the treatment of its expatriates, but China's international status was very different than Japan's. Japan's recent defeat of Russia had established it as a powerful Asian nation, and American interests in Japan were much more substantial than they were in China (Kurashige 2016, 88). Furthermore, the United States had recently acquired the Philippines, and many policymakers were interested in using that as a base from which to expand American involvement in the rest of Asia (Miller 1982, ch. 2). Developing hostile relations with Japan would not be conducive to America's ambitions in the east. While it likely also helped that Theodore Roosevelt held some positive views towards the Japanese, there was little question that U.S. international interests were best served by maintaining friendly relations.

Roosevelt's administration negotiated an agreement with the key parties. San Francisco officials agreed to not segregate Japanese schoolchildren, Japan agreed to stop emigration of laborers, and the U.S. agreed to allow Japanese already in America to bring back spouses. Some aspects of the agreement needed congressional approval, however, and so those elements were attached to an immigration bill that happened to already be moving through Congress that winter. The addition of these new provisions triggered intense debate in Congress in early 1907.

During the congressional debate, the influence of foreign policy concerns was clear. The bill included a passage specifically designed to help stop Japanese immigration, but the drafters took great care to avoid any explicit mention of Japan, so as to avoid giving offense. A key supporter, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge (R-Massachussetts) told the Senate

> . . . dismiss the idea that this is a clause about the Japanese. No nation's name is mentioned in the statute, except in the repealing clause, which excepts from repeal the Chinese-exclusion statute.(41 Cong. Rec. 3092 1907)

Lodge also said that

> It is a matter of such grave consequence in preserving the peace between this nation and Japan, and our interests in the Orient are such that every possible effort ought to be made within the bounds of reason and by the power of Congress to effect satisfactorily an adjustment and disposition of these differences.(41 Cong. Rec. 3092 1907)

The power of this argument is highlighted by the intensity of the opposition. Many (if not most) members of Congress were strongly opposed to Japanese immigration. While some claimed great respect for the Japanese, others were not even concerned about the sensitivities of Japan. Senator Thomas Patterson (D-Colorado) warned of a "Mongolian invasion," and declared that "The Japanese question has already become a burning one in Colorado" (41 Cong. Rec. 3097 1907). Senator Edward Carmack (D-Tennessee) condemned the Roosevelt administration for its "harsh and turbulent and offensive" attitude toward Californians who wished to discriminate against the Japanese (41 Cong. Rec. 3098 1907). These members of Congress strongly supported the desire of San Francisco officials to segregate Japanese schoolchildren, and there were probably very few members of Congress who opposed segregation in principle.

Harsh opposition could also be found in the House of Representatives. One example came from Edwin Webb, a Democratic representative from North Carolina, who declared his support for "The people of California [who] are terribly in earnest and are determined to fight to the bitter end any effort to force orientals into their white public schools" (41 Cong. Rec. 3134 1907). Webb added that "I come from a section of this Republic where the conviction is innate that the Caucasian race is superior to the Mongolian as well as to the African—in fact, superior to all other races" (41 Cong. Rec. 3134).

The racist opposition was hardly surprising. What is notable is that foreign policy concerns restrained some of that opposition, and a majority of both houses agreed to legislative language crafted to avoid offending Japanese sensitivities.

The could be seen even more a decade later, in 1917, when support for immigration restriction had gotten stronger. The Barred Zone Act (Immigration Act of 1917) greatly expanded the grounds for limiting immigration, moving beyond simply blocking groups from certain countries to enacting broader-based limits, most notably a literacy test that would prevent immigration by those with little or no education. It also expanded limits on Asian immigration to exclude almost all immigration from

that region (Helwig 1995).

Because Chinese and Japanese immigration was covered by previous immigration restrictions, there was no need for the Barred Zone Act to address those nations. Nevertheless, some members of Congress pushed hard anyway for language that would clearly name the Chinese and Japanese. They succeeded in adding language that stated that the law would not "repeal, alter, or amend existing laws relating to the immigration or exclusion of Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent" (Public Law 301, 39 Stat. 897 [1917]), but, they were less successful in getting language that explicitly referred to Japan.

The influence of foreign policy over prejudices is perhaps most starkly reflected in the comments of Henry Cabot Lodge, who was still representing Massachusetts in the Senate in 1917. Lodge declared his strong opposition to Asian immigration, but nevertheless wished to avoid unnecessarily offending the Japanese government. In an exchange with a senator who wanted to name Japanese explicitly as one of the groups to be banned, Lodge responded

> I am just as much opposed to the character of immigration as the Senator is opposing—Chinese, Japanese, and other kinds . . . I have sought to restrict it for 25 years; I have always stood for restriction . . . but I want to say plainly that I think it would be a great mistake if Congress gives wanton and needless offense to a friendly nation and at the same time gains absolutely nothing in the way of exclusion. (54 Cong. Rec. 222 1916)

Reflecting concern over Japanese objections, the original language of the bill was changed after Japan complained. One of the House bill managers, E.A. Hayes (R-California), explained that

> ". . . we were advised that the Japanese people thought that that language was intended to affect them only; and therefore the conferees put in a provision that was very general . . . in order that no nation may have any just cause for offense. (54 Cong. Rec. 1492 1917)

The other House bill manager, John Burnett (D-Alabama), also emphasized that changes were made "in order that we might remove the idea of any purpose to intentionally insult the Japanese Government" (54 Cong. Rec. 1495 1917).

The influence of foreign affairs on immigration policy could also be seen twenty-five years later, during World War II. As the United States became fully involved in

the war, there were growing calls to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, since China was now an ally in the war against Germany and Japan. Strong anti-Asian prejudices continued to be widespread in Congress, but, given the powerful foreign policy concerns of the time, even those favoring continued discrimination sought to justify their arguments by appealing to international concerns.

Both sides agreed that the United States was locked in a battle for Asian opinion, with Japan seeking to build pan-Asian support by emphasizing American discrimination. Supporters of the repeal effort (often known as the "Chinese Repealer") argued that repeal would help undermine the Japanese argument, while opponents warned that repeal might help strengthen the Japanese effort[3].

Interestingly, supporters of repeal also warned that failure to respect China could help set the stage for a race war where the United States might do poorly. Walter Judd (R-Minnesota), a House member with experience in China, told his colleagues bluntly that

> . . . this is not a war between races, and will not become one unless we make it so. If it were, China would be fighting with Japan against us, not with us against Japan. . . . There cannot be a great war between the white and colored races in the next 10 years, or the next 100 years, or the next 300 years, if we keep ourselves—the white people—and the Chinese, the largest and strongest of the colored peoples, on the same side. (89 Cong. Rec. 8633 1943)

Repeal supporters also frequently warned that Chinese exclusion aided Japan's propaganda campaign. For example, Representative Ed Gossett (D-Texas) argued for repeal by noting that

> It is a notorious fact that for many years the Japanese have been carrying on a propaganda campaign seeking to aline [sic] the entire oriental world behind Japanese leadership, seeking to set the oriental world against the occidental world. They have called it a campaign of Asia for Asiatics. . . Therefore, reason number one for this bill is . . . to blast their campaign of

3) Pro-Japanese groups outside of government had warned of offending Japan prior to the war, although those groups had a different focus, seeking to bolster liberal politicians in Japan and warning that the increasingly assertive Japanese posture in Asia was "the inevitable and necessary response to Western militarism" (quoted in Blankenship 2016, 9).

> Asia for Asiatics . . .(89 Cong. Rec. 8581 1943)

Notably, few repeal supporters claimed that it would have any significant impact on American society. They often stressed that the end of the ban would be followed by the imposition of a quota where only about 105 Chinese immigrants a year would be allowed.

Still, those seeking to maintain racist walls were fearful that even this symbolic act could chip away at the racial inequality they supported so strongly, and they too cited international consequences to support their position. Several repeal opponents asserted that repeal of Chinese exclusion would allow the Japanese to appeal to Filipinos, because the latter would then be treated worse than the Chinese. William P. Elmer (R-Missouri) warned the House that "To elevate China now above the other Asiatics is a discrimination against them and lays the foundation for future disputes with them" (89 Cong. Rec. 8593 1943). Elmer was more open than most opponents about his distaste for the Chinese, complaining "When did the Chinese devils become Chinese saints?" (89 Cong. Rec. 8593 1943), but most repealer foes tried to position themselves as motivated by fairness and concern for the international consequences, rather than driven by racial motives. Representative Bertrand W. Gearhart (R-California) asked

> If Japan is able to make propaganda out of the fact that we exclude the Chinese, what is Japan going to do to us in the Philippines when we admit Chinese and continue to exclude Filipinos? (89 Cong. Rec. 8589 1943)

The arguments made little sense, saying, in essence, that the United States would have more allies if it discriminated against more countries than if it discriminated against fewer. The resort to such an illogical argument was the result of even repeal opponents finding it necessary to appeal to international considerations to try to justify their position.

But, although racial prejudices were still strong in many members of Congress, the influence of foreign affairs seemed even stronger, and Congress voted to repeal the ban on the immigration of Chinese laborers.

CATEGORIZING RACIAL GROUPS—BY NATION OR REGION

The international context also shaped the way that races were categorized. While

others have described the way that international concerns have directly influenced policies that affect marginalized groups (e.g. Borstelmann 2001; Daniels 1988; Dudziak 2000), there has been little scholarship on this effect of foreign affairs. In ways so obvious that they have escaped notice, the international order forced members of Congress to focus on nations, weakening the efforts of those who wished to define racial categories in broader geographic terms. Defining races in broader terms would likely have made discriminatory policy easier. Defining it in narrower terms—i.e., focusing on individual nations—created much more work for those who wanted to discriminate, since the discrimination might have to be enacted for each nation, rather than for an entire world region, and it opened the door to different treatment for citizens of different nations.

While it might seem that there was no alternative to categorizing by nation, there is one important subpopulation that was racially categorized by world region rather than nation: individuals of African ancestry. Unlike all other groups, people of African ancestry were subject to discriminatory rules that applied to everyone from a broad geographic area that spanned many modern nation-states.

Defining the black race by an entire world region lumped together many different ethnic groups, making no distinctions between them[4]. In fact, there was considerable ethnic diversity among early African immigrants. However, the color line that developed in America ignored these differences. The racial boundary was drawn so that everyone with ancestry in the sub-Saharan African region of the world was defined as being part of the same racial group.

This was very different from the way that European immigrants were defined when they came to the United States. Those immigrants were usually categorized by

4) Over time, Americans of African-ancestry appear to have developed a powerful common identity, probably because they were all the target of extensive discriminatory laws and norms. With this sense of common identity, plus the commonalities created by racial segregation, cultural patterns developed to the extent where the population could be defined as both an ethnic group and a racial one (Cornell and Hartman 2004, 29). This also helped to produce a striking level of political agreement across other typical lines of division (Dawson 1994).

The surge of immigration to the United States in recent decades has the potential to reverse this. If it did, it could hold enormously important consequences for American politics and society. Addressing those issues is far beyond the scope of this paper, however.

nationality or smaller grouping：e.g., Irish, Germans, Poles, or southern Italians[5]. Some of those European nationalities were the target of considerable discrimination, but there was never strong discrimination toward everyone of European ancestry.

This indigenous peoples of the Americas were also initially categorized by nation. Europeans quickly learned that there were many different native nations, and Europeans needed to pay close attention to those distinctions, because one might be an ally while another might be an enemy. Over time, the panethnic terms "American Indian" or "Native American" became widely used, but even today native peoples often still identify by their national or tribal affiliation, such as Dakota, Apache, or Cherokee. In addition, legal relations with native nations continue to highlight the differences between them, since different tribes have different legal agreements with the United States national government.

Immigrants from Asia were also usually identified by national group, rather than only by world region. This helped to create policies where discrimination varied by national origin. The discrimination against the Chinese differed from the discrimination against the Japanese, and the discriminatory policy toward Asian Indians was different than that toward either the Chinese or Japanese.

While it might seem unavoidable that these policies focused on individual nations, in fact there was disagreement over whether to discriminate by nation or by world region. The choice to focus on specific nations wasn't the result of any careful deliberations, but was driven by the reality of the international order. By the time of large-scale Asian immigration, nation states had come to be the dominant actors in international affairs. As a consequence, the political identity of most people corresponded to their nation of birth, and American policy makers often had to consider that political identity[6].

Not everyone welcomed this approach. Those most committed to racist ideas

5) These nationality groups were often referred to as races, reflecting the more flexible use of the term "race," where racial differences were not considered to be as fundamental.

6) There were complications, though, as the late-19th and early-20th century was an era of multinational empires, so policy makers sought to distinguish national origin from political authority (Perlmann 2001). Many African nations, for instance, were under the political control of European powers, but the black residents of those nations were not viewed as the same as the white residents of European countries.

pushed for discriminatory policies that would categorize Asian immigrants by world region, not by nation. For example, Representative John Williams (D-Mississippi), who represented an area with some of the strongest discriminatory practices toward Blacks, strongly supported racial discrimination and the supremacy of white people. When arguing for white supremacy, Williams viewed people by world region rather than by nation. In the debate over the Gentlemen's Agreement, Williams said

> I am with the Californians . . . upon the subject of the protection of the white labor of the United States against either *African or oriental* imported competition.(41 Cong. Rec. 3222 1907, emphasis added)

Williams referred specifically to the Japanese at times, but his goal of promoting white supremacy was more effectively communicated by lumping Asians together, sometimes done by referring to them as "orientals." He might see some distinctions between Japanese and Chinese, for instance, but he saw both as nonwhite, and his overriding goal was to retain policies which favored whites and discriminated against and excluded nonwhites to the greatest extent possible.

When referring to Asian immigrants, members of Congress who were most in favor of exclusion sought to lump together Asian nationalities as much as possible, and to remove differential treatment that might be somewhat favorable to some groups, such as the Japanese[7]. Senator Harry Lane, a Democrat from Oregon, offered a good example of this in the debate over the Barred Zone Act. Lane offered praise for the Chinese, Japanese, and "Hindus[8]," but declared that "our racial differences were . . . irreconcilable" and opposed policies that drew distinctions between Asian nations:

> . . . I would not pass my favors out to portions of Asia and discriminate against other portions of Asia. I would have the courage to say that we do not believe that they would appropriately amalgamate with our people;that assimilation is impossible.(54 Cong. Rec. 269)

---

7) Mae Ngai (2005)has developed this distinction in much more detail. However, I believe she fails to note the degree of complexity of Asian racialization. She argues that Asians were racialized in what I have called panethnic terms, but her argument doesn't fully consider the ways in which Asians were racialized at the national level, similar to European groups.

8) Many Americans referred to immigrants from India as "Hindus," despite the fact that many of those immigrants were of the Sikh, not Hindu faith.

While claiming to admire much about the Chinese, "Hindus," and Japanese, Lane made it clear that he lumped them all together in their unacceptability.

This lumping is perhaps most notable in the debate over the 1943 Chinese repealer. Of the three cases I examine, this one saw the most vigorous efforts to distinguish Asian groups, especially by supporters of repeal, who frequently referred explicitly to the Chinese and Japanese, stressing the need to keep the former from being drawn to the pan-Asian appeals of the latter.

In contrast, opponents of repeal strove to categorize Chinese by world region, even as they went out of their way to praise them. One of the best examples of this came from Representative John Robison, a repeal opponent from Kentucky (D):

> This bill will permit a certain number of Chinese to come in every year and in due course become American citizens . . . This changes our entire immigration laws as to approximately 1,000,000,000 people residing in the continent of Asia. If this measure becomes law then it is the first time we will have granted a quota . . . to . . . people from the continent of Asia. (89 Cong. Rec. 8577 1943)

Note how Robison started with a reference to the Chinese, but then shifts to discussing "people from the continent of Asia," thereby placing them in the larger category, rather than focusing on them by nationality. He knew that it would be difficult to oppose favorable policies toward the Chinese, since they were a key ally at the time, so he tried to lump them in with all Asians, hoping that most members of Congress would see Asians in general as more undesirable.

In each case, though, foreign policy concerns powerfully influenced the terms used in the debate, pushing members to focus on specific countries. It was virtually impossible for Congress to avoid referring specifically to Japan and China, regardless of how hard some members tried to shift the focus to the entire Asian region. Even in the consideration of the Immigration Act of 1917, when there was widespread support for preventing most immigration from Asia, the debate continued to address specific countries. Could Japan be trusted? How would China be affected? Efforts to racialize by world region were sometimes successful, but foreign policy concerns made it much harder. The focus on individual nations limited the scope of discriminatory policies, sometimes leading to more favorable treatment for residents of certain nations, as was the case for the Japanese in the first few decades of the

20th century, and then for the Chinese during World War II (while the fortunes of Japanese Americans became much worse).

FOREIGN RELATIONS AND PUBLIC POLICY TODAY

It is clear that foreign policy concerns sometimes had a powerful effect on the shaping of discriminatory policies toward Asians in the past. Today, foreign policy continue to have a powerful effect on American domestic policy, although there have been significant changes, of course.

In the late 19th and early 20th century, most forms of racial discrimination were widely accepted in America. Given that, it was more efficient to discriminate against large categories of people, rather than individual national groups.

International considerations made that more difficult, however. American national interest sometimes led to more moderate treatment for immigrants from some nations.

After World War II, it became much harder in the United States to justify discrimination against people from a world region tht spans a continent, or close to a continent. Foreign policy continued to shape the treatment of specific groups, however. For example, migrants fleeing countries that had hostile relations with the United States would sometimes receive a warmer welcome than those fleeing countries that had the strong support of the United States. The most notable case is probably Cuba, where unauthorized Cuban immigrants were long given far more favorable treatment than unauthorized migrants from other nations (Rusin, Zong, and Batalova 2015).

In addition, it is possible to draw on foreign policy concerns to justify discriminatory treatment against smaller regions. It would be very hard to claim that a threat spans an entire continent (with the possible exception of Australia, perhaps), but policy makers could argue that threats span several nations within a smaller region. Discrimination against residents of several Middle Eastern nations has been justified on those grounds.

However, arguments for discrimination that go beyond those geographic ones may

be more difficult to defend[9]. In 2017, the Trump administration tried create a travel ban on residents of several Muslim-majority countries[10]. As a candidate, Trump had openly called for restricting Muslim immigration, and others associated with him had reiterated that[11]. Given the changes in American norms and the development of case law, it is not surprising that this broad-based ban was been blocked by the courts, in part because it was seen as religious discrimination, which is difficult to defend in the U.S. Notably, the Trump administration denied discriminating on religious grounds, and argued that the policy was a case of discrimination only against certain nations, but Trump's own words led the courts to consider it a broader type of discrimination[12].

Trump's efforts also illustrate the continued clash between some domestic preferences in the United States and foreign policy concerns. Many American foreign policy experts criticized Trump's attack on Muslims in general, noting how harmful it was to American interests to alienate such a huge population of people. However, Trump's broad attacks on Muslims probably had domestic appeal, though, helping him attract support from the segment of American voters prejudiced against all Muslims (Sides 2017), just as some members of Congress in the early 20th century found it politically beneficial to advocate for the toughest possible language against

9) My focus here is on legal discrimination, not interpersonal discrimination. Individuals can discrimination for a wide range of reasons, but governments are more constrained.

10) After the first effort was blocked by the courts, the Trump administration came up with a second version of its travel ban, which was also stayed by the courts. The bans are very similar, but the second tried to address some legal issues by reducing the number of people who would be affected, most notably by exempting lawful permanent residents and existing visa holders from the ban. For a useful quick comparison of the two versions, see Soffen and Cameron (2017). For a brief review of Trump's statements about Muslims, see Johnson and Hauslohner(2017).

11) Trump's effort differs greatly from that of other presidents. Many have noted the dramatic difference between President George W. Bush's comments about Muslims after 9/11 (e.g., Bridgeland 2016)and President Trump's push for a Muslim ban. Examples of Bush's vastly more nuanced approach can be found in his remarks at an Islamic center only days after 9/11 (Bush 2001a)or to a joint session of Congress, a little over a week after 9/11 (Bush 2001b).

12) In June 2017, the U.S. Supreme Court temporarily revived some of the travel ban, but required that it be applied more narrowly. The Court will hear the full case later in the year, and issue a ruling by June 2018.

Japanese immigration.

It is clear that international affairs continue to shape the fortunes of specific groups in America today, and continue to influence some domestic policies. In public policy, as in economics and other areas, our world has become interconnected in ways that cannot be easily separated.

WORKS CITED

Barth, Fredrik.1969. "Introduction." in Fredrik Barth, ed. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Boston: Little, Brown. Pp. 9–38.

Bennett, Lerone Jr. 1975. *The Shaping of Black America*. Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company.

Blankenship, Anne. M. 2016. *Christianity, Social Justice, and the Japanese American Incarceration during World War II*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Borstelmann, Thomas. 2001. *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bridgeland, John. 2016. "Donald Trump Fails George W. Bush's Lessons from 9/11." *Time*. October 19. http://time.com/4534927/donald-trump-muslim-911/.

Brooks, Charlotte. 2009. *Alien Neighbors, Foreign Friends: Asian Americans, Housing, and the Transformation of Urban California*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 2015. *Between Mao and McCarthy: Chinese American Politics in the Cold War Years*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bush, George W. 2001a. "Remarks at the Islamic Center of Washington." *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George W. Bush (2001, Book III)*. P. 1121.

_____. 2001b. "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the United States Response to the Terrorist Attacks of September 11." *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George W. Bush (2001, Book III)*. P. 1140.

Cheng, Cindy I-Fen. 2013. *Citizens of Asian America: Democracy and Race During the Cold War*. New York: New York University Press.

Cornell, Stephen and Douglas Hartman. 2004. "Conceptual Confusions and Divides: Race, Ethnicity, and the Study of Immigration." In Nancy Foner and George M. Fredrickson, eds., *Not Just Black and White: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage. Pp. 23–41.

Daniels, Roger. 1988. *Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Dawson, Michael C. 1994. *Behind the Mule: Race and Class in African-American Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Deglar, Carl N. 1959. "Slavery and the Genesis of American Race Prejudice." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 2, no. 1 (Oct.) : 49–66.

Dudziak, Mary L. 2000. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gotanda, Neil. 1996. "Towards Repeal of Asian Exclusion: The Magnuson Act of 1943, The Act of July 2, 1946, The Presidential Proclamation of July 4, 1946, The Act of August 9, 1946, and the Act of August 1, 1950." In Hyung-Chan Kim, ed. *Asian Americans and Congress: A Documentary History*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press. Pp. 309–335.

Gyory, Andrew. 1998. *Closing the Gate：Race, Politics, and the Chinese Exclusion Act*. Chapel Hill：University of North Carolina Press.

Handlin, Oscar and Mary F. Handlin. 1950. "Origins of the Southern Labor System." *The William and Mary Quarterly*. 7, no. 2(April)：199–222.

Haney López, Ian F. 1996. *White by Law：The Legal Construction of Race*. New York：New York University Press.

Hattam, Victoria. 2007. *In the Shadow of Race：Jews, Latinos, and Immigrant Politics in the United States*. Chicago：University of Chicago Press.

Helweg, Arthur W. 1995. "The Immigration Act of 1917：The Asian Indian Exclusion Act." In Kim, Hyung-chan. Ed. 1996. *Asian Americans and Congress：A Documentary History*. Westport, CT：Greenwood Press. Pp. 153–223.

Ignatiev, Noel. 1995. *How the Irish Became White*. New York：Routledge.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. 1998. *Whiteness of a Different Color：European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge, Mass.：Harvard University Press.

Johnson, Jenna and Abigail Hauslohner. 2017. "'I Think Islam Hates Us.' A Timeline of Trump's Comments about Islam and Muslims." *Washington Post*. May 20. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2017/05/20/i-think-islam-hates-us-a-timeline-of-trumps-comments-about-islam-and-muslims/?utm_term=.b64c5c479d8b.

Kurashige, Lon. 2016. *Two Faces of Exclusion：The Untold History of Anti-Asian Racism in the United States*. Chapel Hill：University of North Carolina Press.

Logan, Rayford W. 1941. *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti：1776–1891*. Chapel Hill：University of North Carolina Press.

Miller, Stuart Creighton. 1992. "*Benevolent Assimilation*"：*The American Conquest of the Philippines, 1899–1903*. New Haven：Yale University Press.

Morgan, Edmund. 1975. *American Slavery, American Freedom*. New York：Norton.

Ngai, Mae M. 2005. *Impossible Subjects：Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, N.J.：Princeton University Press.

Okamoto, Dina. 2014. *Redefining Race：Asian American Panethnicity and Shifting Ethnic Boundaries*. New York：Russell Sage.

Perlman, Joel. 2001. "Race or People：Federal Race Classifications for Europeans in America, 1898–1913." Working Paper No. 320. http://www.levyinstitute.org/publications/race-or-people.

Plummer, Brenda Gayle. 1996. *Rising Wind：Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935–1960*. Chapel Hill：University of North Carolina Press.

Roediger, David R. 2007. *The Wages of Whiteness：Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. Rev. ed. London：Verso.

Ruslin, Sylvia, Jie Zong, and Jeanne Batalova. 2015. "Cuban Immigrants in the United States." *Migration Information Source*. April 7. http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/cuban-immigrants-united-states.

Saxton, Alexander. 1971. *The Indispensable Enemy：Labor and the Anti-Chinese Movement in California*. Berkeley：University of California Press.

Sides, John. 2017. "Race, Religion, and Immigration in 2016：How the Debate over American Identity Shaped the Election and What It Means for a Trump Presidency." Democracy Fund Voter Study Group. June. https://www.voterstudygroup.org/reports/2016-elections/race-religion-immigration-2016.

Soffen, Kim and Darla Cameron. 2017. "What Trump "Changed in the New Travel Ban." *Washington Post*. March 6. https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/trump-compare-travel-ban/?tid=a_inl.