

2013

Asian American Masculinity Eclipsed: A Legal and Historical Perspective of Emasculation Through U.S. Immigration Practices

Michael Park

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/tma>

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Park, Michael. "Asian American Masculinity Eclipsed: A Legal and Historical Perspective of Emasculation Through U.S. Immigration Practices." *The Modern American* 8, no. 1 (2013): 5-17.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Washington College of Law Journals & Law Reviews at Digital Commons @ American University Washington College of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in *The Modern American* by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ American University Washington College of Law. For more information, please contact fbrown@wcl.american.edu.

Asian American Masculinity Eclipsed: A Legal and Historical Perspective
of Emasculation Through U.S. Immigration Practices

ASIAN AMERICAN MASCULINITY ECLIPSED: A LEGAL AND HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF EMASCULATION THROUGH U.S. IMMIGRATION PRACTICES

By: Michael Park¹

This Article provides a critical and historical analysis of the impact of U.S. immigration laws and policies in shaping Asian masculinity norms and the emasculation of the Asian male subject. The article begins with a historical introduction to immigration laws that have affected Asian Americans, particularly, Chinese immigrants. The article then examines the way in which American immigration practices and laws barred citizenship to Asian men, and in effect designated them as “other” and emblematically “non-male.” Moreover, the article discusses how United States exclusion and miscegenation laws have emasculated Asian men by restricting their access to heterosexual norms and ideals, including nuclear family relations. Finally, the article examines how economic hardships that have resulted from disenfranchisement and legalized exclusion, “feminized” Asian American men by forcing them into professions generally associated with women, particularly, in the laundry industry.

I. Introduction

The law is the discourse that generally presides over citizenship and the result of the law's effect often shape who the citizens are. Laws affect the collective histories, and narratives that include or exclude individuals in relation to the nation as a whole. For many years, scholars and historians have focused great attention on Asian immigration to the United States in order to help understand the racialization of the United States as a nation.² Moreover, there has been insightful research and critical analysis done on female subjectivity, mother-daughter relations and interracial marriages.³ However, less analytical attention has been given to the impact of United States immigration laws and policies in shaping Asian

masculinity norms and the emasculation of the Asian male subject.

The history of the legal definitions of citizenship, naturalization, exclusion, national antimiscegenation laws, and the legislative bans on the entry of Asian wives have collectively contributed to a female gendering, along with the racialization of the Asian American male.⁴ As such, the Asian American male's identity continues to be produced and sustained through the means of racialized gendering. Many contemporary stereotypes of Asian American men embody an emasculated image, and unlike the hyper-masculinized image and perceived menacing sexual threats associated with the Black male body, Asian American males are viewed as effeminate, asexual and passive.⁵ Popular cultural representations appear to only confirm this perception. Take, for example, the character of Jin, the Asian male cast member of the ABC television series *Lost*. Jin is portrayed early on as a controlling and quiet figure, and as the series progresses, it is subsequently revealed (not coincidentally), that Jin is impotent. More recently, the popular Hollywood comedy *The Hangover Part II*, reinforces this emasculated image of the Asian male with the character of Mr. Chow, who, as one critic notes, is the butt of the most cliché of penis jokes: “His naked man-handle is mistaken for a Shiitake mushroom.”⁶ Even New York Knicks sensation Jeremy Lin, currently the only Asian American player in the NBA, was the subject of racist media comments during his rise to NBA stardom this past February. Fox sports columnist Jason Whitlock aimed directly at Lin's “lack” of masculinity when he made the following comment on Lin's meteoric rise: “Some lucky lady in NYC is gonna feel a couple inches of pain tonight.”⁷

Professor Darren Hutchinson writes that the sexualized construction of Asian American males is also heterosexually based—“it seeks to stigmatize Asian American male hetero-sexuality by feminizing it, or even labeling it as ‘gay’.”⁸ The character of “Lloyd” (played by Asian American actor Rex Lee), on the HBO series *Entourage*, personifies a subservient and effeminate character (he is also gay), and provides a (not so subtle) link between emasculation and the image of the Asian male. Author Frank Chin notes that mainstream stereotypes depict Asian American men as “completely devoid of manhood,” and “our nobility is that of an efficient housewife.”⁹ As Chan, Chin, Inada, and Wong point out in *The Big Aiiiiieee!*, “It is an article of white liberal American faith today that Chinese men, at their best, are effeminate closet queens like Charlie Chan and at their worst, are homosexual menaces like Fu Manchu.”¹⁰

As a product that is socially constructed, racialized masculinity is shaped by historical, political and cultural forces. Informed by the concept of “racialized gender” or “gendered race”¹¹ and how the term “gender” is constructed rather than found, racialized masculinity is also constructed, rather than found. Immigration policies and its implications on Asian masculinity present histories to be explored. This paper presents a historical and legal analysis of some of the ways in which Asian American men have been materially feminized and emasculated by the effects of various United States immigration practices and laws. Although popular culture—through film, television, and literary work—have perpetuated negative stereotypes of Asian American males, United States immigration practices have been a significant factor in shaping the current stereotypical image of the effeminate Asian American male subject. However, the analysis here should not be construed as a universal prototype for Asian American masculinity, and I do not argue that American immigration laws represent the sole basis for the current image of the emasculated Asian male.¹² Although the effect of immigration and exclusion laws were to impede Chinese, Japanese and other immigrants from settling permanently in America, I offer an examination of how the net effect of American immigration laws may have also played a key role in the emasculation of the Asian American male.

Part II provides a historical introduction to immigration laws that have affected Asian Americans, particularly, Chinese immigrants. Part III examines the way in which American immigration practices and laws barred citizenship to Asian men, and in effect designating them as “other” and emblematically “non-male.” Part IV discusses how United States exclusion and miscegenation laws have emasculated Asian men by restricting their access to heterosexual norms and ideals, including nuclear family relations. Finally, Part V examines how economic hardships that have resulted from disenfranchisement and legalized exclusion, feminized Asian American men by forcing them into professions generally associated with women, particularly, in the laundry industry.

II. Asians and United States Immigration Practices and Laws

For almost 350 years after Christopher Columbus landed in North America, very few Asians immigrated to the United States. Asian immigration was virtually nonexistent.¹³ In many Asian countries, there was little reason, need, or desire to immigrate to the United States, even though the era before the mid-1800s was a time of open immigration for Asian immigrants into America.¹⁴ Asian immigration (particularly Chinese immigration), began during a period when the European powers and the United States were experiencing major social and economic transformations.¹⁵ The rapid expansion of industrial capitalism in America during the mid-1800s created a high demand for cheap labor.¹⁶

Driven by a rice shortage, the damaging effects of the Taiping Rebellion and China’s loss to Britain in the Opium Wars, Chinese laborers began to arrive in America in the 1840s.¹⁷ The Chinese were officially welcomed when they first arrived in America.¹⁸ The simultaneous opening of Asia and the American West, along with the new gold rush, created a demand for “coolie,” or (unskilled and cheap) Chinese labor.¹⁹ Even John McDougall, the governor of California in 1852, wanted to provide land grants as incentives for the Chinese to settle on America’s new frontier.²⁰ The governor called for “further immigration and settlement of Chinese—one of our most worthy classes of newly adopted

citizens—to whom the climate and character of our lands are particularly suited.”²¹ By 1882, almost 300,000 Chinese laborers had entered and worked on the West Coast.²²

“Coolie” labor²³ was seen as a great value in developing the industries of America, not only on the west coast, but also throughout America; some Southern plantation owners even considered replacing African-American slaves with Chinese labor.²⁴ The Chinese were regarded as more dependable and less demanding than white workers, and the Central Pacific Railroad, at first doubtful about the Chinese’ ability, hired them.²⁵ The Central Pacific Railroad realized that the Chinese labor force could be purchased for two-thirds the price of white workers, and without the Chinese, “it would have been impossible to complete the western portion of the transcontinental railroad in the time required by Congress.”²⁶

Although the Chinese were initially encouraged to enter the New World as laborers, the “coolie” labor that arrived and worked hard to help establish the industries of early America would soon face the cruelties of racial prejudice. This anti-Asian sentiment, fueled by the white majority’s fear of losing jobs to aliens, prompted demands for restrictive federal immigration laws and practices. These same laws and practices would not only exclude Asians from the American polity, but would simultaneously help create a racialization and female gendering of the Asian American male.

A. *Chinese Exclusion: A Brief History*

Chinese immigration to America can be divided into distinct periods that present a “schizophrenia” in American immigration policy. The period of 1849 to 1882 represented years of free immigration; an age of exclusion from 1882 to 1943; an era of limited immigration from 1943 to 1965; and a period of renewed immigration since 1965.²⁷ The official Chinese welcome which began before the mid-1800s was short-lived; the Chinese welcome would turn into oppression, fueled by white racism. In 1852, the California legislature passed a discriminatory license fee requirement that was specifically targeted at Chinese gold miners.²⁸ Two years later, the California Supreme Court ruled that the Chinese had no right to testify against whites.²⁹

According to historian Ronald Takaki, by the 1860s, Chinese immigrants were seen as a threat to the idea of a racially white homogeneous society and as “heathenish souls” who “have no knowledge of or appreciation of free institutions or constitutional liberty.”³⁰ These economic and racial fears attributed to the Chinese would ultimately culminate into exclusionary laws and discriminatory economic practices that would limit job opportunities, prevent family formations, and effectively emasculate Asian men.

In 1862, California’s first Republican governor (who was also one of the founders of Stanford University), Leland Stanford, used his inaugural address to decry “the presence among us of a degraded and distinct people,” and to call for “any Constitutional action, having for its object the regression of the immigration of Asiatic races.”³¹ The Chinese were also viewed as an economic threat to white labor and were resented for their resourcefulness and for their reputed frugality.³² As Tomás Almaguer explains: “[T]he racialized hostility toward Chinese immigrants arose from their location at the point of conflict between American capitalists—eager to employ Chinese labor—and white workers—who considered them a threat to the free laboring class.”³³ By the 1870s, Chinese employment by the Central Pacific Railroad was at its peak, and anti-coolie clubs increased, resulting in frequent mob attacks against the Chinese.³⁴ The resentment of the Chinese would further fuel the need to preserve “racial purity” and “Western civilization.”³⁵

The pressure by both fronts of the American capitalist institution (American capitalists and white workers) would prove to be fatal to the Chinese’ inclusion in the American citizenry. In 1870, Congress amended the Nationality Act of 1790, which limited citizenship to “free white persons,” to include African Americans and Native Americans but deliberately denied the Chinese the right to citizenship.³⁶

The anti-Chinese movement that erupted in the 1870s led to legislative attacks against Chinese businesses, particularly, Chinese laundries.³⁷ In what would be known as the “laundry ordinances,” city boards enacted ordinances that gave local supervisors unlimited discretionary power to issue licenses.³⁸ However, most of these ordinances were created to target Chinese businesses and prevent the Chinese from obtaining licenses required by the board.³⁹

Chinese immigrants also lost political standing in court. In 1878, the court in *In re Ah Yup*, ruled that Chinese immigrants were deemed ineligible for citizenship because they were not white.⁴⁰ Even Mark Twain, who observed the ill treatment of the Chinese and harbored his own prejudices against the Indians of the West, remarked on the unjust treatment of the Chinese:

Any White man can swear a Chinaman's life away in the courts, but no Chinaman can testify against a white man. Ours is the 'land of the free'—nobody denies that—nobody challenges it. (Maybe it is because we won't let other people testify). As I write, news come that in broad daylight in San Francisco, some boys have stoned an inoffensive Chinaman to death and although a large crowd witnesses the shameful deed, no one interfered.⁴¹

It was only a matter of time before the United States Congress would pass the first exclusion act against individuals based on their nationality.

1. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882

On May 6th, 1882, the 47th U.S. Congress enacted the Chinese Exclusion Act.⁴² The act provides in pertinent part: “[I]n the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to this country endangers the good order of certain localities within the territory thereof”⁴³ The Act excluded Chinese laborers for ten years but it did not apply to laborers who were already in America at the date of enactment.⁴⁴ In order for Chinese workers already in the United States to come and go freely, the United States government set up an identification system.⁴⁵ Before resident Chinese laborers could leave and reenter the United States, customs officials would issue “return certificates;”⁴⁶ Chinese laborers without authorized return certificates were denied entry, and every Chinese unlawfully in the country “would be caused to be removed therefrom to the country from whence he came”⁴⁷

The anti-Chinese movement however, pressed for even more exclusion. Amendments were made to the original exclusion act in 1884,⁴⁸ making

return certificates the only permissible evidence for a laborer to establish a right of reentry even if the laborer was a resident in California before the 1882 act was enacted and went to China before the passage of the act.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the prohibition was expanded in 1888 to include “all persons of the Chinese race.”⁵⁰

The Chinese Exclusion Act was renewed in 1892 when Congress passed the Geary Act.⁵¹ With the Geary Act, Congress complied with the demand for the registration of all Chinese laborers and the act even denied bail for Chinese habeas corpus proceedings.⁵² In 1902, ten years after the Geary Act, the prohibition was extended indefinitely.⁵³ Congress passed laws that gave the majority what they wanted: the removal of the Chinese to help defuse any fears by the white labor force, and to help alleviate class conflicts within the white majority during an era of economic crisis resulting from unemployment.⁵⁴ The wrath of anti-Chinese legislation led to a major decrease in the Chinese American population—from 105,465 in 1880, to 89,863 in 1900, to 61,639 in 1920.⁵⁵

2. The Immigration Act of 1924

At the dawn of the twentieth century, the severe anti-Asian immigration laws did little to satisfy the xenophobic demands of the white majority. The white majority insisted that Asians were racially inferior, and the legislation that passed in this era reflected this sentiment. America's victory in the Spanish-American War, coupled with neo-colonialist military expansion by other nations, helped fuel America's reactionary and isolationist political climate.⁵⁶

This renewed xenophobia would lead to even more exclusionist demands as Congress passed the landmark Immigration Act of 1924, section 13(c) of which reads in pertinent part: “No alien ineligible to citizenship shall be admitted to the United States”⁵⁷ The act provided that immigrants of any country be limited to two percent of their nationality in 1890. Although legislative supporters of the act were more concerned with limiting immigration from many European countries,⁵⁸ the act also eliminated a few remaining categories for Asians.

The act provided for the exclusion of any “alien ineligible to citizenship,” and since many Asians were excluded from naturalization under the 1870

statute, the possibility of entry for Asians was cut off indefinitely.⁵⁹ The act even prohibited previously privileged merchants, teachers and students—“Asians were not allowed even under the two percent quota rule.”⁶⁰

It was not until the middle of World War II did most Chinese immigrants finally see light at the end of a dark, exclusionary tunnel. As the United States joined forces with the Chinese to fight against the Axis powers, Congress felt the need to address the charges that America was discriminating against the citizens of an ally.⁶¹ In 1943, Congress passed the Magnuson Act, otherwise known as the Chinese Exclusion Repeal Act,⁶² and for the first time, Chinese immigrants were allowed to naturalize and become American citizens.⁶³ In 1965, President Kennedy helped abolish the old quota system and implemented amendments that would allow twenty thousand immigrant visas for every country not in the Western Hemisphere.⁶⁴

III. Citizenship and Masculinity

Asian immigrants who entered the United States from the nineteenth century onward were viewed as the “yellow peril”⁶⁵ threatening to “oust” white European immigrants.⁶⁶ These immigrants were industrious, and soon began to surpass white workers. As the “yellow peril,” Asian Americans were viewed as “[i]nscrutable, sneaky, competitive,” and are also depicted as “military, cultural, or economic enemies and unfair competitors for education and jobs.”⁶⁷ It is no coincidence that the racialization of Asians as physically inferior from “whites” predominated when America was in desperate need of cheap labor and capital, coupled with an anti-Asian backlash.⁶⁸

Many white laborers felt threatened by the competition from Asian workers, even though many employers continued to seek them as subservient domestics and cheap labor. As Asian immigrants became the scapegoats for the economic downturn in the late 1800s, union leaders and writers sustained the backlash with the rhetoric of preserving “racial purity” and “Western civilization” in hopes of sparking anti-Asian legislation.⁶⁹ Immigration and naturalization laws were therefore a means to regulate the terms of who constitutes a citizen, and also as a

means to define Asian immigrants as racially “other” and emblematically “non-male.”

Until 1870, United States citizenship was granted only to white male persons.⁷⁰ In 1870, African Americans could become naturalized,⁷¹ yet Asians were deliberately barred from naturalization until the Magnuson Act repealed immigration exclusion in 1943.⁷² After 1943 however, as the state extended citizenship to Asian men, it could be said that the state had formally designated them as “male.”⁷³ However, the enfranchisement of Asian immigrants into citizenship was limited to an annual quota of only 105 immigrants.⁷⁴ Although the 1946 modifications of the Magnuson Act, referred to as the Chinese War Brides Act, exempted Chinese wives of U.S. citizens, the Act was largely intended to benefit U.S. military servicemen.⁷⁵ Facing a very low annual quota of 105, non-naturalized Chinese immigrants were therefore severely limited in establishing family formations and taking part in the naturalization process.

As several social theorists have noted, notions of citizenship are dependent on and supported by the idea of the patriarchal household and a “rationalized masculinity.”⁷⁶ Asian males, denied access to citizenship, are then racialized and gendered by social and legal forces—including immigration and citizenship policies that further truncated the development of family formations, or a “patriarchal household.” If bodily autonomy or integrity is a key component of citizenship rights, then Asian men lacked full rights.

Asian men would have their manhood denied when defined as “other” rather than citizens, or persons eligible for naturalization. Furthermore, citizenship and immigration laws have historically been connected to economic agendas; such practices are therefore anchored in the institutions of slavery and capitalist neocolonialism, and racism is often the by-product.⁷⁷ In the case of Asian men, a racialized gender was the by-product of exclusionary political and legal institutions. Thus, the state’s management of citizenship through exclusionary laws from the mid-1800s until the repeal acts of the mid-1900s aided in the racialization⁷⁸ and gendering of the Asian American male.

IV. Female Exclusion Laws and Antimiscegenation

From 1850 until the repeal acts of the 1940s, Asian immigrant masculinity was institutionally marked different from that of European-American “white” citizens owing in part to the communities that were available to Chinese men as a result of exclusion and miscegenation laws.⁷⁹ Such exclusion laws helped to emasculate Chinese men by restricting their access to heterosexual norms and ideals such as nuclear family formations. Fearful that Asians would establish strong communities, voting rights and gain political power, the Euro-American power structure deliberately denied Asians the ability to establish nuclear family formations. However, the antimiscegenation and exclusion laws that resulted from such economic and social fears have helped contribute to the construction of the emasculated Asian American male subject.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the number of Chinese women in America did not exceed 7.2 percent of the total Chinese population, although the percentage grew slowly during the twentieth century—mostly due to births on American soil.⁸⁰ On March 3, 1875, Congress passed the Page Law of 1875, banning the importation of Asian laborers from “China, Japan, or any oriental country,” and the importation of women “for the purpose of prostitution.”⁸¹ But the Page Law had very little impact in halting the immigration of Asian laborers. Mary Coolidge notes that the number of Asian immigrants arriving from Asian countries exceeded the total number for any other seven-year period prior to 1882 (and the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act).⁸² However, the impact of the Page Law was much greater with regard to female immigration. From 1876 to 1882, the percentage of Asian women entering the United States declined by 68 percent.⁸³

Although the act was specifically drafted to ban Asian prostitutes, the Page Law was often enforced as a general restriction on Asian female immigration, and thereby reducing the total number of Asian female immigrants.⁸⁴ The Page Act granted immigration officers the right to arbitrarily determine if Asian women who chose to emigrate were “persons of high moral character.”⁸⁵ However, since immigration officers often suspected all but the wives of merchants and diplomats of prostitution, immigration officials

implemented a system of examination that made the immigration of Asian women prohibitively difficult.⁸⁶

Furthermore, under the 1922 Cable Act,⁸⁷ a female citizen, whether white or nonwhite, who married an “alien ineligible to citizenship” lost her own United States citizenship.⁸⁸ This act also demonstrated that the provisions had a racialized designation; the act contained provisions for American born European and African women to reclaim their citizenship, however, there were no such provisions for American born Asian women.⁸⁹

Finally, wives of Chinese laborers were also banned, which helped to effectively halt the immigration of Asian women. The *Ab Quan*⁹⁰ and *Ab Moy*⁹¹ decisions in the 1880s, made it clear that “no woman married to a Chinese laborer could come into the United States, unless she herself could prove prior residence here”⁹²

Racialized designations in the statutes passed during this anti-Asian era were a familiar theme; further laws would include antimiscegenation measures to help diffuse any “threats to white racial purity.”⁹³ As Gary Okihiro concludes, “the ‘yellow peril’ was the despoiling threat posed by Asian men or an aggressive heathenism and barbarism to European women or a pure Christianity and virtuous civilization.”⁹⁴ As a result of Asia’s industrial progression of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Asian men were viewed as a threat to “civilized” European nations and were “reborn as predators of white women.”⁹⁵ It seems for a short period, Asian men were remasculinized to a small degree as threats to white female “purity” until the antimiscegenation and exclusion laws were enacted to suppress the “yellow peril.”

While Asian men were seen as a threat to the wall of racial purity, enacting antimiscegenation laws effectively barred the Chinese from “tainting” the racial “purity” of white women while also differentiating Asians from whites to support white supremacy and control over nonwhites.⁹⁶ According to Historians D’Emilio and Freedman: “European migrants to America had merged racial and sexual ideology in order to differentiate themselves from Indians and Blacks, [and] to strengthen the mechanisms of social control.”⁹⁷ Okihiro argues that as Asian countries became more industrialized in the nineteenth century and conflicts arose between Chinese immigrants and white labor, “[the] need to differentiate gained

new urgency during the nineteenth century.”⁹⁸ Although antimiscegenation laws were intended to bar Asian men from procreating with white women by differentiating Asians as “inferior,” the net effect of such laws have also helped contribute to the construction of the emasculated Asian male.

Maryland enacted the first antimiscegenation law in 1661,⁹⁹ prohibiting marriages between whites and blacks and by the nineteenth century, most states enacted similar laws.¹⁰⁰ In 1880, the California legislature enacted legislation prohibiting the issuance of any license, which authorized the “marriage of a white person with a negro, mulatto, or Mongolian.”¹⁰¹

By 1866, a similar antimiscegenation law was in place in Oregon,¹⁰² where the law prohibited marriages between whites and “Chinese, Hawaiians and Native Americans.”¹⁰³ These antimiscegenation laws, coupled with laws such as the Cable Act of 1922¹⁰⁴ (where a female citizen who married an “alien ineligible to citizenship” lost her own American citizenship) effectively limited opportunities for Asian male immigrants from procreating and establishing nuclear family formations. Thus, white women who wanted to marry Asian male immigrants were barred by antimiscegenation laws. Non-white women who married Asian male immigrants would lose their citizenship. In turn, the antimiscegenation and exclusion laws effectively limited the opportunities for Asian men to procreate by legally penalizing white and non-white women if they chose to marry an Asian immigrant.

The anti-Asian movement also proclaimed that Chinese labor would drive down the working wage and force the wives of white working men into prostitution.¹⁰⁵ The Page Act of 1875¹⁰⁶ and the exclusion of Chinese laborers’ spouses, effectively halted the entry of Chinese women which worked to produce Chinese enclaves as exclusive “bachelor communities.” Frank Chin acknowledges that these “bachelor” Chinatowns were products of racism and the notion that the Chinese themselves clustered together to preserve their alien culture is a myth.¹⁰⁷ According to a San Francisco newspaper, the *Marin Journal* of March 30, 1876, whites believed that a Chinese man had “neither wife nor child, nor expects any.”¹⁰⁸ Such isolated communities represented the “asexualization” of the Chinese male subject whereby Asian American men were barred from normative

heterosexual reproduction and entitlements to community in the United States.

The historical institutionalization of Chinese bachelor societies imposes an extension to the theoretical study of race and gender for Asian male subjects, and possibly to an extension into the realm of homosexuality.¹⁰⁹ These bachelor communities were physically and socially isolated, and can even be recognized as “queer” enclaves prohibited from heterosexual reproduction and entitlements to community. The Asian male, before the repeal acts of the 1940s, was denied the opportunity to establish families in America and extend successive generations among Asian immigrants—they were “stripped” of their manhood, both legally and socially.

V. The “Feminized Professions”

Although, prior to the early 1940s, Chinese immigrants were barred from becoming citizens, and laborers’ wives were excluded from entering the United States, “ethnic antagonism,” also contributed to the “feminization” of Asian American men by forcing them into professions typically associated with women:¹¹⁰ cook, waiter, tailor, and laundryman.¹¹¹ “Ethnic antagonism” in the mines, factories, and fields came in the form of anti-Chinese riots where Chinese immigrants were beaten and shot by white workers; Chinese labor camps and Chinatowns were raided, looted, and many buildings were set on fire.¹¹² The Chinese were virtually forced into self-employment, and many of the Chinese turned to the laundry industry.¹¹³ Although many Chinese men sought their fortunes in the gold mines during the gold rush, Chinese men were subject to a special tax that reduced their earnings and white miners expelled them from certain mining districts.¹¹⁴ Okihiro also notes that because of the dearth of women in nineteenth-century California, “work such as cooking, cleaning and washing were open to Chinese men, who according to a prevalent idea, were lesser men belonging to a feminized race.”¹¹⁵

A writer for *The Cosmopolitan* (then, a “family magazine”) described laundry work as a “woman’s occupation [and men did not] step into it for fear of losing their social standing.”¹¹⁶ In 1870, there were 2,899 Chinese laundry workers in California, comprising seventy-two percent of the

laundry labor force in California; twenty years later, the ratio of laundry workers to all workers in the Chinese immigrant population peaked to one out of every twelve.¹¹⁷

One of the reasons for such a high influx of Chinese as laundrymen is the fact that a laundry business could be opened with very little capital, and with very little command of the English language.¹¹⁸ But the Chinese were mostly constructively “forced” into such occupations; laundry work was “open” to the Chinese. One commentator noted, “[m]en of other nationalities who are jealous of the Chinese have raised such a great outcry about Chinese cheap labor that they have shut him out of working on farms or in factories or building railroads or making streets or digging sewers.”¹¹⁹ One old Chinese man recalled, “You couldn’t work in the cigar factories or the jute or woolen mills any more—all the Chinese had been driven out. About all they could be was laundrymen or vegetable peddlers then.”¹²⁰ Thus, the Chinese laundry “phenomenon” represented a retreat into self-employment in a restricted labor market, to perform a traditional role assigned to women.¹²¹

The high concentration of Asian American male immigrants in what are typically viewed as “feminized” professions further demonstrates the intersectionality of race and gender.¹²² Chinese male immigrants, before 1940, could be said to occupy a “feminized” position in relation to European-American males.¹²³ From a historical vantage point, these “feminized” professions have helped to create and stabilize an identity and image of the Asian American male subject that continues to linger today in various stereotypes.

Thus, Asian men’s domestic labor, their “feminization,” as Okihiro argues, helped to preserve and advance white manliness and free white men from “womanly” tasks.¹²⁴ The stereotypes that have continued to define and identify past and present Asian American male laborers to such low-paid “feminized” positions, provides compelling evidence of the means in which economically, and in turn, legislatively determined methods of racialization and gendering cling to the Asian male body.¹²⁵

VI. Conclusion

The legal and historical examples of the definitions of citizenship tied to immigration policies, the institutionalized exclusion of social space, and the social constructs of professions, have collectively coupled racial and gendered imperatives. These racial and gendered imperatives encourage us to understand that discourses on masculinity and race do not define Asian Americans of any particular group,¹²⁶ but encompass the larger Asian American constituency “whose status has been disavowed as full members of the U.S. nation.”¹²⁷

Asian American males, before the Magnuson Act repealed immigration exclusion in 1943,¹²⁸ occupied an emasculated, or even “feminized” position in relation to the “masculinized” white male citizen. America’s historical legal record, with regard to Asian Americans has so far been uneven and inconsistent. While Asian immigrants had no trouble entering America before the 1850s, the anti-Asian movement spawned soon after; almost 80 years would pass before the United States slowly cut away at the exclusion laws and finally repeal the exclusive immigration acts.

America’s complex legal history of social organization has placed emblematic significance on categories of gender, race and sexuality. From this standpoint, Asian American masculinity draws its definition from a multitude of strategies and a legal and social history that has racialized and gendered the Asian American male. As David Eng writes, “uneven national histories of anti-Asian discrimination might be described not only as being turned into the subject but also as being repressed and erased through the abstraction of that turn, the subjection of that subject.”¹²⁹ In this historical context, race and masculinity should not be viewed as a fixed notion; rather, they must be viewed as a configuration in which social and legal forces produce a dominant view of the Asian American male subject.

(Endnotes)

¹ Doctoral Candidate at the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Southern California and a graduate of the University of California, Hastings College of the Law.

² See GARY OKIHIRO, *COMMON GROUND: REIMAGINING AMERICAN HISTORY* (2001); BILL ONG HING, *MAKING AND REMAKING ASIAN AMERICA THROUGH IMMIGRATION POLICY 1850-1990* (1993); SUCHENG CHAN, *ASIAN AMERICANS: AN INTERPRETIVE HISTORY* (1991) [hereinafter *AN INTERPRETIVE HISTORY*]; RONALD TAKAKI, *STRANGERS FROM A DIFFERENT SHORE: A HISTORY OF ASIAN AMERICANS* (1989); ROGER DANIELS, *ASIAN AMERICA: CHINESE AND JAPANESE IN THE UNITED STATES SINCE 1850* (1988).

³ See, e.g., the feminist literary criticism in ELAINE H. KIM, *ASIAN AMERICAN LITERATURE: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE WRITINGS AND THEIR SOCIAL CONTEXT* (1982); see also SUSAN KOSHY, *SEXUAL NATURALIZATION: ASIAN AMERICANS AND MISCEGENATION* (2004); TRAISE YAMAMOTO, *MASKING SELVES, MAKING SUBJECTS: JAPANESE AMERICAN WOMEN, IDENTITY, AND THE BODY* (1999).

⁴ DAVID L. ENG, *RACIAL CASTRATION* 16 (2001) (The author notes that the “feminization of the Asian American male in the United States cultural imaginary typically results in his figuration as feminized, emasculated, or homosexualized”).

⁵ See John M. Kang, *Deconstructing the Ideology of White Aesthetics*, 2 MICH. J. RACE & L. 283, 345 (1997) (noting that “[e]arly White American rhetoric surrounding Black men focused on their masculine appearances, but the rhetoric surrounding Asian men emphasized either their asexuality or their perceived femininity”).

⁶ Jeff Yang, *Looking for a ‘Hangover’ Cure*, SFGATE (Jun. 3, 2011, 04:00 AM), <http://www.sfgate.com/entertainment/article/Looking-for-a-Hangover-cure-2358831.php>.

⁷ Staff Report, *Jason Whitlock Apologizes for Offensive Jeremy Lin Tweet*, SPORTINGNEWS (February 12, 2012, 4:28 PM), <http://aol.sportingnews.com/nba/story/2012-02-12/jason-whitlock-apologizes-for-offensive-jeremy-lin-tweet>.

⁸ Darren Hutchinson, *Ignoring the Sexualization of Race: Heteronormativity, Critical Race Theory and Anti-Racist Politics*, 47 BUFF. L. REV. 1, 91 (1999); see also Kang, *supra* note 5, at 347 (discussing the stereotypic view of effeminate Asian American men in twentieth century cinema, including the popular Charlie Chan character who “was depicted as sexless or effeminate”; and the Asian foreign

exchange student in *Sixteen Candles*, who is portrayed as “infantile, feeble, and weak”).

⁹ Frank Chin & Jeffrey Paul Chan, *Racist Love*, in *SEEING THROUGH SHUCK*, 68 (Richard Kostelanetz ed., 1972).

¹⁰ BIG AIIIEEEEE!: AN ANTHOLOGY OF CHINESE AMERICAN AND JAPANESE AMERICAN LITERATURE, at xiii (Jeffrey P. Chan et al. eds., 1991) (The authors explain that Charlie Chan is a fictional character created in the 1920s by writer Earl Derr Biggers. Chan is a detective for the Honolulu police and is one of the earliest representations of the “model minority”); see also JACHINSON CHAN, *CHINESE AMERICAN MASCULINITIES* 27 (2001) (Chan contends that Charlie Chan is associated with a non-sexualized image, and his physicality is linked to asexuality and a stereotypical cultural stoicism that promotes a submissive male identity. Fu Manchu, on the other hand, is a menacing criminal character created by Sax Rohmer and first appeared in *The Insidious Dr. Fu-Manchu* in 1913. Fu Manchu became an Asian stereotype associated with the “Yellow Peril.” The author notes that the Fu Manchu character “perpetuates the myth that the Chinese, and by extension, Asians, are trying to take over the Western World.”).

¹¹ Eileen Boris, *The Racialized Gendered State: Constructions of Citizenship in the United States*, 2 SOC. POL. INT’L STUD. GENDER, ST. & SOC’Y, 160-80 (1995).

¹² “Asian American” is a political term that has been used since the 1960s as a way to unify intra-ethnic Asian groups and create a panethnic coalition. Homogenizing Asian Americans as a monolithic group can be theoretically problematic and I am cognizant of how the historical specificity of each sub-group differs. Although this article reflects a strong reliance on Chinese American experiences and laws that directly affected Chinese Americans, I believe this historical context to be integral to the formation of a Pan-Asian masculinity. See Richard Fung, *Looking for My Penis: The Eroticized Asian in Gay Video Porno*, in *HOW DO I LOOK? QUEER VIDEO AND FILM*, 145, 147 (Bad Object-choices eds., 1991) (Fung notes that, “there are contradictory sexual associations based on nationality. So for example, a person could be seen as Japanese and somewhat kinky, or Filipino and ‘available.’ The very same person could be seen as ‘Oriental’ and therefore sexless”). Although there are ways in which the masculinities of intra-ethnic groups can be perceived differently, these perceptions can (and are often) conflated into the generalization that Asian men are sexless and thus, emasculated.

¹³ BILL ONG HING, *MAKING AND REMAKING ASIAN AMERICA THROUGH IMMIGRATION POLICY 1850-1990* 19 (1993).

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ HYUNG-CHAN KIM, A LEGAL HISTORY OF ASIAN AMERICANS 1790-1990 44 (1994).

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ HING, *supra* note 13, at 20.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.* at 21.

²⁰ MARY R. COOLIDGE, CHINESE IMMIGRATION 22 (1909) (Although the governor originally planned to provide such grants to the Chinese, no land grants were allocated to Chinese immigrants in the mid-1850s.).

²¹ DANIELS, *supra* note 2, at 35.

²² COOLIDGE, *supra* note 20, at 15-18; *see also* S.H. TSAI, THE CHINESE EXPERIENCE IN AMERICA 12-15 (1986).

²³ “[T]he origin of the term [“coolie”] is not clear. It . . . [was] adopted by the Europeans to describe workers doing heavy labor and then translated phonetically into Chinese characters meaning ‘bitter labor’—a person subjected to hard and exploitative labor” PETER KWONG, FORBIDDEN WORKERS: ILLEGAL CHINESE IMMIGRANTS AND AMERICAN LABOR 42 (1997).

²⁴ MILTON R. KONVITZ, THE ALIEN AND THE ASIATIC IN AMERICAN LAW 11-12 (1946).

²⁵ HING, *supra* note 13, at 20.

²⁶ COOLIDGE, *supra* note 20, at 52; *see also* ALEXANDER SAXTON, THE INDISPENSABLE ENEMY: LABOR AND THE ANTI-CHINESE MOVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA 60-65 (1971).

²⁷ *See* SUCHENG CHAN, ENTRY DENIED: EXCLUSION AND THE CHINESE COMMUNITY IN AMERICA 1882-1943 (1990).

²⁸ Act of the Third Session of the State Legislature, Chapter XXXVII, STATUTES OF CALIFORNIA 84 (1852).

²⁹ *People v. Hall*, 4 Cal. 399 (1854).

³⁰ TAKAKI, *supra* note 2, at 100-01.

³¹ DANIELS, *supra* note 2, at 36.

³² HING, *supra* note 13, at 23.

³³ TOMÁS ALMAGUER, RACIAL FAULT LINES: THE HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF WHITE SUPREMACY IN CALIFORNIA 6 (1994).

³⁴ ELMER CLARENCE SANDMEYER, THE ANTI-CHINESE MOVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA 45-46 (1939).

³⁵ *Id.* at 22.

³⁶ Naturalization Act of 1870, 16 Stat. 254 (1870). The Naturalization Act of 1870 amended the naturalization law to conform with the intent of the Reconstruction amendments and allowed “aliens of African nativity and descent” to become naturalized citizens. It amended the Nationality Act of 1790, which had limited citizenship through naturalization to “free white persons” (specifically

excluding African Americans and Native Americans). *See* Nationality Act of 1790, 1 Stat. 103 (1790).

³⁷ CHAN, *supra* note 27, at 12.

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ *See* *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886).

⁴⁰ *In Re Ah Yup*, 1 F. Cas. 223, 224 (C.C.D. Cal. 1878).

⁴¹ MARK TWAIN, ROUGHING IT 350 (1972).

⁴² Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, ch. 126, 22 Stat. 58 (restricting Chinese migration to the United States).

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ CHAN, *supra* note 27, at 31.

⁴⁵ *Id.*

⁴⁶ *See id.* (Return certificates included “all facts necessary for the identification of each of such Chinese laborers. If satisfied that the Chinese laborer was entitled to come ashore, the collector would file and cancel the return certificate.”).

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 31; *see also* SAXTON, *supra* note 26, at 14; STUART CREIGHTON MILLER, THE UNWELCOME IMMIGRANT: THE AMERICAN IMAGE OF THE CHINESE, 1785-1882 (1969).

⁴⁸ 23 Stat. 117, 8 U.S.C.A. § 269.

⁴⁹ CHAN, *supra* note 27, at 40 (A number of Chinese laborers, who were residents of California but who went to China before the passage of the 1882 act, would be denied reentry to the United States because they lacked a return certificate.).

⁵⁰ TAKAKI, *supra* note 2, at 111.

⁵¹ Geary Act of 1892, 27 Stat. 25 (1892).

⁵² HING, *supra* note 13, at 25.

⁵³ 32 Stat. 176 (1892).

⁵⁴ TAKAKI, *supra* note 2, at 110-11 (The author notes that exclusion acts enacted by Congress also reflected a broader concern than the Chinese presence. Congress was responding to the reality that the age of opportunity was coming to an end; society experienced “the discovery of unemployment.” Exclusionists warned that the presence of an “industrial army of Asiatic laborers” was aggravating the class conflict between white labor and white capital. They claimed that white workers had been “forced to the wall” by the Chinese laborers. Labor unions were striking and rioting across the country from Chicago’s Haymarket Riot of 1886 and the Pullman strikes of the 1890s. Removing the Chinese was more symptomatic of the class conflict between white labor and capital; excluding the Chinese was thus, a way for Congress to “remedy” the tension within the white working class.).

⁵⁵ TAKAKI, *supra* note 2, at 111-112.

⁵⁶ See JOHN W. HALL, *JAPAN FROM PREHISTORY TO MODERN TIMES* (1970); see also JAMES T. PATTERSON, *AMERICA IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY* (1983).

⁵⁷ Immigration Act of 1924, ch. 190, 43 Stat. 153 (1924).

⁵⁸ The law struck harshly at Jews, Italians, Slavs, and Greeks, who had immigrated in great numbers after 1890, and who would have been disfavored by such a quota. See *id.*

⁵⁹ HING, *supra* note 13, at 33.

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ EDWARD P. HUTCHINSON, *LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF AMERICAN IMMIGRATION POLICY 1798-1965* 264-65 (1981).

⁶² Act of Dec. 23, 1943, ch. 344, 57 Stat. 600. However, the Chinese were allotted a yearly quota of *only* 105 immigrants under the law.

⁶³ HING, *supra* note 13, at 36.

⁶⁴ Immigration Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-236; 79 Stat. 911 (1965).

⁶⁵ The definition of the “yellow peril” stereotype generally refers to Asian Americans as foreigners who hold lower ethical standards and as one author writes, “constitute a threat to American stability.” Rhoda J. Yen, *Racial Stereotyping of Asians and Asian Americans and Its Effect on Criminal Justice: A Reflection on the Wayne Lo Case*, 7 *ASIAN L.J.* 1, 6 (2000); see also Natsu Taylor Saito, *Model Minority, Yellow Peril: Functions of “Foreignness” in the Construction of Asian American Legal Identity*, 4 *ASIAN L.J.* 71, 71-72 (1997). Several works have also elaborated the representations of the “yellow peril” in film, theater, and television. See DARRELL Y. HAMAMOTO, *MONITORED PERIL: ASIAN AMERICANS AND THE POLITICS OF TV REPRESENTATION* (1994); GINA MARCHETTI, *ROMANCE AND THE “YELLOW PERIL”: RACE, SEX, AND DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES IN HOLLYWOOD FICTION* (1993); JAMES MOY, *MARGINAL SIGHTS: STAGING THE CHINESE IN AMERICA* (1993).

⁶⁶ See LISA LOWE, *CRITICAL TERRAINS: FRENCH AND BRITISH ORIENTALISMS* (1991).

⁶⁷ YEN, *supra* note 65, at 6.

⁶⁸ LISA LOWE, *IMMIGRANT ACTS* 11 (1996).

⁶⁹ HING, *supra* note 13, at 22.

⁷⁰ Nationality Act of 1790, 1 Stat. 103 (1790).

⁷¹ Naturalization Act of 1870, 16 Stat. 254 (1870).

⁷² Act of Dec. 23, 1943, ch. 344, 57 Stat. 600.

⁷³ LOWE, *supra* note 68, at 11 (Lowe notes that the 1946 modification of the Magnuson Act exempted Chinese wives of U.S. citizens from the annual quota (of 105), but as the law changed to reclassify “Chinese immigrants” as eligible

for naturalization and citizenship, female immigrants were not included in this reclassification but were in effect specified only in relation to the changed status of the “Chinese immigrant” who was legally presumed to be male); see also DAVID ROEDIGER, *THE WAGES OF WHITENESS: RACE AND THE MAKING OF THE AMERICAN WORKING CLASS* (1991).

⁷⁴ Act of Dec. 23, 1943, 78th Congress, ch. 344, § 1, 57 Stat. 600.

⁷⁵ Act of Aug. 9, 1946, 79th Congress, 60 Stat. 975.

⁷⁶ See R.W. CONNELL, *GENDER AND POWER: SOCIETY, THE PERSON AND SEXUAL POLITICS* (1987); Chandra Talpade Mohanty, *Cartographies of Struggle*, in *THIRD WORLD WOMEN AND THE POLITICS OF FEMINISM* 21, 21-22 (Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, Lourdes Torres eds., 1991) (The author argues that the intersection of patriarchy and a racialized capitalist state produces a definition of citizenship that is always a gendered and racial formation. Mohanty further argues that the contemporary Euro-American state operates through an establishment of a “gender regime:” A regime whereby the state is the primary organizer of the power relations of gender. In other words, the state delimits the boundaries of personal/domestic violence, protects property, criminalizes ‘deviant’ and ‘stigmatized’ sexuality, embodies masculinized hierarchies (e.g. the gendered bureaucracy of the state personnel).).

⁷⁷ Mohanty, *supra* note 76 at 23-24.

⁷⁸ *Id.* at 24-25 (“A comparison of the history of the immigration of white people and of the corresponding history of slavery and the indentured labor of people of color in the United States indicates a clear pattern of racialization tied to the ideological and economic exigencies of the state. White men were considered ‘free labor’ and could take a variety of jobs.” Asian immigrants however, were paid much lower wages than whites to work in mines and railroads. Furthermore, the history of immigration and naturalization laws have intersected with the process of racialization, e.g., the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was the first law to exclude individuals based on nationality); see Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, ch. 126, 22 Stat. 58.

⁷⁹ LOWE, *supra* note 68, at 11.

⁸⁰ CHAN, *supra* note 27, at 94. In 1920, seventy years after Chinese immigration began, women numbered fewer than ten percent of the Chinese American population. See DANIELS, *supra* note 2, at 16.

⁸¹ An Act Supplementary to the Acts in Relation to Immigration (Page Law) sect. 141, 18 Stat. 477 (1873-Mar. 1875); see George Anthony Peffer, *Forbidden Families: Emigration Experiences of Chinese Women Under the Page*

Law, 1875-1882, 6 J. AM. ETHNIC HIST. 28 (1986) (noting that the ban on the importation of Asian laborers carried with it a relatively light punishment, and therefore, the Page Act failed miserably in its attempt to halt the immigration of Chinese laborers).

⁸² COOLIDGE, *supra* note 20, at 492.

⁸³ *Id.* at 502.

⁸⁴ See Peffer, *supra* note 81 (The author's examination of the consul administrations responsible for all prospective Chinese immigrants reveal that enforcement of the Page Law amounted to a more general restriction of Chinese female immigration.); see also Mohanty, *supra* note 76, at 25.

⁸⁵ See Peffer, *supra* note 81.

⁸⁶ See *id.*

⁸⁷ Act of Sept. 22, 1922, ch. 411, § 6, 42 Stat. 1021

⁸⁸ AN INTERPRETIVE HISTORY, *supra* note 2, at 105-107; HING, *supra* note 13, at 21-26.

⁸⁹ LOWE, *supra* note 68, at 188 n.37.

⁹⁰ In re Ah Quan, 21 F. 182 (C.C.D. Cal. 1884).

⁹¹ Cheong Ah Moy v. United States, 113 U.S. 216 (1885).

⁹² CHAN, *supra* note 27, at 112.

⁹³ TAKAKI, *supra* note 2, at 101.

⁹⁴ OKIHIRO, *supra* note 2, at 105.

⁹⁵ *Id.* at 104 (The concern involved "a breach in the wall of racial 'purity' and sexual privilege.").

⁹⁶ *Id.* at 110.

⁹⁷ JOHN D'EMILIO AND ESTELLE B. FREEDMAN, INTIMATE MATTERS: A HISTORY OF SEXUALITY IN AMERICA 86 (1988) (The merger of racial and sexual ideology in order to differentiate whites from nonwhites justified "the appropriation of Indian and Mexican lands through the destruction of native peoples and their cultures.").

⁹⁸ OKIHIRO, *supra* note 2, at 110.

⁹⁹ See Proceedings of the General Assembly, 1637-1664, at 533-34.

¹⁰⁰ TAKAKI, *supra* note 2, at 101. By the time the U.S. Supreme Court finally declared antimiscegenation laws unconstitutional in *Loving v. Virginia*, thirty-nine states had enacted antimiscegenation laws. Leti Volpp, *American Mestizo: Filipinos and Antimiscegenation Laws in California*, 33 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. 195, 798 (2000).

¹⁰¹ Megumi Dick Osumi, *Asians and California's Anti-Miscegenation Laws*, in ASIAN AND PACIFIC AMERICAN EXPERIENCES: WOMEN'S PERSPECTIVES 2, 6 (Nobuya Tsuchida ed., 1982) (citing section 60 of the California Civil Code).

¹⁰² 1866 Or. Law section 2163 (prohibiting marriage between any white person and any person with one-quarter or more negro, Chinese, or Kanuka blood or any person having more than one-quarter Indian blood). Section 2164 provided for imprisonment for up to one year for knowingly intermarrying.

¹⁰³ R.J. Mooney, *Matthew Keady and the Federal Judicial Response to Racism in the Early West*, in 63 OR. L. REV. 561-637 (1984)

¹⁰⁴ Act of Sept. 22, 1922, ch. 411, § 6, 42 Stat. 1021

¹⁰⁵ RONALD TAKAKI, IRON CAGES: RACE AND CULTURE IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY AMERICA 217 (1979) [hereinafter IRON CAGES].

¹⁰⁶ Act of Mar. 3, 1875, ch. 141, 18 Stat. 477.

¹⁰⁷ FRANK CHIN, THE CHICKENCOOP CHINAMAN / THE YEAR OF THE DRAGON, at x (1981).

¹⁰⁸ SANDMEYER, *supra* note 34, at 25.

¹⁰⁹ Jennifer Ting, *Bachelor Society: Deviant Heterosexuality and Asian American Historiography*, in PRIVILEGING POSITIONS: THE SITES OF ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES, 271-79 (Gary Okihiro ed., 1995) (Ting has studied the formation of bachelor communities as queer spaces.).

¹¹⁰ LOWE, *supra* note 68, at 11. See also Mohanty, *supra* note 76, at 22 (The author notes that contemporary liberal notions of citizenship are constitutively dependent on and supported by the idea of the patriarchal household and formulated around the notion of a "rationalized" hegemonic masculinity. This rationalized masculinity is evident in the bureaucratic sexual division of labor of people employed by the state. The majority of the political elite, judiciary and military are male while women are overwhelmingly employed in the human services and secretarial arms of the state.); TAKAKI, *supra* note 2, at 92-93 (Takaki notes that the "Chinese laundryman" was an American phenomenon); Lee Chew, *Life Story of a Chinaman*, in THE LIFE STORIES OF UNDISTINGUISHED AMERICANS AS TOLD BY THEMSELVES 289-90 (Hamilton Holt ed., 1906) (Lee Chew, who came to America in the 1860s writes that "[t]he Chinese laundryman does not learn his trade in China; there were no laundries in China. All the Chinese laundrymen here [in America] were taught in the first place by American women just as I was taught.").

¹¹¹ LOWE, *supra* note 68, at 11.

¹¹² CAREY MCWILLIAMS, FACTORIES IN THE FIELD: THE STORY OF MIGRATORY FARM LABOR IN CALIFORNIA 74-75 (1971).

¹¹³ *Id.*

¹¹⁴ OKIHIRO, *supra* note 2, at 76.

¹¹⁵ *Id.*

¹¹⁶ *The Chinese in New York*, THE COSMO., vol. 5, no. 4 298 (June 1888).

¹¹⁷ Paul M. Ong, *Chinese Laundries as an Urban Occupation in Nineteenth Century California*, in THE ANNALS OF THE CHINESE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST 72 (Douglas W. Lee ed., 1983); see also VICTOR G. NEE AND BRETT DE BARY NEE, LONGTIME CALIFORNIA: A DOCUMENTARY STUDY OF AN AMERICAN CHINATOWN (1972) (documenting the range of professions undertaken by Chinese male immigrants in San Francisco's Chinatown).

¹¹⁸ TAKAKI, *supra* note 2, at 93 (“Unlike the retail or restaurant business, a laundry could be opened with a small capital outlay The requirements were minimal: a stove, trough, dry-room, sleeping apartment, and sign.”).

¹¹⁹ Chew, *supra* note 110, at 290.

¹²⁰ TAKAKI, *supra* note 2, at 93.

¹²¹ IRON CAGES, *supra* note 105, at 227-33 (Addressing the work of Bret Harte, the author writes: “The dichotomization between men (the world of business) and women (the world of home) seems to have become regionalized, located respectively in the West and the East.

And in the male society of the mining camp, white men turn to the Chinese—to See Yup—to do their laundry. Indeed, time and again, nineteenth-century American newspapers praised Chinese men in factories for being so ‘obedient,’ ‘acquiescent’ and ‘hard working’ in serving the interest of their white capitalist bosses. When the Chinese workers were seen as an economic threat to the white laborers, the rhetoric was not that of a masculine group of Asian workers. The image was one of effeminate Asian men who would outperform their white counterparts—men who persistently work within the system, without complaint or unions.”).

¹²² ENG, *supra* note 4, at 17.

¹²³ LOWE, *supra* note 68, at 11.

¹²⁴ OKIHIRO, *supra* note 2, at 76.

¹²⁵ For a critical analysis of these stereotypes in the popular and mass media, see MOY, *supra* note 63; HAMAMOTO, *supra* note 65; ROBERT G. LEE, ORIENTALS: ASIAN AMERICANS IN POPULAR CULTURE (1999).

¹²⁶ Such as interethnic Asian, gay and lesbian groups.

¹²⁷ ENG, *supra* note 3, at 18.

¹²⁸ Act of Dec. 23, 1943, ch. 344, 57 Stat. 600.

¹²⁹ ENG, *supra* note 4, at 18.