



Finding a Path Forward

**ASIAN AMERICAN PACIFIC ISLANDER
NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS THEME STUDY**

Edited by Franklin Odo





Use of ISBN

This is the official U.S. Government edition of this publication and is herein identified to certify its authenticity. Use of 978-0-692-92584-3 is for the U.S. Government Publishing Office editions only. The Superintendent of Documents of the U.S. Government Publishing Office requests that any reprinted edition clearly be labeled a copy of the authentic work with a new ISBN.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Odo, Franklin, editor. | National Historic Landmarks Program (U.S.), issuing body. | United States. National Park Service.

Title: Finding a Path Forward, Asian American and Pacific Islander National Historic Landmarks theme study / edited by Franklin Odo.

Other titles: Asian American and Pacific Islander National Historic Landmarks theme study | National historic landmark theme study.

Description: Washington, D.C. : National Historic Landmarks Program, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 2017. | Series: A National Historic Landmarks theme study | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017045212 | ISBN 9780692925843 | ISBN 0692925848

Subjects: LCSH: National Historic Landmarks Program (U.S.) | Asian Americans--History. | Pacific Islander Americans--History. | United States--History.

Classification: LCC E184.A75 F46 2017 | DDC 973/.0495--dc23 | SUDOC I 29.117:AS 4

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017045212>

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office

Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800

Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

ISBN 978-0-692-92584-3

Essay 1



Imperialism and Migration

Gary Y. Okihiro

Center for the Study of Ethnicity and Race, Columbia University

The United States was conceived in imperialism. The origins of U.S. imperial history date back to the expansion of Europeans in their search for Asia and their wars against Asians, beginning with the ancient Greeks and continuing through Portugal and Spain's 15th century voyages of "exploration." That spread engulfed the planet in a world-system within which flowed capital, labor, and culture. The U.S. was a consequence of that world-system in its origin as an extractive colony of shareholders in London.

After gaining independence, the U.S. came to dominate that global, imperial network. The U.S. postcolonial nation-state continued Europe's thrust toward Asia across the American continent, conquering American Indian lands and peoples and territory held by Mexico. The U.S. extended its reach beyond the continent to Puerto Rico, Hawai'i, Guam, Sāmoa,

"Britannia," carrying the white flag of "Civilization," leads soldiers and colonists in an advance on an opposing dark-skinned army waving a flag labeled "Barbarism." Illustration by Udo Keppler, published in *Puck*, Dec. 10, 1902; courtesy of the Library of Congress.

and, for a time, the Philippines. In that way, all of Indian country, a substantial part of Mexico, and entire islands in the Caribbean and Pacific became U.S. territories and its peoples, U.S. subjects. Imperialism, thus, is a central feature of U.S. history.

By *imperialism*, I mean powers over peoples and, often, occupation of their lands and waters outside the borders of a nation-state.¹ Those extra-territorial influences include economic, political, and cultural impositions. Unlike most standard U.S. histories that depict imperialism as largely confined to the 19th century and as an aberration, this chapter maintains that imperialism, as discourses and material relations, is a crucial aspect of the republic's constitution. The U.S. was made in the idea and act of accumulation.

SEEKING ASIA

Asia's wealth drew Europeans to Asia. America was an accident of that ancient, imperial pursuit. Christopher Columbus, sponsored by Spain, sailed westward for Asia but instead found America in 1492. Spain retained most of the initiative in colonizing America, a continent named for a human trafficker, Amerigo Vespucci, who, like Columbus, captured and sold American Indians as plunder. Spaniards called the people "indios," or "Indians," because Columbus believed them to be natives of India. In their global expansions, the Spaniards used "indios" to designate native peoples wherever they encountered them in America, Asia, and the Pacific.

The Spaniards soon learned that their lands were not a part of Asia but a "new world," as was described by Pietro Martir de Anghiera in his 1493 account of Columbus's achievement, *De Orbe Novo* (Of the New World). Spanish conquerors captured Mexico with the aid of native allies in 1521 and Peru in 1533. From Mexico City, the representative of the Spanish crown ruled "New Spain," which covered much of the American continent and the islands of the Caribbean. Through violence, enslavement, and disease, in Mesoamerica alone, the pre-Spanish population numbered an estimated 25 million, but by 1650, it fell to 1.5 million.

Extracting gold and silver from the Earth's veins drove the Spaniards' brutal mission of expansion and conquest in America, which built a great empire. Over a 150-year period beginning in 1503, gold from Colombia alone increased the entire European supply by about 20

percent. Silver, however, was the bullion that sustained the Spanish empire, and during the period of 1503 to 1660, more than 7 million pounds of silver from America reached Spain. Besides flowing from New Spain to Spain, silver found its way from Acapulco, Mexico, to Manila in the Philippines.

The Manila galleon trade, begun in 1565, finally connected Spain with Asia. It was American silver extracted by Indians that purchased the goods so coveted by the Spaniards. In the Philippines, American silver bought Chinese silks, satins, and porcelain along with Southeast Asian spices that were transported back to New Spain and from there to Spain and Europe. The trade drew Chinese and Spanish merchants to Manila, which grew into an urban trade hub supported by the agricultural production of Filipino farmers in the rural hinterland.

In 1597, more American silver went to Manila than to Seville, Spain, and from 1570 to 1780, an estimated 4,000 to 5,000 tons of silver were delivered into Asian hands. The Manila-Acapulco galleon trade was so lucrative that merchants in Spain, whose businesses suffered at the hands of merchants in New Spain, petitioned the King to limit the number of ships to two each year. The galleon trade ended in 1815 during the Mexican War of Independence.

Asians, mainly Filipinos and Chinese, moved from Asia to America on board Spanish galleons among the stash of textiles, spices, porcelain, and furniture. Those Asians worked on board the galleons, and Spanish masters enslaved some of them for sale in New Spain until 1700. Spaniards also took Filipina concubines to America, where they produced mestizos who, along with galleon-deserting Asian seamen, blended into Mexico's Indian population. Called "indios" by their Spaniard colonizers, Asians and American Indians alike were of the subject class, and a century later, in 1810 to 1821, when Mexico rose up in rebellion against Spain, hundreds of Mexican Filipinos, including Ramon Fabie, joined the struggle for freedom as soldiers and military commanders.

As early as 1635, Spanish barbers in Mexico City expressed displeasure with their Chinese competitors. In a petition to the viceroy, they asked that he impose a limit of 12 Chinese barbers in the city and expel the rest to outside districts. Like Mexico City, the seaport of Acapulco, called "city of the Chinese," flourished and

teemed with American Indians, Chinese, Filipinos, and mestizos. From New Spain, some Filipinos and possibly Mexicans sailed into the Gulf and fished Louisiana's southeastern coast as early as 1765, before the United States declared its independence from England.

EXPLOITING LABOR

European expansions in the Atlantic, Indian, and Pacific oceans were directed at securing Asian goods even as African, American Indian, and Asian labor enabled their purchase. In the Atlantic world, the sale of enslaved Africans and Indians helped to underwrite Portuguese and Spanish expeditions, and Indian forced labor extracted gold and silver for Spain. African slaves, later joined by indentured Asians, produced the green gold of tropical plantations, mainly sugar but also tobacco and cotton. That trans-Atlantic commerce of enslaved Africans grew from 275,000 sent to Europe and America between 1451 and 1600 to over a million in the 17th century and then over 6 million in the following century. The boom in sugar and tobacco production in America's plantations accounted for that immense increase. The human traffic

was a catastrophe for those enslaved while enriching planters and merchants, and it retarded Africa's development while advancing those of Europe and the U.S.

Indentured labor, a form of bound labor, characterized Asian and Pacific Islander migration. European settlers in Mauritius in the Indian Ocean acquired indentures from India, and by the end of the 18th century South Asian migrant workers, contracted for periods of two to three years, were in most major ports throughout Southeast Asia. The end of the African slave trade at the beginning of the 19th century led to coolie-ism or a "new system of slavery," as described by the British imperial historian Hugh Tinker, devised for Asians and Pacific Islanders as replacements for enslaved Africans. South Asian indentures labored in cane fields in Fiji and South Africa; Chinese contract workers served in tropical plantations, South African mines, guano deposits along Peru's coastal islands, and industries on the U.S. west coast; Japanese contract laborers worked Hawaii's sugar plantations; and traffickers captured Melanesians and Polynesians and sold them to planters in Australia and Peru.



Laborers ready sacks of raw sugar on a Hawaiian plantation. Photo courtesy of the Library of Congress.



Chinese laborers at work on the Milloudon Sugar Plantation in Louisiana. Woodblock print by Alfred Waud; published in *Every Saturday*, July 29, 1871. Courtesy of the Library of Congress.

Labor recruiters procured Hawaiians to work in Peru, where many of them perished from diseases and unforgiving work conditions. Over a two-year period beginning in 1845, nearly 2,000 Hawaiians served on foreign ships, and by 1850 that total reached 4,000, or almost one-fifth of the Hawaiian kingdom's population of adult males. To benefit from that labor migration and limit the loss, the kingdom imposed a poll tax on foreign employers of Hawaiians who, by mid-century, were toiling on ships and on land from Tahiti and Peru to the south to the Pacific Northwest and Alaska to the north. Hawaiians served in the Mexican navy and worked on Russian holdings along the west coast. By 1830, Hawaiians comprised the majority of the crewmembers on U.S. ships on the west coast, and they were also found in the Atlantic and its port cities.

When American Indian and African slavery was abolished in Peru in 1854, planters recruited Chinese, and later, during a brief ban on Chinese indentured labor, they sent ships to capture Polynesian workers. The *Adelante*, with its barred hatches and compartments and swivel guns to sweep the deck, returned to

Callao, Peru, in 1862 with 253 Polynesian captives whose sale reaped their owners a profit of \$40,000, or a 400 percent return. Men sold for \$200 each, women \$150, and children \$100. For those ill-gotten gains, Pacific Islanders were hunted down and captured; marched to the beach in chains to waiting ships; thrust into crowded, unsanitary holds; and sold to the highest bidder in America. Many died from the raids and introduced diseases, with mortality rates ranging from 24 percent of one island's total population to 79 percent of another. Rapa Nui (Easter Island) had an estimated population of 4,126 in 1862 but lost 1,386 to labor raids and about 1,000 to disease, thus enduring a 58 percent population decrease.

British sugar planters in the Caribbean grafted their need for labor onto the empire's circuits in the Indian and Pacific oceans. In India, a British colony since about 1800, the system involved both British colonizers and South Asian accomplices. Working through local bosses or headmen, recruiters offered cash advances as enticements to recruits who frequently were in debt or trouble. The British colonizers privatized land in India to encourage agricultural production for export, and the ensuing land grab concentrated wealth and displaced peasants, making them ideal hired hands and migrant workers. Over a million South Asians served masters on tropical plantations; about half a million labored in America, where today they comprise significant proportions of the populations of Guyana, Trinidad, and Jamaica.

China, too, became a prime source for indentured labor, especially after its defeat by Britain in 1842 in the Opium War, whereby Hong Kong became British until 1997. European entrepreneurs, working through Chinese brokers in Macao, Singapore, and Penang, tapped into China's pools of labor, which were mainly Chinese but also included Vietnamese and Filipinos. Village leaders identified recruits; some signed or were deceived into signing indenture contracts, which bound them to employers for a period of years, while others received credit for their trans-Pacific passage from suppliers who

controlled their movements and the terms of employment. Reduced to commodities, this human traffic was called “pig-dealing” by the Chinese and the transaction “the buying and selling of pigs.” Nearly all of those destined for America came from Guangdong Province, clustering around the British and Portuguese enclaves of Hong Kong and Macao. About 125,000 went to Cuba; 100,000 to Peru; 18,000 to the British West Indies; and the remainder to Panama and Costa Rica, the Dutch and French West Indies, Brazil, and Chile. An estimated 46,000 Chinese indentures went to Hawai‘i, and primarily via the credit-ticket, some 200,000 made the passage to California.

“Coolies” were an invention of Europeans, beginning with the Portuguese, who used the term to refer to Asian laborers, but by the 19th century, the word specified South Asian or Chinese indentured workers bound for sugar plantations in America to replace enslaved Africans. Coolies were thereby the means to recoup the loss of labor incurred by the emancipation of slaves, but with its roots in slavery and its abuses, the specter of slavery continued to haunt the traffic. Despite hearings, investigations, and regulations by the British government, the planters exercised controls over their labor investments, and laws criminalized resistance by indentures as violations of civil contracts. Moreover, coercion was a central feature of the coolie trade, which involved kidnappings, debt-servitude, ships outfitted as prisons, and rapes, floggings, and corporal punishment.

In the 1850s, one out of six South Asians bound for the Caribbean died before making landfall, and of the first group of 396 South Asian indentures taken to British Guiana in 1838, one-fourth failed to survive the period of their five-year contract and only 60 chose to remain in the colony. The mortality for Chinese indentures on

coolie ships during the second half of the 19th century was between 12 and 30 percent, or a rate higher than the middle passage of the African slave trade. Some reached as high as 50 percent. Conditions on board the ships and the length of the crossing—three to four months from India and four to eight months from China—might have accounted for those staggering figures. While nearly all of the Chinese were men, South Asian indentures included men, women, and children; women were susceptible to rape and children to malnutrition and disease. As an example, over half of the 324 South Asian coolies from Calcutta on board the *Salsette* bound for Trinidad in 1858 died, and according to court papers, a woman on a different ship died en route after having been gang-raped by the crew.

Yuan Guan, a Chinese coolie in Cuba, testified he was kidnapped and taken to Macao in 1858. With more than a hundred others on board, the ship arrived in Havana in April 1859, and about two months later he was sold to a white, sugar plantation owner who had 60 Chinese working for him. After the owner’s death in 1864, the new managers and overseers were “as vicious as wolves and tigers” and their hearts were “like snakes,” Yuan recalled. Because of the cruelty, Yuan reported, two Chinese committed suicide: Chen jumped into boiling sugar and Lian hanged himself. Chen chose to pollute the product, sugar, that was the source of his oppression. Liu and several others died after having been beaten by overseers.²

While “great men” like Columbus “the Admiral” routinely appear as the shapers of world history, the so-called ordinary people, including Yuan, Chen, Lian, and Liu, supplied the labor that ultimately transformed the world. Their deeds, although small when reduced to their brief individual lives, moved mountains when seen collectively. Enslaved and indentured American Indians, Africans, Asians, and Pacific Islanders built and sailed the transport ships and produced the goods that circulated in the world-system. They extracted from the earth precious metals as well as the green gold, such as sugar, cotton, tobacco, and coffee, that changed the course of human history.

UNITED STATES

America, “discovered” and named by Spaniards on their way to Asia, gave rise to the United States of America.



“Two hundred coolie boys we want.” A ship captain awakens a Chinese laborer and orders him to find other workers and supplies for their voyage. Illustration by F. C. Yohn and published in “In the Matter of a Bale of Blankets” by James B. Connolly, Dec. 1913. Illustration courtesy of the Library of Congress.



In addition to sugar and fruit, rice cultivation by Japanese and Chinese workers in Hawai'i began in the 1860s and became a staple of the Hawaiian economy. The rice was processed in water-powered mills like the Haraguchi Rice Mill on Kauai, pictured here. Photo courtesy of the Library of Congress.

The nation-state first emerged from the generative, destructive world-system as an extractive, plantation colony on the periphery of Europe's core. Like many other settler colonies the world over, in the U.S., settlers rose up in rebellion against their colonial masters, gained their independence, and formed a sovereign nation-state that became a member of the core through its concentration of capital, deployment of labor, and flexing of imperial powers.

ENGLISH AMERICA

Begun as private enterprises, not governmental projects like the Spanish version, English colonies were transplants of companies funded by private investors. Chartered by King James I, the London Company established Jamestown in Indian country in 1607 to turn a profit on its initial investment. Accordingly, the company directed its colonists to find gold, trade with Indians for skins and furs, and carve out a route to Asia. As John Smith, who emerged as the colony's leader, confessed, the religious conversion of the native peoples was simply a covering motive for the colony "when all their aim was profit." Despite that purpose, the colony floundered even as the London investors poured more money and settlers into the venture.

The "free" land of America was, in fact, purchased by blood and at the expense of Indian country. Tobacco, a gift of American Indians, exhausted the soil and

exploited laborers—English indentured and African slaves who produced the commodity that became the colony's mainstay. Tobacco plantations, however, required expansive tracts of "virgin soil" and increasing numbers of laborers. At first, those were indentured servants from among England's castoffs such as the poor. Indentured, both men and women, were bought and sold and were subjected to harsh treatment and abuse. Having served their period of indenture, however, Europeans gained their freedom and men acquired property and rights of citizenship.

As the cost of indentures rose, the preference for enslaved Africans grew. Africans, familiar laborers in the Mediterranean and Atlantic worlds, first arrived in the Jamestown colony on a Dutch ship in 1619. By the 1670s, the traffic from Africa became increasingly larger and cheaper. The colony's population of indentured Europeans and enslaved Africans helped to fortify the related ideas of white freedom and black bondage. Although indentured, Europeans were considered eventual members of the community while slavery, a life-long and inherited condition, became a mark of African ancestry.

REBELLION

A worldwide systematic regulation of English colonies gained impetus in England during the 17th century from the realization that profits and prestige could accrue to the nation. Colonies produced raw materials for the

homeland while providing markets for the core's manufactures. Mercantile capitalism within an imperial order thereby produced what Adam Smith called "The Wealth of Nations." However, the extractive nature of that system, involving monopolies and taxation, impoverished the peripheries, which functioned to profit the core. That relation produced a tension between the colonial power and its settlers, who chafed at their exploitation, which they saw as smacking of tyranny.

The British East India Company and its trade monopoly with Asia was a case in point, helping to fan the flames of discontent in America. In 1773, the Tea Act allowed the dumping of the company's huge tea surplus directly onto the colonies tax-free. Enraged colonial merchants, thereby being denied their middlemen profits, feared the loss of their livelihoods at the hands of a powerful monopoly, and a protest against taxation without representation gained traction and wide popular appeal. Tea consumption involved nearly everyone across the colonies, and the calls for a tea boycott mobilized large segments of the population. In December 1773, white men dressed as Mohawks staged the Boston Tea Party, which also involved American Indians and Asians. The Asian trade and settler sovereignty, including as indicated in the Declaration of Independence, freedom from "domestic insurrections" by "merciless Indian savages," were at the center of the rebellion and subsequent independence movements.

SOVEREIGNTY

The new nation-state declared its independence on July 4, 1776, and promptly sought its destiny not only in westward conquests of Indian country but also in Asia across the seas, tracing the footsteps of Spain and the British East India Company.

One of the first acts of the fledgling nation-state was to claim and parcel the lands west of the border along the Appalachians drawn by the British in 1763. The lands from that 1763 line westward to the Mississippi River became its Northwest Territory. In the 1780s and 1790s, Congress tried to coerce American Indians in the territory to surrender their lands, but Indians like the Miami Confederacy resisted the white invasion. The war ended with the Treaty of Greenville (1795) in which the U.S. recognized the sovereignty of Miami Indians. That acknowledgment affirms that U.S. expansion across the

continent was, in fact, imperialism and the conquest of extra-territorial lands and peoples. U.S. treaties with and annexation of the sovereign Hawaiian kingdom were, similarly, acts of imperialism.

In pursuing its designs on Asia, the U.S. followed the European formula for national greatness—traffic in Asian goods and labor. About a year after the Treaty of Paris (1783) settled the Revolutionary War, the *Empress of China* slipped out of New York's harbor for Canton, laden with 57,687 pounds of ginseng, a root known to the Iroquois as a medicine that grew in profusion from the Adirondacks to the Appalachians. The venture was financed by Robert Morris of Philadelphia, one of the most important patrons of the American Revolution, and Daniel Parker, a merchant from New York; others included a Caribbean plantation owner who had served the British in colonial India.

The *Empress* expressly set out for China's tea. Sailing on February 22, 1784, the *Empress* returned on May 11, 1785, carrying black and green tea, chinaware, and silk. George Washington bought a set of so-called Cincinnati china from a shipment carried by the *Empress*. Thereafter and for about a hundred years, the patriotic eagle design from Chinese porcelain remained popular in the U.S. market. The *Empress of China* realized a modest



Chinese porcelain commissioned by George Washington. In the post-Revolutionary period, trade between New York City and Canton was initiated with the voyage of the *Empress of China*, which left New York on February 22, 1784. More than a year later, it returned full of Chinese goods, including a 302-piece set of porcelain commissioned by George Washington for the Society of the Cincinnati, whose insignia is featured in the center. The society was an organization whose members had served as officers in the French or American armed forces during the Revolutionary War. This piece is exhibited in the Cincinnati Art Museum. Photo courtesy of Wikimedia Commons, licensed under Creative Commons, accessed on August 15, 2017.

profit of 25 to 30 percent on the initial investment. Despite that inauspicious start, the *Empress* inaugurated the infant nation's entry into the Asian trade, which was then dominated by Europe's imperialists.

Like driftwood carried to these shores, Asians made landfall on board U.S. and British trade ships. A few months after the *Empress* returned from China, another U.S. ship, the *Pallas*, docked in Baltimore with a crew, according to one account, of "Chinese, Malays, Japanese and Moors," although a contemporary wrote to George Washington that the crew were "all Natives of India" except for four Chinese, whose hair, color, and features reminded him of American Indians.

In the 1790s, South Asians with given English names—John Ballay, Joseph Green, George Jimor, and Thomas Robinson—arrived in Boston, Salem, and Philadelphia. Some served their indentures; others were sold and bought as slaves. Upon attaining their freedom, the men perhaps married African American women and became members of the North's free black communities. We know today of one sailor from India, James Dunn, because he filed a petition with the Pennsylvania Abolition Society during the 1790s, appealing for his freedom.

U.S. merchants plied the lucrative Asian trade. In 1797, the *Betsy* returned from China with a cargo that netted \$120,000 in profits, and by the 1830s, the U.S. trade with China totaled nearly \$75 million, a sum greater than the total debt of the American Revolution. Family fortunes were made in that commerce. Augustine Heard of Ipswich, Massachusetts, built upon his father's business, trading New England lumber and fish for West Indian sugar, molasses, coffee, and other tropical products, a practice common in the 18th century. The son extended his father's business dealings in the Caribbean to India and China during the first half of the 19th century. Working for the large firm Russell & Co. and then his own Augustine Heard & Co., Heard took huge sums of gold and silver dollars on voyages that involved hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy silk, spices, teas, and other Asian products in Calcutta and Canton.

MAKING ALIENS

The new nation's sovereignty entailed not only establishing its lands through a delineation of borders but also defining its peoples. Article I of the U.S. Constitution, ratified in 1787, qualified the nation's citizens or those

counted for full representation as "free Persons," including indentured servants, meaning all whites, American Indians who were taxed, and "three fifths of all other Persons," referring to African Americans and those not free. Citizenship thus hinged upon race and condition as was shown in the first U.S. Census (1790), which enumerated just three categories: "free whites," "slaves," and "all other free."

The first U.S. Congress, in 1790, passed the Naturalization Act, which declared citizenship through naturalization as limited to "free white persons." Any foreigner "being a free white person" of good character and a resident of the U.S. for two years could apply for naturalization, and upon swearing to uphold the Constitution, "such person shall be considered as a citizen of the United States." Thus race, specifically whiteness, in this foundational law was a condition of citizenship but so was freedom. In fact, at least since colonial Virginia, whiteness was a condition of freedom while blackness a



The Naturalization Act of 1790 included one of the first mentions of race in American law, and tied the right of citizenship directly to whiteness. Printed by Francis Childs; courtesy of the Library of Congress.

condition of bondage.

As non-whites, Asians and Pacific Islanders were, like American Indians and African Americans, excluded from citizenship by the 1790 Naturalization Act. In 1854, the Supreme Court of California ruled on the petition of a white man, George Hall, convicted of murder on testimony from Chinese witnesses in *The People v. George W. Hall*. Hall's claim of immunity flowed from a long tradition of race-based segregation beginning in colonial Virginia, which held that Indians and Africans were "incapable in law." California's law, Hall's attorney pointed out, disallowed American Indians and African Americans from testifying for or against whites. Chief Judge Hugh Murray agreed: "A free white citizen of this State" had his rights abridged by having been subjected to a trial contaminated by evidence provided by aliens "not of white blood." The "European white man," Murray reasoned, must be shielded from the testimony of "the degraded and demoralized caste," like Africans, Indians, Pacific Islanders, and Asians. Moreover, if given equality and the rights of citizenship, the Chinese would constitute "an actual and present danger" to the nation's stability. Hall's conviction was overturned.

The phrase "free white persons" thus defined citizenship as a matter of race but also of gender, insofar as freedom, including property rights, was a virtue possessed by white men, not women. The alienation of Indians, Africans, and Asians and Pacific Islanders as comprising "degraded castes" and "inferior races" purchased white men's citizenship and freedoms and with them the rights to life, liberty, and property, including dependents—women, children, and servants and slaves. Herein we find the intersection of race, gender, sexuality, class, and nation.

African Americans, considered "aliens," "property," and "other Persons" for nearly the first century of the U.S. nation-state, only became "persons" in 1868 with the adoption of the 14th Amendment, which allowed that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States...are citizens..." In 1924, Congress granted citizenship to American Indians, former "aliens," who were born after that year. All American Indians were absorbed as U.S. citizens in 1940. Asians remained "aliens ineligible to citizenship," per the 1790 Naturalization Act until 1952, when Japanese and Koreans were the last Asians to receive naturalization rights.



Newly arrived Chinese immigrants wait as their belongings are inspected in a customs house. Illustration published in *Harper's Weekly*, Feb. 3, 1877. Illustration courtesy of the Library of Congress.

CONQUESTS

Like American Indians and Mexicans, Pacific Islanders fell within the grasp of the U.S. nation-state through conquest. Their loss of land and sovereignty were the means of their incorporation.

About the time of the U.S. Declaration of Independence, Britain outfitted and sent one of its most famous "explorers," James Cook, to the South Pacific to find, name, classify, and collect the region's flora and fauna. Directed north, the expedition bumped into the Hawaiian Islands and continued on to reconnoiter America's west coast up to the Aleutian Islands and Bering Strait. Although he found no Northwest Passage, Cook found fur-bearing animals that were valuable commodities in the China trade, as the Spaniards of New Spain had long known. Both Hawai'i and the furs of the Northwest would figure prominently in the new nation's land expansion and its Asian and Pacific destiny.

The coming of whites to Hawai'i signaled a new phase in the life of the Hawaiian people. "If a big wave

comes in,” prophesized Hawaiian scholar Davida Malo in 1837 of the European flood, “large and unfamiliar fishes will come from the dark ocean, and when they see the small fishes of the shallows they will eat them up.”³ Educated by Christian missionaries and a convert to that foreign religion, Malo witnessed the swift decline of the Hawaiian kingdom’s sovereignty.

Called “Indians” by some foreigners, Hawaiians suffered population losses comparable to America’s indigenous peoples. Various estimates range from 250,000 to 800,000 in 1778 when the first Europeans arrived, the Hawaiian population plummeted by more than 50 percent by about the time of Malo’s premonition of his people’s dispossession.

Among the company of scientists and artists on Cook’s third and final Pacific expedition was an American, John Ledyard. Before enlisting, Ledyard had tried to gain support from Robert Morris of the *Empress of China* enterprise, among others, for a trade expedition to the Northwest to obtain furs to exchange for China’s tea, silk, and porcelain, which would reap “astonishing profit,” he promised. After voyaging with Cook, Ledyard published *A Journal of Captain Cook’s Last Voyage to the Pacific Ocean, and in Quest of a North-West Passage, Between Asia & America...* (1783), which restated the

case for his commercial scheme. He failed, however, to attract sponsors in the U.S., so he traveled to Paris where he met the U.S. minister to France, Thomas Jefferson, who showed an interest in his plan.

That contact, according to a biographer, later fired Jefferson’s desire as U.S. President to find a direct route across the continent when France offered to sell its Louisiana Territory. In April 1803, the nation nearly doubled its size when Jefferson purchased Louisiana’s some 830,000 square miles for \$15 million. About two months after the acquisition, Jefferson directed Meriwether Lewis, his personal secretary, and William Clark, an army officer, to open a highway to the Pacific Ocean “for the purposes of commerce” and report on the availability of furs in the Northwest.

IMPERIAL REPUBLIC

The U.S. is an imperial republic because the nation began as a product of English expansion into the Atlantic world and as a white settler colony that appropriated American Indian lands through negotiations as well as conquest by force. That extra-territorial spread engulfing Indian country continued after independence. In the 19th century, the Louisiana Purchase added not only land but also new populations to the nation:



“American Progress,” a famous painting by John Gast, depicts the American spirit leading westward expansion, in keeping with the idea of Manifest Destiny. Chromolithograph reproduction published by George A. Crofutt, 1873; courtesy of the Library of Congress.

French citizens, Spaniards, Africans, American Indians, Filipinos, and their mixed offspring. The nation's westward march across the continent extinguished the sovereignty of American Indians, conquered and annexed Mexico's northern territories, and, upon reaching the Pacific Ocean, extended its reach to the islands within. And throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, the U.S. waged multiple wars, declared and undeclared, against Asians and continues to occupy military outposts, notably in Hawai'i, Guam, Okinawa, Japan, Korea, and West Asia to secure its powers in Asia, the Indian Ocean, and the Pacific.

MANIFEST DESTINY

It was in 1845 that a Democratic editor, John O'Sullivan, coined the phrase "manifest destiny" to describe the ideology and movement that justified the nation's spread across the continent's girth. U.S. expansion, O'Sullivan declared, was "by the right of our manifest destiny to overspread and to possess the whole continent which Providence has given us for the development of the great experiment of liberty and federative self government entrusted to us." Fanned by those flames of nationalism and the imperatives of capitalism, manifest destiny drove the nation's border westward from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

President Theodore Roosevelt echoed, in 1903, the sentiment captured by O'Sullivan's term at an exposition celebrating Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana. "We have met here today," he noted, "to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of the event which more than any other, after the foundation of the Government and always excepting its preservation, determined the character of our national life—determined that we should be a great expanding nation instead of relatively a small and stationary one."⁴

The first period of manifest destiny took place during the first half of the 19th century, as the nation surged across the continent, swamping Mexico's northern territories and lands to the north settled by American Indians but claimed by Mexico, Russia, and Britain. In 1846, the U.S. and Britain signed a treaty that fixed a division between British and U.S. territory at the 49th parallel, a line that today forms the boundary between the U.S. and Canada. Oregon Territory eventuated into the states of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

In the Southwest, the principal instigators in the conquest of Mexican lands were white settlers from the U.S. seeking agricultural landholdings cultivated by enslaved, black laborers. Initially invited by Mexico to settle Texas in the 1820s, whites came to dominate the area and then fomented rebellions against their newly independent host nation. Settler discontent included a desire to legalize slavery, which Mexico had banned in all of its territories. In 1836, the white settlers defeated the Mexican army, declared an independent Texas Republic, and promptly petitioned for U.S. annexation.

Smitten by expansionist fervor, Congress admitted Texas as a state in 1845, and President James Polk dispatched an army to Texas as well as a naval expedition to California to seize Mexican lands. The provocation led to a U.S. declaration of war against Mexico in 1846. After an invasion of Mexico and military offensives in New Mexico and California, where white settlers had declared a "Bear Flag Republic," Mexico agreed to surrender its lands to the U.S. The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (1848) ceded lands north of the Rio Grande to the U.S. for \$15 million and stipulated that former Mexican citizens would become U.S. citizens and thus be racialized as whites.

Critics of expansionism in the U.S., mainly Northeasterners, feared that Southern interests to acquire new slave lands propelled the nation's westward march. Sectional conflict intensified in the years after the conquest and annexation of Mexican territory. News of gold's discovery in 1848 at a sawmill owned by John Sutter in the Sierra Nevada foothills of California attracted hundreds of thousands of fortune seekers to the gold fields. Like the expansion of whites into Texas, that demographic shift rekindled debate around newly settled lands as free or slave, which the Compromise of 1850 sought to resolve. The act admitted California as a free state and the rest of former Mexican lands—what became New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and parts of Colorado and Wyoming—as territories without restrictions on slavery.

Throughout this period of continental manifest destiny, U.S. trade with China continued. President Millard Fillmore instructed Commodore Matthew Perry to "open" Japan to U.S. vessels and for the China commerce. Since 1638, Japan, under the Tokugawa Shogunate, had closed its doors to foreigners, fearing



A three-scene cartoon depicts an Irish and a Chinese man consuming Uncle Sam from the head and feet, respectively, before the Chinese man eats his fellow immigrant. The background details a series of railroads spanning the land. Illustration published by White & Bauer, c.1860; courtesy of the Library of Congress.

erosion of its sovereignty. After consulting with U.S. businessmen, Perry headed for Japan with an expeditionary force of four ships, having received executive powers to use arms if necessary to accomplish his mission. After a “dress rehearsal” in Okinawa, Perry arrived in Tokyo Bay on July 1853. Japan’s government delayed negotiations, and Perry sailed away, promising to return the following year. In February 1854, Perry arrived with seven warships determined to wrest a treaty from Japan. He succeeded with the Treaty of Kanagawa, which opened the ports of Shimoda and Hakodate to U.S. vessels. Later that year, the British, Russians, and Dutch also gained access to Japan’s ports, thereby emulating Perry’s achievement.

U.S. imperialism or the acquisition of new lands during this first phase of manifest destiny reveals a central problem—the existence of non-white peoples in those territories. Whites assimilated into the nation as citizens, but non-whites, with the exception of Mexicans, remained foreign bodies within the nation as non-citizens. Territorial expansion during this period also reveals the tensions at work in the nation-state

between enslaved and free labor, between industrial capitalism in the Northeast and the plantation economy of the South. The conflicts would lead to a rupture between regions and, some have argued, cultures and to a brutal war between brothers.

CIVIL WAR

The U.S. Civil War redirected the nation’s destiny and transformed it in many ways. Most pertinent to this history of Asians and Pacific Islanders in the U.S. were the passage of the Constitution’s 13th Amendment (1865), which abolished slavery; the first Civil Rights Act (1866), which declared African Americans to be citizens; the 14th Amendment (1868), which conferred citizenship on those born in the U.S. and ensured to “all persons” equal protection under the law; and the

15th Amendment (1870), which guaranteed the right of citizens to vote regardless of “race, color, or previous condition of servitude.”

Those transformative advances in U.S. democracy illustrate the complexity of the social formation in the intersections and articulations of race, gender, and class. The National Woman Suffrage Association, led by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, opposed the 15th Amendment because, observed Stanton, it gave political power to “the lower orders of Chinese, Africans, Germans, and Irish, with their low ideals of womanhood.”⁵ That opposition divided the suffragist from the abolitionist cause and movement, which had worked together for decades, and it underscored a longstanding positioning of race against gender and class.

Stanton’s association of Germans and the Irish with people of color might appear puzzling in light of our present notion of whiteness. The Irish, however, were once called the “niggers of Europe” and only attained whiteness by distinguishing themselves from African and Chinese Americans. Before that racial transformation and indicative of their non-white status, some Irish women worked with and married African and Chinese American men. In lower Manhattan, amidst a polyglot of mariners and migrants, Irish women and Chinese men drank, danced, slept together, and married. Chinese

ship steward William Brown, living in New York City in 1825, wed Irish Rebecca Brown, and Chinese seaman John Huston, a resident of New York in 1829, married Margaret, an Irish woman, and they had two daughters. Of an estimated 150 Chinese in New York City in 1856, 11 were married to Irish women. Apparently some of those Chinese were former coolies from Peru, while others were seamen in the U.S.-China trade.

The admission of African Americans into U.S. citizenship, while not with full political and civil rights, redressed some 250 years of exclusion and relegation to “another and different class of persons.” The “citizen race,” per the Supreme Court’s *Dred Scott* (1857) ruling, henceforth included a people of color, and that change was truly revolutionary. For Asians, the 14th Amendment was the only means by which most of them acquired U.S. citizenship before 1952, when the final barrier to Asian naturalization was removed. The importance of the 14th Amendment’s guarantee of equality under the law for all persons cannot be overstated. Those basic realignments coming from the Civil War put to rest the prior discourse and fiction of a white republic and a nation-state of a single people or race. Equal protection under the law and voting rights in disregard of race and, in 1920, gender, remain foundational constitutional rights even though they were not always observed.

Asians and Pacific Islanders, indeed, all of the nation’s peoples, benefited from that advancement of democracy. Those civil rights, nonetheless, were not simply gifted to them. They, like African Americans, earned their claims to equality through the blood they shed on the nation’s battlefields during the Civil War. Hawaiians, Chinese, Filipinos, South Asians, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans served in the African American U.S. Colored Troops (USCT) and, a few, in white units.

About 30 Filipinos and over 60 South Asians served in the Civil War, but most prominently documented were the more than 60 Chinese who served both the Union and Confederate causes. In the South, Chinese and Filipinos served in Louisiana units, fighting on the Confederate side, along with Christopher Bunker’s sons, Chang and Eng, the original “Siamese Twins.” The Bunkers were slaveholders and, like other Southerners, they fought to preserve white supremacy and the white republic.

DESTINY’S CHILD

The first period of manifest destiny ended with the treaty with Mexico in 1848. The second period of manifest destiny, which I call “Destiny’s Child,” took place during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Because both phases involved the acquisition of territories populated by non-white peoples, manifest destiny and its child tested the imperial republic’s original intention to limit citizenship and therewith membership in the nation to “free white persons.” White settler machinations in Hawai’i and a war with Spain expanded the nation’s limits beyond the continent, opening the nation to other people of color and their island homes in the Caribbean and Pacific.

In the late 19th century, unprecedented numbers of immigrants largely from southern and eastern Europe flocked to cities in the North. Between 1865 and 1915, 25 million immigrants streamed to these shores, more than four times the total of the previous 50 years. By 1890, foreign-born immigrants and their children comprised 80 percent of the population of New York City and 87 percent of Chicago. While industrialists might have welcomed them as workers, nativists agitated against their entry. United in a hatred of foreigners, blaming the nation’s social ills on them, the 500,000 members of the American Protective Association and the Immigration Restriction League clamored for immigration restrictions.

Mirroring that wider fear of aliens and the perils they allegedly posed, in 1882, Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act because, in the framers’ words, “the coming of Chinese laborers to this country endangers the good order of certain localities within the territory thereof.” The language of the act suggests Chinese workers, as perpetual aliens or “aliens ineligible to citizenship,” introduce disorder and danger affecting the national defense and interest.

In addition to the immigration influx, the 1890 U.S. Census declared that the nation had been fully settled or, in the words of historian Frederick Jackson Turner, “the task of filling up the vacant spaces of the continent” had been completed—a statement made in utter disregard of the land’s native peoples. He and many others saw this achievement as “the closing of the frontier.” Ominously, the frontier, Turner and his supporters held, was central to the constitution of the nation and its people because it was the site that sired and fostered the American



The destruction of the USS *Maine* in Havana Harbor, Cuba, sparked war between America and Spain as the former began to eye territories overseas. Stereographic print published by the Keystone View Co., c.1898; courtesy of the Library of Congress.

spirit—rugged individualism, initiative and self-reliance, and democratic values. Moreover, the engine for the nation’s economic growth was the energy generated by the constantly expanding frontier with its seemingly limitless resources and opportunities. Its closure, thus, was a cause for alarm. Capitalism’s crisis of the 1890s served to reinforce those fears. Markets and land and labor abroad seemed to offer exits that the frontier’s continental end appeared to foreclose. Pressed from within, the U.S. sought outlets abroad.

European empires reveal, Alfred Thayer Mahan argued in his widely read *The Influence of Sea Power upon History* (1890), that sea power leads to economic and national greatness. Domestic production requires overseas markets, a strong navy to protect the sea-lanes, and colonies to provide anchorages and supply resources and labor. Ideology fortified imperialist arguments such as Mahan’s for material gains. Racism justified the conquest and colonization of inferior, backward peoples, and imperialism trembled with religious fervor. Josiah Strong, a Christian minister and author of the best-selling *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (1885), believed that the “Anglo-Saxon race” was “divinely commissioned” to spread and “move down upon Mexico, down upon Central and South America, out upon the islands of the sea, over upon Africa and beyond.” He closed with the certainty of social Darwinism: “And can any one doubt that the result of this competition of races will be the ‘survival of the fittest?’”⁶

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The nation’s destiny beyond the continent began with a war with Spain over Cuba and Puerto Rico in 1898. This conflict was an outgrowth of economic interests Americans held in various Caribbean islands from the colonial period, as well as the nation’s flexing of powers in the western hemisphere as exhibited by the Monroe Doctrine (1823), which warned Europe against encroaching on U.S. sovereignty that included the Caribbean and Latin America. In 1897, annual U.S. trade with Spanish-ruled Cuba totaled \$27 million. The U.S. animus over Spain’s “uncivilized and inhuman” conduct in Cuba, as President William McKinley charged in 1897, and its brutal suppression of Cuban anti-colonial movements also fueled the war.

The immediate cause of the conflict was the explosion that killed more than 260 on board the U.S. battleship *Maine*, anchored in Havana harbor, on February 15, 1898. At the time, many held Spain responsible for the ship’s sinking, but later evidence suggested the cause was an accidental explosion inside the ship’s boiler room. War on Spain was declared in April 1898 and ended by August the same year. It was, Secretary of State John Hay pronounced, “a splendid little war” in which many more U.S. soldiers died from malaria, dysentery, and typhoid than bullets.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Theodore Roosevelt, an ardent imperialist and Mahan follower, ordered Commodore George Dewey and the Pacific Squadron to Manila to battle the Spanish there, extending the war into the Pacific. In May 1898, Dewey steamed into

Manila Bay and destroyed the antiquated Spanish fleet. As had been the case in Cuba, in the Philippines, the Americans walked into an anti-colonial revolution against a teetering Spanish empire. The Filipinos had driven the Spaniards into the city of Manila and had surrounded them. The U.S. forces lay anchored in the bay awaiting the arrival of ground troops to complete the defeat of the Spaniards. After several months, the army arrived. The Spaniards, caught between the Filipinos and Americans, eagerly capitulated to the latter to avoid the humiliating spectacle of whites surrendering to their colored subjects.

Under the terms of an armistice and the Treaty of Paris that ended the 1898 war between Spain and the U.S., Spain recognized Cuba's independence and ceded Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and Guam to the U.S. for \$20 million. During the Senate debate over ratification of the treaty, a mixed group of anti-imperialists opposed the acquisition of the Philippines and Puerto Rico, which some feared might lead to a pollution of pure American blood by Asia's "inferior" and Puerto Rico's "mongrel" races. Others warned of the flood of cheap Asian laborers, while U.S. sugar interests did not relish competition from tropical island plantations in the Caribbean and Pacific.

Imperialists, in response to those arguments cited as a model the longstanding treatment of American Indians, who were absorbed territorially but not politically or socially. Massachusetts's Senator Henry Cabot Lodge reminded his anti-imperialist detractors that from the beginning American Indians were held as subjects but not as citizens. Congress held plenary powers over Indians who were "domestic dependent nations" as the Supreme Court had ruled in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831). Filipinos, Lodge expected, were organized as "tribes" like the "uncivilized" American Indian "tribes." They were, thus, unfit to rule themselves and would not become U.S. citizens.

INDIAN WAR

Senate ratification of the Treaty of Paris was achieved on February 6, 1899. The "gift" of the Philippines, according to President McKinley, troubled him at first, but after prayer it came to him that he should "take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them...." Contrarily, the "little brown

brothers" who were the objects of the U.S. President's "benevolent assimilation" refused to recognize the gift and instead continued their struggle for independence against the United States. The war was prolonged, bloody, and costly for the U.S. and Filipinos.

As analogized by imperialists like Senator Lodge, the U.S. war of conquest in the Philippines was waged as an Indian war in which, in the words of Secretary of State Hay, America's Far West became the Far East. Many of the same troops who had fought against the Sioux and chased and captured the Apache chief Geronimo in the U.S. West marched against Filipinos. Major General Adna Romanza Chafee, who in 1901 led the invasion of the Philippines, had spent decades fighting against the Kiowa, Comanche, Cheyenne, and Apache. A contemporary said of Chafee that he "brought the Indian wars with him to the Philippines and wanted to treat the recalcitrant Filipinos the way he had the Apaches in Arizona—by herding them onto reservations."⁷

Filipino troops, unable to match U.S. firepower in the open, resorted to guerilla warfare. The invaders responded in kind, demolishing crops and burning villages, corralling civilians into concentration camps, and executing those suspected of being or collaborating with the enemy. "Kill and burn, the more you kill and burn the better it will please me" and "shoot anyone over the age of 10," a U.S. commander directed his troops. Torture, such as the "water cure" that simulated and induced drowning, was routinely practiced.⁸ In that war, genocide was defensible because, as John Burgess, a Columbia University professor, declared, "there is no human right to the status of barbarism."

African Americans both at home and in the Philippines saw a connection between racism in the U.S. and abroad. Imperialism's intent, Frederick McGee, a founder of the Niagara movement stated, was "to rule earth's inferior races, and if they object make war upon them." In 1883, the Supreme Court voided the Civil Rights Act of 1875, which had ensured equal rights for all in public places, and in 1896, in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the Court ruled that separate was equal and thus did not violate the 14th Amendment. An African American soldier in the Philippines wrote to his family in Milwaukee. White soldiers, he reported, "began to apply home treatment for colored peoples: cursed them [Filipinos] as damned niggers, steal [from] and ravish them, rob them...dese-

crate their church property...looted everything in sight, burning, robbing the graves.”⁹

The war in the Philippines continued for three years, from 1898 to 1902, despite a robust anti-war movement in the U.S. and disenchantment among the troops in the field. The conquest required approximately 200,000 U.S. soldiers and resulted in over 4,300 American deaths. Besides the destruction of property, tens of thousands of Filipinos perished; some figures put the number of deaths as high as nearly a million, including those who died of disease and starvation as a result of the fighting. The capture of Emilio Aguinaldo, the leader of the Filipino republican army, in March 1901 was a factor in the war's end. That same year, the U.S. installed a civilian government headed by William Howard Taft, who would later become U.S. President. But the war was not over, and fighting continued especially in the southern, Muslim islands. Like the use of American Indians in the Indian wars in the U.S. West, the army inducted Filipinos as “scouts” and then ground soldiers.

Meanwhile in the Caribbean, the U.S. installed a colonial governor in Puerto Rico in 1900, and after passage of the Platt Amendment in 1901, which gave the U.S. control over Cuba's foreign relations, it granted independence to Cuba. Still, the U.S. military remained on the island to suppress dissent and protect U.S. economic investments such as sugar plantations, refineries, and railroads, whose fortunes soared during the occupation. The military also maintained Guantanamo Naval Station, which it used as a coaling and naval base and, in 2002, as a military prison for U.S. captives in its “War on Terror.”

The U.S. established itself as an economic and military presence in other locations as well. A busy Secretary of State Hay declared in 1898 an “open door” trade policy with China, and in 1899, the U.S. gained the coveted harbor and naval station, Pago Pago on Tutuila Island, Sāmoa. In addition, Hawai'i presented yet another opportunity for Yankee imperialists in the tropical zone. The frontier, closed on the continent, was again open for business, now, off- shore.

IMPERIAL RESIDUES

Manifest destiny, as was feared by many white supremacists, changed the face of the nation. The white or “citizen race” was joined by “persons of color,” “another and different class of persons” who were not “included

in the word citizens,” in the words of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Roger Brooke Taney in the decision he wrote for the ruling on the infamous Dred Scott case (*Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. 393), 1857. That distinction was upheld in the differential treatment extended to the overseas acquisitions. In 1900, Congress formalized the incorporation of Hawai'i as a territory, indicating its eventual absorption into the union as a state, unlike Puerto Rico, Guam, Sāmoa, and the Philippines, which remained “unincorporated” U.S. territories. The distinction was crucial for the rights extended to those peoples, whether as “citizens” or “nationals.” Their status as “wards” of the U.S. government derived from the state's policies toward American Indians.

With regard to the people of color on the U.S. continent, expansion absorbed Mexicans as citizens who were rendered white by treaty (1848). The citizenship of African Americans in the wake of the Civil War terminated the narrative of a single race and nation, and the Jones Act (1917) bestowed a second-class citizenship to Puerto Ricans on the island. The Dawes Act (1887) sought to dismantle the structure of American Indian “nations” by privatizing land holdings and granting to adult owners U.S. citizenship. That act reversed a nearly 100-year-old policy recognizing American Indian sovereignty beginning with the Treaty of Greenville (1795) and *Elk v. Wilkins* (1884), a Supreme Court ruling that American Indians were not U.S. citizens but citizens of their tribal nations. In 1924, Congress declared American Indians, born after that year, to be U.S. citizens, and extended citizenship to all American Indians with the Nationality Act of 1940. A consequence of expansionism and the imperial republic, consequently, was a “darkening” of the nation's peoples.

Asians and Pacific Islanders were particularly problematic to that process of expansion and incorporation. Their lands, waters, and resources were vital to the imperial republic and their labor sustained the nation's economy. Pacific Islanders and Asians, however, posed a peril to the nation as aliens and competitors in the Pacific, and their Oceania, an imagined imminent danger to the domestic tranquility. Those problems and their attendant threats evolved over time, as did their solutions, which were extensions of treatments accorded to all “persons of color.” But peculiar to Asians and Pacific Islanders was the language of the 1790 Act, which limited

naturalization to “free white persons.” Thereby rendered “aliens ineligible to citizenship” up to the mid-20th century, unlike African Americans, American Indians, and Mexicans, they were especially well suited to serve as migrant laborers as we will see in subsequent chapters.

Endnotes

1 Many scholars understand imperialism as a stage of capitalism. While I see capitalism and its search for markets and resources as influential in extra-territorial expansions, I define imperialism more broadly than those conventional views.

2 Lisa Yun, *The Coolie Speaks: Chinese Indentured Laborers and African Slaves of Cuba* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008), 80-82.

3 As quoted in Gavan Daws, *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1986), 106.

4 Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge, *Addresses and Presidential Messages of Theodore Roosevelt, 1902-1904* (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1904).

5 Alan Brinkley, *American History: A Survey*, 9th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1995), 420.

6 Josiah Strong, *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (New York: Baker & Taylor, 1885), 159, 160, 161, 175.

7 Russell Roth, *Muddy Glory: America’s ‘Indian Wars’ in the Philippines* (West Hanover, Mass.: Christopher Publishing, 1981), 24.

8 In our time, this same treatment was not considered torture under the George W. Bush administration and by many in Congress.

9 Letter published in the *Wisconsin Weekly Advocate*, May 17, 1900.

References

- Bederman, Gail. *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Bender, Daniel E. and Jana K. Lipman (eds.) *Making the Empire Work: Labor and United States Imperialism*. New York: New York University Press, 2015.
- Brinkley, Alan. *American History: A Survey*, 9th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1995.
- Daws, Gavan. *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1986.
- Hoganson, Kristin L. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*.

New York: Hill and Wang, 2000.

Kaplan, Amy. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Reddy, Sujani K. *Nursing & Empire: Gendered Labor and Migration From India to the United States*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

Roosevelt, Theodore and Henry Cabot Lodge. *Addresses and Presidential Messages of Theodore Roosevelt, 1902-1904*. New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1904.

Roth, Russell. *Muddy Glory: America’s ‘Indian Wars’ in the Philippines*. West Hanover, MA: Christopher Publishing, 1981.

Stratton, Clif. *Education for Empire: American Schools, Race, and the Paths of Good Citizenship*. Berkeley: University of California Press 2016.

Strong, Josiah. *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis*. New York: Baker & Taylor, 1885.

Sturdevant, Sandra Pollock and Brenda Stoltzfus (eds.) *Let the Good Times Roll: Prostitution and the U.S. Military in Asia*. New York: New Press, 1992.

Yun, Lisa. *The Coolie Speaks: Chinese Indentured Laborers and African Slaves of Cuba*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008.

