

CALIFORNIA BLACK PRESS RE- SPONSE TO CHINESE CITIZEN- SHIP, 1865-88

Introduction by Herodotus Editorial Board

Tinuola Dada's engaging paper analyzes how black newspapers in Northern California advanced Anglo American narratives of Chinese racial and moral inferiority at a time when California and the federal government denied Chinese immigrants citizenship rights. Analyzing black newspapers in operation from the Reconstruction era through the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, Dada challenges the notion that, in her words, "racial oppression necessarily produces racial solidarity." Rather than advocate for a fellow racial minority, African Americans, Dada shows, saw Chinese immigrants as a threat to the political rights they had recently acquired and were struggling to preserve. Ultimately, Dada's paper demonstrates that anti-Chinese sentiment of the nineteenth century crossed racial barriers, at times aligning an oppressed racial group with its oppressors.

California Black Press Response to Chinese Citizenship, 1865-88

Tinuola Dada

Introduction

The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution was ratified July 9th, 1868, invalidating the Supreme Court's ruling in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* that determined that African Americans could not be citizens of the United States. Section I of the Amendment defines United States citizenship as applying to "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof."¹ While the Fourteenth Amendment was intended to provide citizenship for former slaves and their descendants, the broad language of Section 1 soon became relevant to other groups arguing for citizenship rights. In 1898, the Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* solidified the concept of "birthright citizenship," in this case confirming citizenship rights for an American-born child of Chinese immigrants. Superficially, the Supreme Court cases that bookended this period suggested a progressive movement in ideas of citizenship, especially for nonwhites. However, these years saw powerful anti-Chinese sentiment and legislation resulting in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the first law to prevent all members of a specific ethnic or national group from immigrating to the United States. These anti-Chinese policies were often rooted in white supremacy and therefore also impacted African Americans. Although 30 years after its adoption the Fourteenth Amendment ensured Chinese-American citizenship, in the interim, anti-Chinese attitudes threatened the rights the amendment guaranteed to African Americans.

This paper will investigate how the California black press responded to the question of Chinese-American citizenship between 1865 and 1888. In 1860, 4,086 African Americans lived in California, a population that grew slowly until the twentieth century. Comparatively, California's Chinese population grew rap-

1 U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1.

idly in the 1860s, with nearly 60,000 Chinese in the state by 1870.² Despite the small black population, by 1865 two black newspapers, the *Elevator* and the *Pacific Appeal*, were operating in San Francisco. Black newspapers like these helped establish a sense of collective identity among African-Americans, for they regularly received correspondence from writers across the country and printed news relevant to the black community. They also aimed to produce narratives of black racial progress and condemn anti-black legislation and policies.³ The *Elevator*, for example, sub-titled itself "A Weekly Journal of Progress," with the slogan "Equality before the law." Similarly, the *Pacific Appeal* called itself the "Official organ of the People of Color in the State of California, and of the American Colored People on the Pacific Coast." Thus, the black press not only created a space for black public discourse but was also central to black identity.

This paper begins with Reconstruction, when African-American and Chinese civil rights were directly and comparatively debated, and ends just after the Chinese Exclusion Act. Although Chinese-American citizenship was contested up to the *Wong Kim Ark* decision, only the *Elevator* and the *San Francisco Vindicator*—another black newspaper—were operational through the 1890s, with later issues of the surviving journals not well preserved. Nonetheless, the period this paper examines includes the crescendo of the anti-Chinese movement and demonstrates how African Americans' struggle for civil rights had to emphasize its place within the racial and cultural barriers to citizenship anti-Chinese advocacy had erected. Rather than produce interracial solidarity, the concept of citizenship following the ratification of the fourteenth amendment forced racialized groups to manufacture particular—and often conflicting—images of themselves and others in the struggle for inclusion.⁴ Once the exclusion of the Chinese from citizenship began to impact black political rights, nineteenth-century black newspapers both rejected attempts to conflate black and Chinese rights and employed the logic of the

2 Arnold Shankman, "Black on Yellow: Afro-Americans View Chinese Americans, 1850-1935," *Phylon* 39, no. 1, (1978), 2.

3 Helen Jun, "Black Orientalism: Nineteenth-Century Narratives of Race and U.S. Citizenship," *American Quarterly* 58, no. 4, (2006), 1053.

4 *Ibid.*, 1049.

anti-Chinese movement to craft a narrative of Chinese moral inferiority. That narrative coexisted with an emphasis on black moral, political, and cultural development explicitly aligned with white American values.

Disconnecting Black and Chinese Citizenship

At the end of the Civil War, Chinese and African-American civil rights became increasingly legally and discursively connected. While national politics primarily focused on the Freedmen, western states like California became concerned that the broad language of the Reconstruction Amendments would grant civil rights to Chinese immigrants. In 1867, for example, Governor Henry Haight opposed granting suffrage to blacks out of fear that doing so would lead to Chinese enfranchisement. In his inaugural address, he declared that Californians would never allow either group to vote or hold office as they were both “inferior races.”⁵ Two years later, as Congress was debating the Fifteenth Amendment, Senator Eugene Casserly of California rejected the Amendment during a speech in San Francisco on the basis of its implications for Chinese suffrage.⁶ Californian legislators’ challenges to the Reconstruction Amendments were especially dangerous given the state’s significant electoral power. According to Mary Roberts Coolidge’s ‘California thesis’ for the Chinese Exclusion Act, “the struggle on the part of both parties...to carry California became fiercer and fiercer and gave her demands for legislation a prominence in the national legislature out of proportion to their normal value.”⁷ White newspapers also disseminated this connection between African-American and Chinese suffrage. An editorial from the California-based *Democratic Standard* in 1867 argued that “a vote for those who stand on the Congressional reconstruction platform is an expression of opinion in favor of allowing negro and Chinese suffrage.”⁸ In 1866, the *Weekly Colusa Sun* challenged African Americans to prove themselves as comparatively worthy of citizenship, writing, “We have not deemed it at all necessary to

5 Shankman, 6.

6 “A Party of Broken Pledges,” *Sonoma Democrat* (Santa Rosa, CA), Aug. 21, 1869.

7 Mary Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration* (New York: Holt, 1909), 179.

8 “Negro Suffrage,” *Democratic Standard* (Healdsburg, CA), Nov. 14, 1867.

show the better qualities of the Chinese. Let the negroites attempt to show the meritorious exploits of the negro, and we will tilt against them with bit of Chinese history.”⁹

In response to these legislative debates and changes, black newspapers in California challenged the idea that the Reconstruction Amendments could extend rights to the Chinese. In the late 1860s, black newspapers sought to discredit politicians connecting the Reconstruction Amendments and Chinese political rights. An article from the *Elevator* on gubernatorial-candidate Henry Haight’s opposition to black suffrage responded, “Mr. Haight, the great apostle of the Democracy, in his recent speeches continually intermingles the question of negro suffrage with Chinese immigration...There is no analogy between the cases.”¹⁰ After Henry Haight won California’s 1867 Governor’s race, the paper further undermined him and the logic he used to get elected. Responding to Governor Haight’s inaugural address, the *Elevator* wrote, “Governor Haight seems to think that he was elected on those issues... We can assure him the contrary...and we can further inform him that if the Democratic party had had any hopes of success they would never have nominated H. H. Haight.”¹¹ Two years later, the *Elevator* also condemned Governor Haight’s speech attaching Chinese suffrage to the Fifteenth Amendment, writing, “With all due respect to the Governor, we must be allowed to say that he has less brains or less honesty than we gave him credit for, if he entertained that opinion...no such question...lie[s] concealed within the Fifteenth Amendment; and that to contend that it does, is unmitigated “bosh,” and distinctly demagogical.”¹² Black newspapers propagated these arguments in tandem with Republican papers. In 1869, the *Elevator* republished an article from the *Solano Herald* expressing frustration that the California Democratic party had “chosen to go before the people upon the single issue of opposition to the proposed Fifteenth Amendment,” and called the language

9 “Is the Negro Superior to the Chinaman,” *Weekly Colusa Sun* (Colusa, CA), Feb. 3, 1866.

10 “Democratic Logic,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Aug. 30, 1867.

11 “Inaugural Address of Gov. Haight,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA) Dec. 13, 1867.

12 “The Governor and the Chinese,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Aug. 27, 1869.

of the Amendment “so plain that the wayfaring man, though fool, need not err therein...all the talk and excitement of the Democratic party about negro office-holding and Chinese suffrage, is not only the sheerest nonsense, but it is brazen faced falsehood.”¹³

Black newspapers also criticized their white counterparts for legitimizing these politicians’ arguments. Days after the 1867 Governor’s election, the *Pacific Appeal* criticized white newspapers for using the narrative of Chinese enfranchisement to explain the results, writing, “Some [newspapers] have stated that it was fear of making the Chinese citizens...All are aware that the real issue in the nation at present is hinged upon the reconstruction measures of Congress, whose policy is to induce all the loyal States to adopt Negro Suffrage, and not Chinese citizenship or Chinese suffrage.”¹⁴ In a sidebar in the *Elevator*, one writer made this criticism even more explicit and severe: “A lie well stuck to is sometimes as good as the truth if you can only make people believe it,” he wrote. “The Democratic papers will insist that the 15th amendment confers citizenship on the Chinese, notwithstanding it bears evidence of the contrary...But do they expect anybody to believe it, except the ignorant fools of their own party, who would believe anything?”¹⁵ The *Elevator* was willing to speak out against journals representing both sides of the political aisle. In an 1866 article, for example, the *Elevator* challenged the *Morning Call*, a Republican journal out of San Francisco, saying that “there is no danger to be apprehended from the Chinese ever becoming naturalized citizens of the United States.” The *Elevator* continued, writing that “The [*Morning Call*] seems to be imbued with the idea that this is the white man’s country, and that Negroes and Chinamen have no political rights which white men are bound to respect. We make no issue on the Chinese question; let them ‘paddle their own canoe.’”¹⁶ Rather than conceding that their position required advocacy of Chinese citizenship rights, the California black press denied the premise of anti-Chinese logic by discrediting politicians and newspapers propagating such ideas.

13 “Fifteenth Amendment,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Aug. 27, 1869.

14 “The Interpretation of the Recent Vote” *Pacific Appeal* (San Francisco, CA), Sep.14, 1867.

15 “Untitled,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Jun. 11 1869.

16 “Untitled,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Jan. 19, 1866.

California's black press also proposed its own policy and advocacy solutions to resolve the "Chinese Question." In a letter to the *Elevator*, W.H. Hall, a member of the San Francisco Executive Committee of the California State Convention of Colored Citizens, advocated for a more direct appeal to white voters by encouraging "one or more capable colored men to canvas among the white voters with convincing arguments refuting the Chinese heresy."¹⁷ Black newspapers also submitted petitions to the state government, proposing policies that circumvented the roadblock of anti-Chinese sentiment. Following the 1867 election, the *Elevator* submitted a petition to the California Legislature proposing a change to the State Constitution that would allow the state government to confer voting rights to African Americans. While admitting that Governor Haight's election may indicate that white Californians were opposed to black suffrage, the paper maintained that "that the question was not fairly submitted to them. The issue was on striking the word "white" from the Constitution, and the Negro and Mongolian were thereby connected, thus classifying native Christian Americans with foreign heathens... we believe had not the Mongolian question have been agitated, nothing would have been said concerning negro suffrage."¹⁸ The paper argued that its proposal only asked for the possibility of allowing a future legislature to vote on black suffrage. As for the question of whether doing so would admit Chinese voters, the paper responded, "Our proposition obviates that."¹⁹ California's black press was well aware of the deleterious effect of anti-Chinese sentiment on progressing African-American civil rights and consequently responded by changing the narrative and presentation of policy proposals to exclude the "Chinese Question" from the discussion. This strategy, accompanied by simultaneous Republican efforts to disarticulate the Chinese from legislation that enfranchised black Americans, proved effective. Although both the Republican and Democratic parties adopted anti-Chinese platforms during the 1871 gubernatorial campaign, these platforms included neither the earlier conflation of black and Chinese inferiority nor the double

17 "Letter from W.H. Hall: Fifteenth Amendment" *The Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Jun. 25, 1869.

18 "Our Petition" *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Oct. 11, 1867.

19 "Open Questions" *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Nov. 8, 1867.

objection to black and Chinese suffrage.²⁰

Chinese Heathens and Black Christians

In order to further distance themselves from the Chinese, black newspapers began to employ the rhetoric of the anti-Chinese movement in its representations of Chinese immigrants. White nativists characterized Chinese immigrants as an invasive "yellow peril" that posed a serious moral and economic threat to both white laborers and American society. They questioned whether they could "compete with a barbarous race, devoid of energy and careless of the State's weal? Sunk in their own debasement, having no voice in government, how long would it be ere ruin would swamp the capitalist and poor man together?"²¹ White journalists, politicians, and health officials coordinated to establish Chinatown as "an alien space of filth, disease, and contamination."²² Sensationalist descriptions of Chinatown presented it as "ankle-deep in loathsome slush, with ceilings dripping with percolations of other nastiness above, [and] with walls slimy with the clamminess of Asiatic diseases."²³ The predominantly male composition of the Chinese immigrant community and images of Chinese men as opium addicts and sexual predators of young white girls only fueled the discourse of moral panic in areas surrounding Chinatown.²⁴

Most notably, white Americans often made these representations comparatively between African Americans and Chinese immigrants. In response to the *Weekly Colusa Sun's* challenge to "tell us in what respect the negro is better qualified for an elector than the Chinaman?" the *Marysville Daily Appeal*—a Republican paper—wrote, "The Chinese are heathen, while the negroes are Christians. The negroes are natives of the United States, while the Chinese are Asiatic barbarians. The negroes understand the principles of our government, while the Chinese know nothing about it. Three great, unanswerable reasons in favor of the negroes over

20 Najia Aarim-Heriot, *Chinese Immigrants, African Americans, and Racial Anxiety in the United States, 1848-82* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 163.

21 Jun, "Black Orientalism," 1051.

22 Ibid.; Philip Bell, "The Chinese Crusade" *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Jun. 14, 1873.

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid.

Chinese.”²⁵ Similar arguments continued to be made even at the end of the Reconstruction period. In a statement before the senate in 1877, Reverend Blakeslee, a white minister, argued for Chinese exclusion, saying,

Slavery compelled the adoption of Christian forms of worship...Slavery took the heathens and by force made them Americans in feeling, tastes, habits, language, sympathy, religion and spirit; first fitting them for citizenship, and then giving them the vote. The Chinese feel no such force, but remaining in character and life the same as they were in Old China, unprepared for citizenship and adverse in spirit to our institutions.²⁶

As Reverend Blakeslee’s statement indicates, Christianity was central not only to Chinese Exclusion but also to the justification for black citizenship. The reverend ultimately positioned Christian conversion as the foundation of black moral development and suitability for citizenship.

The California black press adopted the same rhetoric and reasoning. In a letter to the editor of the *Elevator*, a San Francisco resident described Chinatown as “filth actually personified, and the stench which arises and penetrates the olfactory nerves is something perfectly horrible,...he never passed through more filthy,—a more disgraceful locality to any juvenile and enterprising city than the Chinese quarter in San Francisco!”²⁷ Another writer to the *Elevator* called the Chinese “degraded people who, for three thousand years have maintained a wall of superstition and error against our revealed faith.”²⁸ The characterization of Chinese immigrants as ‘idolatrous’ or ‘heathens’ was consistently present in the black press and indicated an effort to distance blacks from the dangerous implications of anti-Chinese legislation that occupied California’s political discourse.²⁹ One telling article published in 1867 denied any link between the black and Chinese situations, arguing that

25 “Untitled” *Marysville Daily Appeal* (Marysville, CA) Jan. 27, 1866 Jun, “Black Orientalism,” 1047.

27 “The Gentile Chinees,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Mar. 19, 1873.

28 “Freedmen vs. Chinamen,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Dec. 17, 1869.

29 “Legislating on the Negro,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), Dec. 15, 1865.

“the Chinese are foreigners, unacquainted with our system of government, adhering to their own habits and customs, and of heathen or idolatrous faith. The negroes ask for the rights of citizenship as their just due.”³⁰ In a letter to the National Labor Convention of Colored men of the United States, republished in the *Elevator*, frequent contributor W.H. Hall made explicit the case for African-American rights in contrast to those of Chinese immigrants. According to Hall, while African Americans “seek to be an integral part of the nation,” the Chinese, “are clannish, avaricious, and antagonistic in their social intercourse, and the danger is impending.”³¹ In emphasizing Chinese degeneracy and peril to civilized society, these authors seized the rhetorical opportunity presented by white writers to comparatively secure black citizenship through the legacy of Christianity as the gatekeeper to citizenship.

The idea of the “Chinese heathen” became a powerful trope for the black community, whose assertions of humanity and claims to citizenship had historically been rooted in Christian morality. Much of the abolitionist movement relied on religious rhetoric, arguing that slavery was antithetical to Christian principles. After emancipation, Christian doctrine and monogenesis presented the best theoretical challenge to scientific racism.³² As a result, nineteenth-century narratives of racial equality encouraged middle-class values—the authoritative signifiers of respectability and humanity. While racist discourses characterized blacks as immoral, irrational, and violent savages unsuited for citizenship or government, the educated black community responded by promoting “values of temperance, thrift, chastity, and patriarchal domesticity as a means of proving their worthiness and entitlement to citizenship.”³³ With African Americans continued to inhabit a politically, socially, and economically precarious position after the Civil War, they sought to strengthen the connection between Christianity and the discourse of citizenship. Moreover, the sharp contrast embodied in the trope of the backwards Chinese “heathen” allowed for the discursive production of black citizens who could be incorpo-

30 “Democratic Logic,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA) Aug. 30, 1867.

31 W.H. Hall “Freedmen vs. Chinamen” *Elevator* (San Francisco), Nov. 19, 1869.

32 Jun., 1056.

33 Ibid.

rated into the narrative of Western historical progress.³⁴

The Problem of Chinese Exclusion

The language of "yellow peril" persisted in the California black press throughout the Reconstruction period into the Gilded Age. In 1887, the *San Francisco Vindicator*, a black newspaper established in 1884, declared, "'The Chinese must go.' So says Dr. O'Donnell and so says the Vindicator. They are polluting the air and everything else. In fact, to come into contact with them at all is to be polluted."³⁵ However, as the anti-Chinese movement intensified, the California black press was divided in its response to the resulting policy changes.

At the state constitutional convention of 1879, California took its most dramatic stance against Chinese immigrants. Article XIX of the updated constitution established explicitly anti-Chinese labor policies and, most broadly, determined that, "the Legislature shall prescribe all necessary regulations for the protection of the State, . . . from the burdens and evils arising from the presence of aliens who are or may become vagrants, paupers, mendicants, criminals, or invalids afflicted with contagious or infectious diseases."³⁶ This language was especially insidious for African Americans, as laws employing similar rhetoric were undermining black civil rights in the South; almost all of the former Confederate states had instituted black codes criminalizing African Americans for any number of behaviors—including vagrancy—in order to reestablish quasi-slavery using the convict lease system.³⁷ The new Constitution also declared that "the presence of foreigners ineligible to become citizens of the United States is declared to be dangerous to the well-being of the State, and the Legislature shall discourage their immigration by all the means within its power."³⁸

Noticing the potentially broad implications of these

34 Ibid.

35 "Untitled," *San Francisco Vindicator* (San Francisco, CA), Jun. 25, 1887.

36 Calif. Const. art. XIX, § 1 (1879, repealed 1952).

37 Jun, "Black Orientalism," 1055; Douglas Blackmon, *Slavery by Another Name: The Re-Enslavement of Black Americans from the Civil War to World War II* (New York: Random House, 2008).

38 "A Chance for Work," *San Francisco Vindicator* (San Francisco), Nov. 17, 1888

changes, the *Pacific Appeal* opposed the new constitution as “insidious. It is evasive...It provides that ‘no native of China’ shall be eligible to the right of suffrage in this State. Then if a white or colored man resident in China should become the father of child; the latter [would be] debarred the privilege of citizenship in California. The new Constitution is too verbose...We are opposed to its adoption.”³⁹ A sudden change in black attitudes toward the Chinese fails to adequately explain the black press’ response to Chinese exclusion in the state constitution. More specifically, despite the *Elevator* and the *Pacific Appeal*’s opposition to Chinese exclusion, these papers made clear that their position was not based on sympathy for the Chinese.⁴⁰ Moreover, black writers’ characterizations of the Chinese as idolatrous heathens continued into the twentieth century.⁴¹ Rather, Chinese exclusion presented both a direct and indirect threat to black rights. During a Congressional debate on amending the Chinese Exclusion Act, for example, one representative observed that “everyone knows that the negro type is certainly not higher than the Mongolian or yellow type...Let us, I say, if we have any law on this subject, have a consistent law that will exclude whole races and whole nations.”⁴² With the passage of Chinese exclusion legislation explicitly placing racial limits on U.S. citizenship, the black press’ opposition to these policies was rooted in the potential threat they posed to African-American rights.

The mixed response of California’s black papers exemplifies the complex implications of Chinese exclusion for black citizenship. Some black newspapers saw Chinese exclusion as an opportunity to improve economic conditions facing blacks. For example, in the aftermath of the Chinese Exclusion Act, the *San Francisco Vindicator* wrote, “Chinese laborers are becoming scarce...this state of things opens up a great field for colored labor...A business-like enterprise to bring to bring laborers from the

39 P.J.C., “The New Constitution,” *Pacific Appeal* (San Francisco, CA), Apr. 5, 1879; see also “A Constitutional Conundrum,” *Pacific Appeal* (San Francisco, CA), Mar. 19, 1879.

40 “Have Chinese Any Rights Which Americans Are Bound to Respect,” *Elevator* (San Francisco, CA), May 24, 1873.

41 Jun, 1061.

42 Representative Lyman, speaking on HR. 1798, 48th Cong., 1st sess., *Congressional Record* 15, pt. 4 (May 3, 1884): H 3763.

Southern States to California, pushed with energy, would certainly be successful."⁴³ Although Chinese exclusion signified the racialization of U.S. citizenship, economic competition from Chinese immigrants presented a countervailing threat to the promises of Reconstruction. In a letter to the *Elevator*, W. H. Hall summarized black anxieties during the period:

"It is impossible to reconcile the movement to introduce thousands of pagan, untried laborers into a field of action already abundantly supplied, and where competition will surely bring confusion and ruin, only as a measure full of evil and instituted from the revenge of those un-repenting misguided sons of the South, who yet seem disposed to scourge the negroes for their unyielding fidelity upon the field of battle [...] behold the unfairness of placing the ignorant negro in conflict with a people, who, in their own country have had all the advantages of their kind of learning, and who come into this warfare of race with almost vandal ferocity."⁴⁴

Although for some black papers, Chinese exclusion exposed the tenuous status of black citizenship, for others, Chinese immigration presented the same threat. While black newspapers justified these concerns in ways similar to those of white laborers, for African Americans, economic anxieties were tied to the promise of citizenship and their social and political future. As W.H. Hall wrote, "if the freedmen fail upon this new experiment of self-government, it becomes a disaster irretrievable to the whole race."⁴⁵

Conclusion

The nineteenth-century California black press employed the language of the anti-Chinese movement in order to distance itself from Chinese Americans and secure African-American rights in the post-Civil War world. This strategy, which underscored the "American" character of blacks and the otherness of the Chinese initially seemed successful—despite the anti-Chinese platforms of both the Republican and Democratic parties in 1871, neither

43 "A Chance for Work," *San Francisco Vindicator* (San Francisco, CA), Nov. 17, 1888.

44 W.H. Hall "The Freedmen versus the Chinamen," *Elevator* (San Francisco), Aug. 27, 1869.

45 Ibid.

eliminated black enfranchisement. After the 1898 *Won Kim Ark* decision, the *San Francisco Chronicle* commented that, although California may be safe from “the more unpleasant features of Chinese...citizenship,” it could become necessary “to amend the Federal Constitution and definitely limit citizenship to whites and blacks”;⁴⁶ black citizenship was constitutionally secure, the *Chronicle* implied. Only two years prior to *Won Kim Ark*, Supreme Court Justice Marshall Harlan dissented in *Plessy v. Ferguson* that “A Chinaman can ride in the same passenger coach with white citizens of the United States, while citizens of the black race...are yet to be declared criminals.”⁴⁷ While the Chinese Exclusion Act defined the racial barriers to U.S. citizenship, the constitutionality of *Plessy v. Ferguson* indicated that, although African Americans were citizens in name, black racial difference would remain at the core of American national identity.

46 “Questions of Citizenship,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (San Francisco, CA), Mar. 30, 1898.

47 Jun, “Black Orientalism,” 1047.