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Asian Americans have always been on the business end of the stick called history. Alternately and simultaneously characterized as both the eternal foreigner—unwilling and unable to assimilate into American society—and the model minority—an "Oriental" version of a bootstrapping Horatio Alger fantasy—Asian Americans occupy a unique position as a constructed racial group that encompasses a multitude of disparate and conflicting ethnicities. The extent to which Asian American identities are overdetermined by gender, national origin, and language has altered our understanding of the very nature of race. Asian Americans are the "model" minority in a different sense, as the pliability and ubiquity of the identity enables them to model every aspect of the racial spectrum. Yet, this essential
diachronic role as the grease that lubricates the ever-churning pistons of America's racial hierarchy and conflict is often dismissed, leading to the racial perception of Asian Americans as honorary whites, constructivive Blacks, and foreigners outside the American experience entirely.

The law has a special role in the history of American race relations, and while the very existence of Asian Americans has disrupted simplistic racial binaries and altered the course of American legal history, the law has also worked to foster the illusion of a monolithic Asian American racial identity, an illusion that ignores the complexities of Asian American communities. In the preface to his book, Race, Rights, and the Asian American Experience, Angelo Ancheta comments on the greater salience Asian Americans' racial identity holds for the outside world than for the members of its many component ethnicities.

Race, Rights and the Asian American Experience details the sor-did mistreatment of Asian Americans at the hands of U.S. courts and legislatures, while examining historical and sociological factors that created such injustices. Centering on the ways in which law and the Asian American community have historically shaped each other, Ancheta analyzes: (1) the differences between anti-Asian and anti-Black-subordination, (2) how post-1965 immigration from Asia shifted American racial demographics, and (3) how these shifting demographics have created a new race relations. In so doing, this book establishes and illustrates how race creates and implements law.


9. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 3 (discussing the "model minority" perception). The authors capitalize "Black" but do not capitalize "white" for the counter-hegemonic purpose of de-centering whiteness as a focus of racial discourse.

10. See id. at 22 (discussing the similarities between anti-Asian subordination and Jim Crow subordination).

11. See id. at 64–66 (discussing how Asian Americans continue to be equated as foreigners).

12. See id. at 128.

13. ANCHETA, supra note 2.

14. See id. at xii.

15. See id. at 12–13.

16. See id. at 20.

17. See id. at 15.
I. PARADIGM LOST: THE BLACK/WHITE ILLUSION

Ancheta’s introduction entitled “Neither Black Nor White” examines the racial “no man’s land” Asian Americans have occupied throughout American legal and social history.\(^{18}\)

Ancheta begins his introduction with an analysis of Spike Lee’s *Do the Right Thing*,\(^{19}\) a movie in which a Korean American grocer, faced with the prospect of having his business destroyed in an uprising, declares to an angry Black crowd “I not white! ... I BLACK!”\(^{20}\) This short sequence aptly demonstrates the ways in which Asian Americans occupy a limited, imagined racial space as well as a limited, tangible, physical space. Situated in a community in which he is seen as an intruder and an economic parasite, the Korean American grocer is forced to defend his limited space and indeed, to justify his very presence. He is forced to align himself (at least in this particular moment) with his working-class Black neighbors since the American master narrative of racial discourse does not recognize a uniquely Asian American identity.\(^{21}\)

Ancheta links this cinematic scene to the historical moment of the Los Angeles uprising, in which Korean American businesses were looted.\(^{22}\) This narrative functions as a road-map for the book, which explores and analyzes the realities of the new race relations and new “racisms,” changing demographics, and increasingly complex power structures that were exposed following the 1992 Los Angeles uprising.

The Los Angeles uprising was the most salient moment in recent history where the very nature of constructed racial identities and the realities of multi-ethnic spaces were exposed to the world.\(^{23}\)

---

18. See id. at 1-18.
23. Phillip Kan Gotanda described the importance of this moment in Asian American history:

We’re in the post-L.A. uprising era which for me marks the end of the ‘60’s consciousness model of Third World unity where black, brown and yellow people stood together. ... But as I watched L.A. burn and conflicts going on, I saw a new world with new realities. And it’s not that easy anymore to build bridges like we used to. We’d like to, but there are issues and deep-seated feelings that crop up,
Despite geographic ghettoization and the exclusion of Asian Americans from the primary labor market, reporters and commentators constructed Korean American business owners as white. The media's inability to understand Asian Americans, together with American society's pathological proclivity to create Black/white conflict placed Asian Americans in a position of dominance over Blacks as "the personal representatives of the invisible hand that has looted local communities of economic autonomy." Ironically, Korean Americans neither participated nor had a voice in defining and positioning their community within America's racial hierarchy.

While the media actively worked to acknowledge the existence of Asian Americans, Latinas/os simply dropped off the racial radar screen. Little mention was made of the significant Latina/o population in the areas most affected by the riots. While accounts of the devastating effects on Korean American owned businesses were detailed and frequent, scant attention was paid to the effects on Latina/o owned businesses. Similarly, the media gave scant coverage to the aftermath of the uprising, during which punishment was meted out unflinchingly on the Latina/o community.

and we have to reinvent the way we all interact with each other. I don't know how to do that.


24. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 2.


26. See Sumi Cho, Korean Americans vs. African Americans: Conflict and Construction, in READING Rodney King, READING URBAN UPRISING, (Robert Gooding-Williams ed. 1993). Cho observed that "a CNN-Time Magazine poll taken immediately after the verdict surveyed 'Americans' on their opinions regarding the verdict and the violence that followed. Id. Yet the poll only sought the views of African Americans and Whites regarding the future of race relations." Id. at 196.

27. In Los Angeles County, the Latina/o population of 3.3 million vastly outnumbers the Korean American population of 150,000. See Jack Miles, Blacks vs. Browns, ATLANTIC MONTHLY, Oct. 1992, at 52, cited in Maria Ontiveros, United We Stand: Collective Action in a World of Individual Rights,(unpublished manuscript, on file with authors). In Koreatown itself, 48% of the population is Latina/o while 3% is Korean American. AN ATLAS OF SOUTH-CENTRAL Los ANGELES (Anderson, Dove, et. al eds. 1992), cited in Armando Navarro, The South Central Los Angeles Eruption: A Latino Perspective, 1993 AMERASIA J. 69, 73.

28. Although there are significant discrepancies in accounts of the effect of the uprising on Latinas/os, between 30% and 60% of the businesses destroyed were Latina/o-owned. See Miles, supra note 27, at 51-52. "Up to 40 percent of the damaged businesses were Latino-owned." MANUEL PASTOR, LATINOS AND THE LOS ANGELES UPRISING: THE ECONOMIC CONTEXT 1 (1993), quoted in Navarro, supra note 27, at 73.

29. Over half of those arrested for looting were Latina/o. See Miles, supra note 27, at 41; see also PASTOR, supra note 28, at 1. In addition to the arrests in the wake of the uprising, hundreds of Latina/os were turned over to the I.N.S., in violation of
The Los Angeles uprising, like the internment of Japanese Americans, forced Asian Americans to face racism American-style. Confronted with the great disparities between reality and media representations, many Asian Americans used this moment to define themselves. This moment is mirrored in Critical Race Theory by Robert Chang’s declaration of an “Asian American moment.”

Chang notes that “an Asian American Legal Scholarship will recognize that Asian Americans are differently situated historically with respect to other disempowered groups. But it will acknowledge that, in spite of these historical differences, the commonalties found in shared oppression can bring different disempowered groups together to participate in each others’ struggles.”

Ancheta’s perspective in looking at Asian American legal history, contemporary race relations, the possibilities of cross-racial mobilizations, and the Black-white paradigm, are firmly situated within Chang’s notion of Asian American Legal Scholarship.

Building on Chang’s notion of “commonality”, Ancheta works to construct another racial paradigm. This paradigm is not offered as a comprehensive totality, as the Black/white paradigm has been held to be, but rather one that is useful to understanding how groups can be similarly situated, despite divergent experiences. Ancheta’s critique reveals the limitations of the Black/white binary in grappling with issues of immigration, which overwhelmingly implicate Asian Americans and Latinas/os. Indeed, Asian and Latin American immigration has constituted the majority of immigration to the U.S. in the last 30 years. While continuously absent from discussions on race and race relations in public discourse, these communities have begun to recognize common interests and implications of the rising anti-immigrant sentiment and attacks on bilingual education.

Because of the significant immigrant component in Asian American and Latina/o communities, new problems and particular nuances arise in their dealings with institutional structures. Ancheta notes that limited English-speaking immigrant populations develop a severe distrust of police because police misconduct itself, in turn,

city policy, and deported before any legal protection or due process could be given. Davis, supra note 25, at 743.


31. Id. at 1249.


develops into a form of anti-immigrant (anti-Asian, anti-Latina/o) violence. Here, the axis shifts to American-foreigner, not Black-white.

Ancheta uses this paradigm to closely map the racial landscape, creating a more inclusive grouping. He makes a conscious effort to draw parallels between Asian Americans and Arab Americans, a group traditionally excluded from race discourse and denied status as people of color. Ancheta recognizes that Arab Americans face discrimination on the same lines as Asian Americans, Latinas/os, and other communities with large immigrant populations.

II. STRANGERS FROM A DIFFERENT SUSPECT CLASSIFICATION: THE ASIAN AMERICAN LEGAL CANON

Despite their racial ambiguity, and in some instances because of it, Asian Americans have established an undeniable role in the shaping and interpretation of law. Throughout the text, Ancheta reveals how Asian Americans have been and continue to be major “players” in the unfolding of American legal history.

In challenging notions of citizenship and constitutional rights, Asian Americans have alternately occupied racial spaces along both sides of the Black-white axis. For example, in two landmark cases that challenged naturalization rights, Ozawa v. United States and United States v. Thind, Asian Americans strategically attempted to pass under the strict citizenship requirements of free white persons by challenging notions of “whiteness” as well as the racial designation of “Caucasian.” In both cases, the Supreme Court demonstrated its inability to contend with multiple racial categories. Despite the Court’s refusal to address the racial designation of “Asian” in the context of U.S. race relations, by disapproving the plaintiff’s argument in each of these cases, it inadvertently defined the category of “Asian” by what it was not: white.

In Chapter One, “Legacies of Discrimination,” Ancheta writes, “the legal subordination of Asian Americans on the West Coast

35. SeeANCHETA, supra note 2, at 75-77.
36. SeeANCHETA, supra note 2, at 76-77.
37. Id. at 64-65.
38. See Natsu Saito Jenga, Finding Our Voices, Teaching Our Truth: Reflections on Legal Pedagogy and Asian American Identity, 3 UCLA ASIAN PAC. AM. L.J. 81, 88 (1995) (describing the range of cases and areas of law that have involved Asian Americans).
39. 260 U.S. 178 (1922) (Ozawa argued that the Japanese are “White persons” who have Caucasian root stocks).
40. 261 U.S. 204 (1923) (drawing from Ozawa, Thind argued as an Asian Indian that he belonged to the “Aryan” race).
41. SeeANCHETA, supra note 2, at 4.
paralleled the treatment of African Americans in the South following Reconstruction: segregation was sanctioned and discriminatory laws abounded at all levels of government. Ancheta’s savvy about the differences between anti-Asian and anti-Black subordination, does not blind him to historical similarities. Paralleling historian Gary Okihiro’s notion of “kindred people,” Ancheta is cognizant of the ways anti-Black sentiments and actions are but another form of anti-Asian subordination. Through this awareness, Ancheta is able to highlight particular instances in Asian American legal history typically glossed over in Asian American historical texts. For example, while cases such as *Takahashi v. Fish and Game Commission* and *Oyama v. California* may be familiar to Asian American legal scholars, including them in a text that will undoubtedly be read in introductory Asian American studies courses is invaluable.

Ancheta examines past and present legislation that targets Asian Americans as a racial group, in conjunction with examples of Asian American resistance against these laws. Ancheta’s critique concentrates mostly on individual cases, but still reveals the failure and unwillingness of the government and the courts to lessen structural racism. He recognizes that local and state laws had the most penetrating effect on the lives of Asian Americans.

Early Asian American settlements were concentrated in specific locales. These communities faced efforts by local and state legislators to implement discriminatory legal obstacles. Ancheta’s discussion of *Yick Wo v. Hopkins* is particularly noteworthy in this context. In *Yick Wo*, the Supreme Court struck down a San Francisco city ordinance by ruling that it violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Ancheta writes, “*Yick Wo* was an anomalous decision given the Court’s rulings in other cases involving Chinese immigrants, and may have been due to the Court’s strong adherence at the time to doctrines protecting business interests and the liberty of contracts.” Ancheta’s analysis recognizes that the Court’s decision in *Yick Wo* was not one of benevolence towards the Chinese

42. *Id.* at 22.
43. GARY OKIHIRO, MARGINS AND MAINSTREAMS: ASIANS IN AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE 34 (1994).
44. 334 U.S. 410 (1948) (holding that a California statute barring commercial fishing licenses to resident alien Japanese citizens violated the Equal Protection and Due Process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment).
45. 332 U.S. 633 (1948) (holding that use of The California Alien Land Law to claim property of a minor American citizen on the ground that his father, a Japanese alien, paid for the land denied the son equal protection of the laws).
46. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 27.
47. 118 U.S. 356 (1886) (holding that discriminatory application of a facially neutral statute violated the Fourteenth Amendment).
48. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 29.
American community, but rather one in which the Court had to extend equal protection to everyone in order to protect the economic interests of the specific plaintiffs in this case. Asian Americans' racial ambiguity and their status as "aliens ineligible for citizenship," inadvertently created seminal legal precedent.

In his analysis of the Japanese American internment, Ancheta focuses on the four constitutional challenges heard in the Supreme Court. While Ancheta discusses the anti-Japanese sentiment that led up to the internment, he does not explicitly draw the link between the Alien Land Laws and internment. The abrogation of property rights of Japanese Americans, coupled with immigration exclusion and educational segregation, set the stage for internment, making a seemingly implausible form of ultimate disenfranchise-ment appear palatable.

Ancheta's discussion of redress for Japanese Americans is extremely brief and the subject warrants a more thorough analysis. In a way, the redress movement was insignificant, as it failed to alter the "fundamental realities of power," fostering instead, "illusions of change," at odds with the continuing oppression of Asian Americans. On another level, the success of the redress movement was a striking historical event; it marked a moment in achieving institutional acknowledgment of racism accompanied by an attempt to remedy its effects. However, the Asian American community must be critical of any attempts by the government to characterize its own brand of injustice. Reparations implemented by the perpetrators of the internment can carry ideological baggage with them. The redress can be seen as an affirmation of the model minority myth through a celebration of super-patriotism. Characterization of

49. Hirabayashi v. United States, 320 U.S. 81 (1943); Yasui v. United States, 320 U.S. 115 (1943); Korematsu v. United States, 323 U.S. 214 (1944); Ex parte Endo, 323 U.S. 283 (1944); see also ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 31-32 (discussing cases cited supra).
50. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 29-30.
51. See Keith Aoki, No Right to Own, 40 B.C.L. REV. (forthcoming 1999).
52. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 32, 40.
54. Id. at 240-41.
55. Redress payments were woefully inadequate compared to actual losses suffered by Japanese American internees. See Chris K. Iijima, Political Accommodation and the Ideology of the "Model Minority": Building a Bridge to White Minority Rule in the 21st Century, 7 S. CAL. INTERDISC. L.J. 1, 3 (1998). The Korematsu decision, which authorized imprisonment of Japanese Americans based on the phantom menace of Japanese espionage was never overturned, despite findings of prosecutorial misconduct. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 32.
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interned Japanese Americans as "ultra-loyal Americans" dismisses the reality of political resistance within the camps, mischaracterizing forced compliance as a kind of supernatural faith in the inherent fairness of America. This misconception adds another dimension of alienation to Japanese Americans who did not swear the loyalty oaths demanded of them.

Ancheta's explanation of the limits of anti-discrimination law is a cogent expression of the inadequacies of "liberal" conceptions of racism. Despite assertions that racism is a result of "bad actors" and can be cured through simple education and punishment of specific egregious acts of intentional discrimination, racism is about power. Though White supremacy manifests itself in hate crimes, racial slurs, and outright discrimination against minorities, these are merely symptoms of a systematic and institutional power structure. Racism works through Complicity and acceptance of this structure; until economic, political, and social power is redistributed, racism will continue to be the driving force behind American society.

III. FEAR OF A BROWN AND YELLOW PLANET: RACE IN IMMIGRATION

U.S. immigration law has been described as a direct product of attempts to exclude Asian immigrants from the United States. Ancheta examines the topic of immigration law through the lens of race, specifically targeting the ways in which Asians have been virtually prohibited from coming to America. Ancheta doesn't focus on the well-documented legislation that restricted Asian immigration, but rather on the judicial doctrine of plenary power that prevents courts from questioning the constitutionality of immigration laws. His analysis moves to naturalization restrictions and a cogent discussion of how limiting membership in American society creates subordination. This approach is innovative in its presentation of a systematic and procedurally unsound system. Restrictions placed on Asian immigration have typically been presented as products of foreign policy—political questions that should not be questioned by the courts. Ancheta exposes the way in which racism

57. See id. at 16–20.
58. See generally JOHN OKADA, NO-NO BOY (1979).
59. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 50–52.
61. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 86–90.
63. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 101–03.
is not confined to specific foreign policy decisions made by certain high ranking government officials. Racism creates and maintains the institutional privilege and deference given to these decisions. This analysis again reveals the "liberal" conception of racism—as a handful of bad, irrational acts—as inaccurate. The invisible hand of racism in immigration law is the lack of accountability inherent in the system.

Although the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965 was a "watershed in Asian American history," it is not beyond reproach. The abolition of national origins quotas, the main mechanism of Asian exclusion, resulted in a uniform cap on the number of immigrants from any given country. This facially neutral policy has been criticized as inherently discriminatory towards certain nation states with extremely large populations (China, India, etc.). While Asian people make up half the population of the world, there are fewer Asian Americans than there are residents of a single Asian city such as Bombay or Jakarta.

The importance of the 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act was to move to a family reunification based model of immigration; however, as the flow of immigrants revealed itself to be predominantly Asian and Latina/o, Congress introduced a new system of visa distribution. Dubbed the "diversity visa," a significant number of immigrant visas began to be randomly distributed via a lottery

---


65. Id. at 1; see also RONALD TAKAKI, A DIFFERENT MIRROR: A HISTORY OF MULTICULTURAL AMERICA 400-01 (1993).

66. See Chin, Civil Rights Revolution, supra note 64 (analyzing the popularly held belief that the 1965 INA was an important piece of civil rights legislation).


68. See Chin, Civil Rights Revolution supra note 64, at 280–82.


70. See Ting, supra note 60, at 308.

71. See Gabriel J. Chin, Segregation’s Last Stronghold: Race Discrimination and the Constitutional Law of Immigration, 46 UCLA L. Rev. 1, 40 (1998) (noting that “half the world is Asian”); see also GRAIN OF SAND, Yellow Pearl, on GRAIN OF SAND, supra note 1 (“... and we are half the world”).


73. See Trucios-Haynes, supra note 32.
system to countries “underrepresented” in the United States. Ancheta does not dwell on the ideological ramifications of the diversity lottery; however, it has disturbing consequences for Asian Americans and their non-citizen relatives that merit a more thorough discussion.

The “diversity visa” system of random distribution defies logic. While nativists argue for a stringent set of immigration restrictions, membership in a nation should not be left to chance. To add insult to injury, the lottery system, notorious for slaying random villagers and exploiting the materialistic dreams of the working class and people of color, establishes citizenship as a game show prize, similar to a washer/dryer set or a trip to Hawaii. While direct relatives of Filipino American citizens face a waiting list of over 20 years, completely random foreigners with no connection to the United States are allowed to immigrate immediately, without regard to the strength of their commitment to our country. The commodification of citizenship cheapens the family reunification ideal and strikingly reveals the racially discriminatory nature of immigration law.

Ancheta also could have included a more thorough discussion of the most blatant form of discrimination against Filipinos in immigration law, denial of citizenship to Filipino World War II veterans. In the period between 1942 and 1945, approximately 7,000 Filipino servicemen obtained U.S. citizenship. In August 1946, the INS authorized another official with the power to naturalize, and approximately 4,000 Filipino servicemen obtained citizenship.

In 1946, the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act was passed. A rider to a supplementary appropriations act, it stated that the service Filipino veterans in the Commonwealth Army performed in World War II “shall not be deemed active service for purposes of any law of the United States conferring rights, privilege, or benefits except for the dead, maimed, or those separated from active service for physical disability.

74. See Ancheta, supra note 2, at 89-90.
75. See Wu, Borders, supra note 62, at 36-38.
76. See Shirley Jackson, The Lottery, in The Lottery 291 (1949) (recounting the stoning death of Tessie Hutchinson).
77. See Kim Phillips, Lotteryville, USA, in Commodify Your Dissent: Salvos From the Baffler (Thomas Frank et al. eds. 1997).
78. See Ancheta, supra note 2, at 128.
80. See id. at 880.
82. § 107(a).
83. § 107(a).
Numerous judicial challenges to the denial of veteran status arose over the years. These challenges resulted in a Supreme Court decision that denied Filipino veterans the right to naturalize, alluding to the plenary power doctrine as its rationale. In 1990, Congress passed Section 405 of the 1990 Immigration Act allowing Filipino natives who served on active duty during World War II to apply for citizenship between May 1, 1991 and May 1, 1993. Approximately 28,000 Filipino veterans were naturalized pursuant to the 1990 Act.

The Filipino veteran situation outlines the wages of colonialism. Though there exists little scholarship regarding other Asian American territories, America’s treatment of the Philippines evinces the denial of rights typically guaranteed under international law. Legislative vindication of Filipino veteran naturalization rights is the merely the first step in an attempt to remedy injustice. Filipino veterans continue to suffer from being excluded from veterans benefits, despite protests that have been unrelenting, yet ineffective.

IV. NO SPEAKEE ENGRISH: LINGUISTIC REGULATION IN AMERICA

In the context of American society, language requirements are typically regarded as non-discriminatory policies, enacted for the sole purpose of fostering assimilation and creating a unified national identity. However, Ancheta manages to succinctly reconcile the idea of America with that of a multilingual society through an examination of how language regulation impacts the fields of education, voting, and employment discrimination. The major sources of law prohibiting language discrimination are found in civil rights statutes, the First Amendment, and the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. By swiftly outlining the strong link between national origin and
language, Ancheta thoroughly explains why non-English speakers should be considered a protected class under civil rights law.95

Ancheta’s discussion of language regulation of non-government entities is helpful, yet abbreviated.96 The idea of consumer protection, as posited by John F. Kennedy’s address to Congress,97 encompasses the right to safety, the right to choose, the right to be heard, and the right to be informed.98 The lack of language specific consumer protection legislation for language minorities underscores the impact of language deregulation on Latina/o and Asian Pacific American communities in the private sphere.99 Furthermore, the enforcement of laws restricting the use of foreign languages on signs owned by private businesses100 has been documented to be extremely racially discriminatory.101 Additional concerns arise when the passage of vague anti-immigrant legislation, like California’s Proposition 187, are interpreted by “language vigilantes” and are enforced through immigrant hate crimes.102 Clearly, the language rights issue is not bound by a public/private distinction and a thorough analysis would include an extended discussion of the private sector ramifications of “English-only” policies.

Although initially characterized as a “English-only” rule,103 Ancheta mentions that the language policy challenged in Dimaranan v. Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center104 was really a “No Tagalog” rule.105 However, Ancheta does not explicitly state the hospital’s policy, which placed “no restriction on the use of other non-English

95. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 119–24.
96. See id. at 118–26.
98. See Kennedy, supra note 97.
99. See Bender, Consumer Protection, supra note 97.
100. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 118–19 (citing Asian Am. Bus. Group v. City of Pomona, 716 F. Supp. 1328 (C.D. Cal. 1984) (discussing ordinance requiring at least one-half of advertising copy of signs to be in English Characters)).
101. See Grace A. Pasigan, Sign Language: Colonialism and the Battle over Text, 17 LOY. L.A. ENT. L.J. 625, 643 n.54 (pointing out examples of L.A. restaurants using foreign language spellings that have not been cited for violation of sign ordinances).
103. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 124.
105. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 124.
languages in the Unit, such as Spanish. Underlying the hospital's policy was the dramatic demographic shift that occurred in the Pomona area in the late 1980s, in which Filipino and other Asian immigration changed population from one that was predominantly Black and Chicana/o, in a similar way to what occurred in Monterey Park in the mid-1980s. This type of sociological analysis displays the complexity of Ancheta's American/foreigner paradigm. In certain areas, there are degrees of outsider racialization that affect some communities more than others. Here, Filipinos found themselves taking the brunt of racist policies that did not seek to punish Chicanas/os.

Ancheta closes the chapter with a discussion of “accent discrimination.” This form of language discrimination is a markedly powerful one. Even though Asian American immigrants, notably Filipinos, frequently master English, the traces of an accent, independent of fluency, often subjugate them in their dealings with the public. Here, language acts as means of racialization.

V. ROCKING THE BOAT: ASIAN AMERICAN POLITICAL IDENTITY

Professor Keith Aoki recently called for Asian Americans to move from identity politics to political identity. The Asian American category is a constructed one, a product of the census. The diaspora of Asian American linguistic, socioeconomic and demographic diversity is near absolute. Ancheta efficiently debunks myths about the monolithic nature of Asian America and shows how statistical information can be manipulated to perpetuate stereotypes. Ancheta engages in an extended examination of the link between Asian American identity and electoral politics. He concludes with an analysis of intersectional identity, focusing primarily on Asian American women. Ancheta chooses to focus on an image of Asian American women as the “mysterious Oriental,” collapsing the multiple and contradictory Asian/Asian American female images of “a privately compliant and catering Asian feminin-

---

107. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 126.
108. See id. at 121–24.
110. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 134–37.
111. See id. at 130–34.
112. See id. at 130.
113. See id. at 142–45.
114. See id. at 145–48.
115. See id. at 140.
ity, predisposed to the assertion of White male desire, . . . overlaid upon a super-competent, professional public exterior.” This paradox of perception results in a new form of sexual harassment, informed as much by race as by gender. Noticeably absent from Ancheta’s book is a discussion of the extent to which Asian American males are heavily gendered as queer, female, or sometimes both. As Professor Robert S. Chang noted, Asian American masculinity tends to be figuratively obscured, and he is often constructed as an Asian American lesbian. Asian American queers are marginalized not only within American society, but within specific ethnic subcultures. Chang posits blurring the lines of categorical distinction through a confusion of identity and a relinquishing of heterosexual privilege.

Ancheta’s last chapter focuses on the role of Asian Americans in America’s racial hierarchy. Ancheta does this through an examination of issues traditionally regarded as outside the Asian American experience, such as affirmative action, public housing, and voting rights. The crucial role of affirmative action in assisting the Asian American community continues to be obscured by right wing pundits purporting to speak for Asian Americans. Asian Americans have been constructed as “honorary Whites” in the educational context, as many affirmative action undergraduate admissions programs do not consider certain groups of Asian Americans to be underrepresented. This blatant misconstruction fails to take into account the institutional and systematic exclusion of Asian Americans from meaningful opportunity to participate in U.S. society. Affirmative action has worked to increase Asian

117. See id. at 194–95.
120. See Robert S. Chang, Divest Now! De-Materializing White Capitalist Heteropatriarchy, 3 J. GENDER, RACE & JUST. (forthcoming 1999) (proposing that his next response to being mistaken as an Asian American lesbian will be “[n]obody but us queers here”).
121. See ANCHETA, supra note 2, at 149–70.
122. See id. at 158.
124. See Chin et al., supra note 3, Sections III.A and III.C.
American participation in universities, the labor market, and contracting.\(^{125}\) As the only institutional challenge to existing forms of institutional racism and exclusion, affirmative action is a crucial component of dismantling the "old boy's network," the "glass ceiling," and existing stereotypes of Asian Americans.\(^{126}\)

Ancheta makes a very intriguing link between anti-immigration and anti-affirmative action rhetoric.\(^{127}\) The shifting neoconservative climate in California, resulted in near simultaneous right wing victories in the passages of Proposition 187, an anti-immigrant measure, and Proposition 209, an anti-affirmative action measure.\(^{128}\) The Black/White paradigm structures Black racial identity as favoring affirmative action and opposing immigration, and thus refuses to acknowledge communities of color adversely damaged by both measures, namely Chicanas/os, Latinas/os and Asian Americans.\(^{129}\) The fact that these two pieces of legislation were passed by ballot initiative underscores the inequities in electoral politics.\(^{130}\)

Asian American political exclusion in redistricting,\(^{131}\) coupled with inherent biases in the immigration and naturalization system that restrict citizenship\(^{132}\) has effectively crippled Asian American political identity. However, recent legislation curtailing the rights of legal permanent residents to public assistance and participation (Proposition 187, Welfare reform)\(^{133}\) has encouraged Asian American naturalization.\(^{134}\) This influx of new voters, forced to naturalize due to anti-immigrant legislation, will necessarily be politicized, using their votes to resist subsequent anti-immigrant attacks.

Ancheta hints at an invidious circle of discrimination. Asian Americans are racialized as foreigners, leading to subsequent disenfranchisement through racialized legislative measures such as immigration restrictions, denial of citizenship rights and insufficient access to public assistance. Executive orders and international agreements work to intern and exclude Asian Americans. Through the plenary power doctrine, Asian Americans find themselves

\(^{125}\) See Ancheta, supra note 2, at 159–160.

\(^{126}\) See id.

\(^{127}\) See id. at 161.


\(^{129}\) See Jenga, supra note 38, at 83.

\(^{130}\) See Bender, Direct Democracy, supra note 102.

\(^{131}\) See Ancheta, supra note 2, at 157.

\(^{132}\) See id. at 101.

\(^{133}\) See id. at 14.

unable to access the judicial system in order to challenge the legislative and executive branches.

CONCLUSION:
"WE DON'T WANT A PIECE OF YOUR PIE, WE WANNA BAKE OUR OWN"\textsuperscript{135}

The confluence of Asian American legal issues—racial hierarchy, immigration, identity politics, discrimination, affirmative action, property restrictions, and forced internment—are all informed by political exclusion. Without significant representation in America's power structures, Asian Americans have become heavily constructed within and outside the ubiquitous Black/White paradigm.

Through his efforts to center Asian Americans, not in a space between Black and white, but as a unique and complex identity, Ancheta reveals the overall project of his book. \textit{Race, Rights, and the Asian American Experience} shows that the real danger in focusing on the Black/white paradigm is the removal of agency and identity from other groups. The denial of Asian American racial experience disenfranchises Asian Americans and disengages social reality. Ancheta's efforts to construct new ideological frameworks that diffuse the power of the liberal viewpoint of racism, align interests of people of color, and provide a critical analysis of the failure of legal protection on a global and systematic level, mark \textit{Race, Rights, and the Asian American Experience} as a welcome addition to the Critical Race Theory canon.

\textsuperscript{135} GRAIN OF SAND, \textit{Free the Land}, on A GRAIN OF SAND, supra note 1.