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While reporting on the civil unrest that followed the police killing of Mike Brown in Ferguson, Missouri last August, Fox News host Bill O’Reilly became enraged when his guest Megyn Kelly suggested that race-based privilege shields White people from police violence while it simultaneously subordinates Black people. After the brief on-air debate, O’Reilly penned a follow-up for the “Talking Points Memo” segment on his eponymous show. O’Reilly asserted that White Privilege was a fiction and held out the economic successes of Asian Americans as
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While reporting on the civil unrest that followed the police killing of Mike Brown in Ferguson, Missouri last August, Fox News host Bill O’Reilly became enraged when his guest Megyn Kelly suggested that race-based privilege shields White people from police violence while it simultaneously subordinates Black people. After the brief on-air debate, O’Reilly penned a follow-up for the “Talking Points Memo” segment on his eponymous show. O’Reilly asserted that White Privilege was a fiction and held out the economic successes of Asian Americans as
incontrovertible proof of his claims. Noting that Asian Americans have a lower unemployment rate than White Americans, O’Reilly demanded:

So, do we have Asian privilege in America? Because the truth is, that Asian American households earn far more money than anyone else. The median income for Asians, [sic] close to $69,000 a year; it’s 57,000 for whites $33,000 for black—so the question becomes why? And the answer is found in stable homes and in emphasis on education . . . . That is why Asian Americans, who often have to overcome a language barrier, are succeeding far more than African-Americans and even more than white Americans. Their families are intact and education is paramount.6

The popular resonance of the Model Minority Myth7 as articulated by O’Reilly above, has led other commentators to wonder whether Asian Americans have, like other ethnic immigrant populations8 before them, “become White.”9

Musings like O’Reilly’s expose the Black/White binary that frames race discourse in the United States. More accurately described as “White-over-Black,”10 the power in this model’s imagery is the clear distinction between the two racial categories and the strict separation between them.

7. See infra Part V.A and Volokh, infra note 9 for additional discussion of the Myth.

Asians have succeeded even though they are a racial minority—this fact deserves to be acknowledged. It redounds to the credit of the many Asians who worked terribly hard against often overwhelming odds. And it’s evidence of the essential fairness of the American capitalist system, which has rewarded this hard work even though many people, including many government officials, tried to penalize it.

Id. (echoing the tenets of the Model Minority Myth).
The binary is not merely a social or cultural byproduct; law has always played a central role in defining and regulating racial categories. Anti-miscegenation statutes, for example, were promulgated for the express purpose of maintaining the stability of the color line demarcating the racial hierarchy upon which the slave trade and chattel slavery depended. By prohibiting marriages between Black and White persons, the states ensured that racial mixing would not threaten to destabilize the rigid divisions that kept the races separate and allowed White supremacy to thrive.

Within the bounds of this socio-legal dichotomy fall Asian Americans. O’Reilly asserts that Asian Americans occupy a privileged position as compared to other groups in the United States. If Asian Americans hold any type of privileged status in today’s racially-stratified society, however, this certainly was not always the case. Throughout history, Asian Americans were the special targets of federal and state laws written to specifically exclude them from the polity. Because “the yellow peril” posed by Asian immigrants and their descendants was an equal threat to the rigid racial divisions that organized U.S. society, states with
significant Asian American populations expanded enforcement of their anti-miscegenation statutes to regulate marriages between Asians and Whites.18

Lawsuits over the anti-miscegenation laws were not battles over the power of the states to regulate marriage—all parties conceded that;19 instead, Asian American litigants fought over how they ought to be classified within the racial framework erected by those laws. Caught in the racial bind set by the Black/White binary, Asian Americans made several attempts to obtain the legal benefits of citizenship by claiming a stake in “Whiteness.”20 The marriage cases are only one example. Whiteness claims by Asian American litigants proliferated in the twentieth century, in areas as disparate as immigration and naturalization to education and equal protection.21 In hindsight, these Whiteness claims can be viewed as entirely instrumental, or they can be viewed within the context of colorism—how a preference for light skin within communities of color complicates a race analysis. This Article takes the latter approach.

As in other ethnic and racial groups, colorism plays a significant role in the social interactions in and among Asian Americans. Investigating colorism in the Asian American community provides insights into how group members construct their own racial identities in relation to the broader race-stratified society. A colorism inquiry is a necessary intervention into the existing discourse of Asian American identity construction because it complicates common understandings of the Black/White binary in ways that shed new light on inter- and intra-racial relationships.

Part II addresses colorism in the Asian American community, and demonstrates both how Asian Americans have been racialized within the Black/White binary as well as how that dichotomy has impacted processes of internal self-identification based on color and skin tone within Asian American communities. Part III presents three examples of the racialization of Asian Americans by U.S. courts. In each case, the Asian

20. See, e.g., RICK BALDOZ, THE THIRD ASIATIC INVASION: EMPIRE AND MIGRATION IN FILIPINO AMERICA, 1898–1946 1–10 (2011) (recounting the case of Rafael Lopez de Olate, a Filipino immigrant “who probably passed as a white man in his everyday interactions” and who asserted that he was White (of “pure Spanish blood”) in order to marry his White fiancé).
21. See infra Part III.
American petitioners claimed that they were white in order to avail themselves of specific privileges that accompanied Whiteness. These efforts to claim White racial identity by and for themselves were unsuccessful. More recently, however, Asian Americans find themselves on the threshold of becoming “Honorary Whites,” as evidenced by O’Reilly’s adherence to the Model Minority Myth. Part IV will consider whether Asian Americans are presently being invited to join the ranks of Whiteness and how the status quo of White supremacy and anti-Black subordination is supported by the creation of this intermediate category.

Part V begins with an interrogation of the Model Minority Myth. Read within the context of the Black/White binary, the Myth presents a choice for Asian Americans—to either accept or reject invitations to Whiteness. Lawsuits by Asian American plaintiffs challenging affirmative action programs in higher education provide contemporary case studies upon which to explore some available options—to join the ranks of Whites or to engage in anti-subordination work through interracial coalition. Being attentive to how and where Asian Americans fit into the racial structure of the United States—and how that structure may be reproduced in color hierarchies within the Asian American community—can provide insights into where and how Asian Americans can participate in interracial coalitions for racial justice. Part VI concludes this Article.

II. COLORISM IN THE ASIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

The prevailing paradigm for understanding and discussing race relations in the United States is the Black/White binary. Although many have embraced the binary as a valuable tool for framing contemporary discussions about race relations, several legal scholars have decried the dichromatic model as inaccurately representing the nation’s numerous and varied racial and ethnic groups. One development which the existing critiques of the Black/White binary have not yet fully accounted for, however, is the growing body of literature on colorism. Colorism is a useful intervention into the existing discourse of Asian American identity construction because it complicates prevailing understandings of the Black/White binary of race relations. Furthermore, because color


23. *Id.* at 249 (employing the terms “honorary whites” and “constructive blacks” to describe the contingent positioning of Asian Americans in the racial hierarchy). See also Volokh, *supra* note 9.

24. See infra Part IV.
preferences are likely to change subject to time and geographical contingencies, colorism discourse offers an alternative, perhaps more agile, method of mapping the complex interactions of race and identity politics.

Racism and colorism are distinct, but related forms of subordination. Sociologist Margaret Hunter defines colorism as “a process that privileges light-skinned people of color over dark in areas such as income, education, housing, and the marriage market.” Colorism, therefore, is a particular manifestation of the broader, systemic problem of racism. As Hunter notes: “The hierarchy employed in colorism, however, is usually the same one that governs racism: light skin is prized over dark, and European facial features and body shapes are prized over African features and body shapes.”

In the Asian American community, colorism is the product of a complex set of social and historical interactions with gender, immigrant, generational, and class dimensions. Within Asian ethnic groups, differences in skin color frequently determine social standing and


26. Margaret Hunter also uses the term “skin color stratification.” Margaret Hunter, The Persistent Problem of Colorism: Skin Tone, Status, and Inequality, 1 SOCIOLOGY COMPASS 237, 237 (2007). The material impacts of colorism on darker-skinned people has been studied and documented. Id. at 238 (citing numerous studies); Angela P. Harris, Introduction, in SHADES OF DIFFERENCE: WHY SKIN COLOR MATTERS 4, 55 (Evelyn Nakano Glenn ed. 2009) [hereinafter SHADES OF DIFFERENCE].

27. Hunter, supra note 26, at 238.

28. Id. at 239; Leonard M. Baynes, If It’s Not Just Black and White Anymore, Why Does Darkness Cast a Longer Discriminatory Shadow Than Lightness? An Investigation and Analysis of the Color Hierarchy, 75 DENV. U. L. REV. 131, 133 (1997) (describing the color hierarchy thus: “Lighter is better and darker is worse.”). Light-skinned people experience certain disadvantages due to colorism, or discrimination on the basis of skin tone. For example, light-skinned or mixed-race African American women and men are often subject to ridicule and inquisitions regarding their racial authenticity. Kimberly Jade Norwood, Colorism and Blackthink: A Modern Augmentation of Double Consciousness, in COLOR MATTERS, supra note 11, at 166–68.

29. For excellent coverage of this topic, see generally JOANNE L. RONDILLA & PAUL SPICKARD, IS LIGHTER BETTER?: SKIN TONE DISCRIMINATION AMONG ASIAN AMERICANS, 106 (2007); Evelyn Nakano Glenn, Consuming Lightness Segmented Markets and Global Capital in the Skin-Whitening Trade, in SHADES OF DIFFERENCE, supra note 26, at nn.21–37 (discussing India and the Indian diaspora, the Philippines, Japan, China, and Korea). See also E.J.R. David & Kevin L. Nadal, The Colonial Context of Filipino American Immigrants’ Psychological Experiences, in CULTURAL DIVERSITY & ETHNIC MINORITY PSYCHOLOGY 298, 299 (2013) (explaining the authors’ use of the term “colonial mentality” to refer to a specific form of internalized oppression “characterized by a perception of ethnic or cultural inferiority”) (internal quotations omitted).
Colorism is a multifaceted system of subordination and influences not only the way that in-group members treat each other, but also how outsiders treat in-group members, and how in-group members treat outsiders. Investigating how colorism operates in the Asian American community yields important insights about how anti-Black prejudice is formed and deployed. Therefore, it is necessary to acknowledge how Asian American groups assert agency both in constructing their own identities and also in “redeploy[ing] structures of racial oppression against others.”

In the Asian American community, colorism exists as a result of an ideology of White supremacy imposed by European colonialists, but also because of a pre-existing preference for white skin that predates sustained contact with Europeans. Ancient Japanese believed that light skin was an indicator of spiritual purity. In China, the association between wealth and fair skin dates back to before the Qin Dynasty. In countries with long histories of European and U.S. colonialism, the Philippines, India, and Vietnam, for example, preference for light skin is closely connected to social and cultural values enforced by White colonial regimes.

Whatever its origin, colorism persists in Asia today. In the melodramatic world of Filipino teleseryes (soap operas), for example, color prejudices play out on the small screen with alarming frequency.
One of the highest-rated series in GMA Network history was titled, *Nita Negrita*. The show’s lead actor played the role of the dark-skinned title character in blackface. “Negrita” in the Tagalog vernacular is not a neutral descriptor. Though diminutive, the word “negrita” is meant to denigrate the person whom it describes. The general societal distaste for dark skin is a factor in ordering the social hierarchy in the Philippines as well as in the formation of racial attitudes when Filipinos migrate to the United States. Colorism as practiced in the Philippines predisposes immigrants to developing negative stereotypical views of Black Americans and other dark-skinned people of color. The author Toni Morrison summarizes the choice that all immigrants confront: “Whatever the ethnicity or nationality of the immigrant, his nemesis is understood to be African American. . . . It doesn’t matter anymore what shade the newcomer’s skin is. A hostile posture toward resident blacks must be struck at the Americanizing door before it will open.” Upon arrival to the United States, latent anti-Black ideology is immediately reinforced by interactions within the extant color and racial hierarchy.

Colorism also impacts intra-racial and inter-ethnic relationships between and among different Asian American sub-groups. Darker-skinned Asian groups are widely considered to be at the bottom of the Asian American social hierarchy. They are often the punch line of crude ethnic
jokes which trade on negative stereotypes.\textsuperscript{45} External markers of success, such as educational achievement, occupation, and income are not shared evenly throughout the Asian American community. In Hawai‘i, for example, light-skinned East Asian groups (i.e., Chinese and Japanese) along with their White counterparts, are overrepresented in white-collar industries.\textsuperscript{46} This group’s socially and economically powerful position in the islands has aided in the subordination of other, typically darker-skinned ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{47} Dark-skinned Asian Americans, including Pacific Islanders, are overrepresented in low-wage blue-collar industries.\textsuperscript{48} Differences in socioeconomic class contribute to stratification along racial and ethnic lines, and the resulting hierarchical power structure is reproduced and maintained through cultural practices such as ethnic jokes.\textsuperscript{49}

Further, colorism informs the ways in which Asian Americans perform race and racial identity.\textsuperscript{50} Chinese American Chrissy Lau reports receiving the following admonition from her mother after swimming outside: “[she] yelled at me with disgust and said, ‘Look how dark you are! You’re becoming black!’”\textsuperscript{51} For many Asian American women and men, Lau’s mother’s rebuke is perhaps familiar.\textsuperscript{52} It is not unusual for Asian American women to take steps to maintain light skin by avoiding the sun\textsuperscript{53} or to purchase expensive skin lighteners or brighteners\textsuperscript{54} to obtain the benefits that accompany a light-skinned appearance. Lau notes that her mother’s

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{45. Roderick N. Labrador, “We Can Laugh at Ourselves”: Hawai‘i Ethnic Humor, Local Identity and the Myth of Multiculturalism, 14 PRAGMATICS 291, 299 (2004) (uncovering the structures of inequality and systems of power that undergird the popularity of ethnic jokes).}
\footnote{46. JONATHAN OKAMURA, ETHNICITY AND INEQUALITY IN HAWAII (2008).}
\footnote{47. Id.}
\footnote{48. Id.}
\footnote{49. Labrador, supra note 45, at 293 (including, for example, jokes based on the stereotype that Filipinos eat dog).}
\footnote{50. RONDILLA & SPICKARD, supra note 29; Charis Thompson, Skin Tone and the Persistence of Biological Race in Egg Donation for Assisted Reproduction, in SHADES OF DIFFERENCE, supra note 26.}
\footnote{51. RONDILLA & SPICKARD, supra note 29, at 7–8.}
\footnote{52. Id. at 9 (“[My Korean parents] always said we looked like a Black person or a country bumpkin when we got dark.”).}
\footnote{54. Rachel Felder, Skin Brighteners Find a Welcome, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 9, 2012) (“In Asia, there are a lot of whitening products, and that’s what the category is called, which is in reference to the pearl-white skin that they aspire to have.”), http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/09/fashion/skin-brighteners-find-a-welcome.html.}
\end{footnotes}
disapproval of dark Asian skin permeated her attitudes towards other people of color: “I began to form a prejudice that I found light skin to be more attractive than dark skin, not only within the Asian race, but the Black race and the Hispanic race.” Colorism is not merely an intra-ethnic phenomenon, but also impacts relationships across different racial groups.

Although the preference for fair skin is the central feature of colorism, phenotypical traits such as hair texture, nose width, and eye shape are other markers of one’s color. Cosmetic surgery has made it possible for individuals to alter the presentation of their color on an even deeper level. The most common cosmetic surgery for Asian American women is a blepharoplasty, or double-eyelid surgery, which promises to make the eyes appear bigger, rounder, and more alert. The outpatient surgery costs between $2500–5000 and lasts less than an hour. When asked, blepharoplasty patients frequently deny that they seek surgery to look more “White.” Through her ethnographic research, however, Eugenia Kaw carefully deconstructs these denials, concluding “the conscious or unconscious manipulation of gender and racial stereotypes . . . influence [] Asian American women to alter their features through surgery.”

Exercising the choice (when available) to display a lighter-skinned appearance or to deemphasize phenotypical markers of difference can yield material benefits for the agent of that choice. As discussed above, light skin may signal belonging in a dominant economic class. These physical features can elevate one’s social status and reputation for beauty. Cosmetic surgery is not always about beauty, however. For Fred Korematsu, undergoing an eyelid surgery was a risky attempt to maintain

55. Rondilla & Spickard, supra note 29, at 8.
56. Id. at 106. See also Michael Omi & Howard Winant, Racial Formations, in RETHINKING THE COLOR LINE: READINGS IN RACE AND ETHNICITY 13 (2d ed. 2003) (“Temperament, sexuality, intelligence, athletic ability, aesthetic preferences and so on are presumed to be fixed and discernable from the palpable marks of race.”).
59. See, e.g., Wen Hua, Buying Beauty: Cosmetic Surgery in China 191–96 (2013) (describing several alternative explanations for seeking double-eyelid surgery, including general beauty concerns, to increase facial expressivity, to ease makeup application, and affordability compared to other cosmetic procedures).
his freedom from unjust incarceration.\textsuperscript{61} To avoid imprisonment in an internment camp for Japanese Americans during World War II, Korematsu underwent surgery, changed his name to Clyde Sarah, and claimed to be of Spanish and Hawaiian descent.\textsuperscript{62}

### III. CLAIMING WHITENESS

Within the bounds of the Black/White binary, Asian Americans occupy a space of contingent racial identity primarily shaped and defined by White institutions. Congress and the courts, for instance, have participated in constructing Asian Americans as non-White or non-Black, depending on the maintenance demands of the status quo. To obtain the benefits distributed according to those boundaries, Asian Americans have often engaged in a variety of acts amounting to claims of Whiteness. Korematsu did so through a literal de-ethnicization of his face. The petitioners in \textit{Ozawa},\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Thind},\textsuperscript{64} and \textit{Gong Lum}\textsuperscript{65} presented and argued legal claims to Whiteness before the United States Supreme Court. Their claims were not identical; the litigants attacked laws denying their access to immigration and public education benefits, each taking a different tack. Takao Ozawa argued that his skin was actually white; whiter than some Caucasians. Bhagat Singh Thind cited contemporary scientific treatises, arguing that because he was classed as “Caucasian,” he was White. Finally, Gong Lum highlighted Chinese Americans’ cultural proximity to Whites, while explicitly disassociating them from Blacks

In October 1914, Takao Ozawa, an immigrant from Japan who had lived in the United States for the preceding twenty years, applied to become a naturalized citizen.\textsuperscript{66} A 1790 law restricted naturalization benefits to “free white persons.”\textsuperscript{67} In his arguments before the Supreme
Court, Ozawa urged that the original intent of this restrictive clause was “simply to distinguish black people from others.”

Therefore, Ozawa attempted to claim a stake in Whiteness by distinguishing himself as a Japanese American, as opposed to Black, in order to receive a legal benefit available to Whites.

Ozawa’s self-authored brief to the federal district court in Honolulu makes the claim that Japanese people have white skin and his color made him eligible to naturalize under the 1790 law. Ozawa argued that he and other people of Japanese descent were “Yellowish White” on the color spectrum and at least as white as Italians, who were “Brownish White.”

In his own words: “Those who live in central and northern part of Japan are much whiter than some of so-called white person [sic] in Hawai‘i.”

For Ozawa, the color white did not only signify one’s race, whiteness also reflected personal virtues. Recall that in ancient Japan, white skin was a sign of spiritual and moral purity. As Devon Carbado notes in his legal history of the case, Ozawa argued that his external white skin and his internal white character made him worthy of U.S. citizenship.

Whiteness as a signifier for hard work and good moral character was an important feature of the whiteness narrative.

Ozawa’s skin-color arguments had legal precedent. Abba Dolla, an immigrant from India, had successfully passed a skin-color test during his own naturalization case. The presiding judge at Dolla’s naturalization hearing determined that the skin on Dolla’s arms was “several shades lighter than that of his face and hands, and was sufficiently transparent for course, struck the entire restrictive phrase “free white persons,” but did not. The purpose of this amendment was to purposefully exclude immigration from the Asian continent.

68. Id. at 194 (quoting Naturalization of a Japanese Subject, In re Ozawa, No. 274, at 14 (D. Haw. 1916) [hereinafter Brief], Ozawa’s self-authored brief to the District Court).
69. Id. at 178.
70. Id. at 203 (quoting Brief at 15).
71. Id. at 203 (quoting Brief at 7).
72. See Hunter, supra note 26, at 239.
73. Id. at 193–200, 203–05. See also John Tehranian, Performing Whiteness: Naturalization Litigation and the Construction of Racial Identity in America, 109 YALE L.J. 817, 823 (2000) (observing the emergence of a “dramaturgy of whiteness” where eligibility to naturalize in racial-prequisite cases like Ozawa and Thind were dependent on the petitioner’s performance and conformance with White cultural values).
74. Carbado, supra note 67, at 189–93 (cataloguing Ozawa’s self-promoted virtues; namely, his education, his disaffiliation with Japan and Japanese American societies, his family’s complete assimilation into U.S. cultural norms, and his Christianity). Ozawa was also a successful business owner. Kaimuki Dry Goods, the store that he and his wife founded in 1926, is still open today. Kaimuki Dry Goods, About Us, http://www.kaimukidrygoods.com/aboutus.shtml.
75. United States v. Dolla, 177 F. 101, 102 (5th Cir. 1910).
the blue color of the veins to show very clearly.”

In his brief to the Supreme Court, Ozawa echoes the Dolla court’s focus on skin luminescence, arguing: “the Japanese are lighter than other Asiatics, not rarely showing the transparent pink tint which whites assume as their own privilege.”

Ozawa’s skin-color argument backfired, however. The Court seemed willing to concede that Ozawa’s skin was in fact white, but it was preoccupied with a concern that a skin-color test would topple the existing race hierarchy. If white-skinned Japanese people were recognized as members of the White race under the law, the strict lines of separation that divided the races could become blurred. So the Court rejected Ozawa’s proposed skin-color test, stating:

Manifestly the test afforded by the mere color of the skin of each individual is impracticable, as that differs greatly among persons of the same race, even among Anglo-Saxons, ranging by imperceptible gradations from the fair blond to the swarthy brunette, the latter being darker than many of the lighter hued persons of the brown or yellow races. Hence to adopt the color test alone would result in a confused overlapping of races and a gradual merging of one into the other, without any practical line of separation.

Ultimately, the Court held that Ozawa was “clearly of a race which is not Caucasian and therefore belongs entirely outside the zone [of those eligible to naturalize].”

Maintaining the color line was of critical importance for the Court. Led by Chief Justice William Howard Taft, the Court “generally showed very little concern over issues of racial prejudice.” Over the next five years, the Taft Court would later vote to uphold racially restrictive covenants and racial segregation in public education.

76. Id.
78. Ozawa, 260 U.S. at 189. “That [Ozawa] was well-qualified by character and education for citizenship is conceded.” Id.
79. Id. at 197.
80. Id. at 198.
author of the Ozawa opinion, was a committed nativist who had supported the extension of the Chinese Exclusion Act.  

Bhagat Singh Thind, a Sikh man born in India, attempted to exploit the Ozawa Court’s conflation of “Caucasian” with “White” by arguing that he was eligible for naturalization because he was a member of the Caucasian or Aryan race. Thind had reason to be optimistic about the strength of his legal claims; the contemporary race literature had definitively placed Indians within the category of Caucasian and his petition for citizenship had been granted at the district court level. Moreover, Thind had served honorably in the U.S. Army during World War I, and Congress had recently streamlined the naturalization process for military service members.

Although based on (pseudo) scientific definitions of the races, Thind’s arguments failed to win over the Court. Justice Sutherland’s opinion again betrays the Court’s concern for the color line and separation of the races. Although technically Caucasians, immigrants from South Asia could not rely on assimilation to erase the corporeal marks of their racial difference, Sutherland reasoned: “It is a matter of familiar observation and knowledge that the physical group characteristics of the Hindus render them distinguishable from the various groups of persons in this country commonly recognized as white.” The Court therefore rejected the race science of the day to return to a physical-traits test it had just rejected in Ozawa.

When asserting their own claims to Whiteness, Asian Americans litigants invariably failed. A third case from the Taft Court era further illustrates this point. The Mississippi state constitution contained a...
provision requiring that “[s]eparate schools should be maintained for the children of the white and colored races.” In Gong Lum v. Rice, the Chinese American plaintiffs in a pre-Brown school desegregation case argued that they were not “colored” and therefore should be allowed to attend “White” schools. The Court ruled against the plaintiffs, finding that Chinese people were not “White” and therefore, that they were “colored” and that the State was not required to provide separate schools for each of the colored races.

Like Ozawa and Thind, in making their legal arguments, the Gong Lum plaintiffs did not raise challenges to the system of White supremacy that subordinates people of color. Instead they argued that the Mongolian race—namely the Chinese—

furnish some of the most intelligent and enterprising people. They certainly stand nearer to the [W]hite race than they do the [N]egro race. If the Caucasian is not ready to admit that the representative Mongolian is his equal he is willing to concede that the Mongolian is on the hither side of the half-way line between the Caucasian and African.

The Gong Lum plaintiffs assumed the legitimacy of the established racial hierarchy and sought to induce the court to classify Chinese at the top of that hierarchy, proximate to Whites, with as much distance from Blacks as possible. This choice fits squarely within a familiar observation about the inescapability of the Black/White binary and its corresponding racial hierarchy: “the anti-black world is conditioned by what we can here describe as two principles of value: (1) It is best to be white but (2) above all, it is worst to be black.”

91. Gong Lum, 275 U.S. at 82 (1927) (citing Section 207 of the Mississippi Constitution of 1890).
92. Rice v. Gong Lum, 139 Miss. 760, 104 So. 105 (1925), aff’d, 275 U.S. 78 (1927).
94. Gong Lum, 275 U.S. at 81–82.
95. Id. at 85, 87 (”a Chinese citizen of the United States . . . is classed among the colored races”).
98. Han, supra note 97.
According to the ideology of colorism, white skin and Whiteness signifies status and accomplishment, not infrequently purchased by methods of deliberation and self-control. Ozawa, Third, and Gong Lum made herculean efforts to prove that their individual successes made them like Whites. No amount of effort, however, could prove to the Supreme Court that Asian Americans should be afforded the status of White. That the Asian American petitioners described above may have made what they considered authentic color-based claims to Whiteness is not unproblematic. Claims to Whiteness in this context were rejections of any alliance or allegiance to Blackness and to the Black community. After they lost their legal battle to obtain access to White schools, for example, the Chinese Americans in the Mississippi Delta did not turn to the Black Delta community with whom the Supreme Court had grouped them. Instead, the Mississippi Chinese doubled efforts “to make themselves more acceptable to the White community.”

It was a missed opportunity for two racially-subordinated groups in the Mississippi Delta to build an anti-racist campaign together.

**IV. THE ADVENT OF THE PIGMENTOCRACY**

That some Asian Americans might try to claim Whiteness or to alter their physical appearance to conform to cultural norms, even to the point of de-ethnicization, is not startling if understood within the complex dynamics of racial formation. Race is not a fixed identity characteristic, but is, rather, socially constructed and mutable. Racial categories and the meanings ascribed to them can therefore be interrogated with reference to the contingencies of time and space. In the United States, the enslavement of Black Africans by White slave-owners created the necessity for legal regulations of race, and so the Black/White binary became the prevailing paradigm of race discourse. The binary disallowed uncertainty and equivocation. The principle of hypo-descent, or the “one-drop” rule, was created to “avoid the ambiguity of intermediate identity.” Moreover, by relegating mixed-race children to subordinate

---

102. Omi & Winant, supra note 56, at 11 (quoting MARVIN HARRIS, PATTERNS OF RACE IN THE AMERICAS 56 (1964)) (contrasting the hypo-descent rule of the United States with the proliferation of “intermediate” race categories in Latin America).
status, the one-drop rule also functioned as an engine in the production of new slaves once the Atlantic slave trade had ended.\textsuperscript{103}

This binary system was, of course, never inviolate. The racial categories Black and White have always been unstable and contested. People who were born Black under the one-drop rule often “passed” over the color line, relying on their light skin color and other racially ambiguous features to gain entrance into White society.\textsuperscript{104} A similar crossing occurred when European immigrants who were not racialized as White upon entry to the United States eventually assimilated and “became” White.\textsuperscript{105}

As these examples demonstrate, if the lens through which race is viewed captures only Black and White, one-way crossings over the two categories can be facilitated, but this view also renders invisible those peoples who exist between those two poles.\textsuperscript{106} The Black/White binary threatens to erase the lived experiences of non-Black peoples of color.\textsuperscript{107} Neither Black nor White, racial intermediate groups like Asian Americans, Latinos, and Native peoples frequently lack both visibility (and thus political power) as well as the legal language to articulate valid discrimination claims.\textsuperscript{108}

The long-term viability of the Black/White binary has been put into doubt, however. Scholars across the disciplines have predicted that the binary will become anachronistic in the near future, and a new and more

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{103} See Brown, supra note 11.


\textsuperscript{105} See generally Ignatiev, supra note 8.

\textsuperscript{106} Leslie Bow uses the notion of “racial interstitiality” to frame her study of Asian Americans in the Jim Crow South. Leslie Bow, PARTLY COLORED: ASIAN AMERICANS AND Racial Anomaly in the Segregated South 8–12 (2010).
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\end{footnotes}
complex racial hierarchy based on gradations of color will take its place. Sociologists Eduardo Bonilla-Silva and David Dietrich propose a pigmentocracy model, in which race relations in the United States will begin to more closely resemble Latin America’s. That is, existing racial stratification will become more variegated, allowing for more gradations of color within a spectrum bounded at one end by White and at the other by Black. Yet even in the pigmentocracy model, Whites still occupy the most privileged position in terms of power, wealth, and social standing. These material benefits are unevenly distributed across the color spectrum, and in decreasing amounts the closer one’s skin color matches those identified as “Black.”

Under the pigmentocracy model, some Asian American groups fall into an intermediary category labeled “Honorary White.” For Bonilla-Silva, the creation of an intermediary group like “Honorary White” is a hegemonic strategy; installing a buffer group between Black and White aids in the maintenance of White dominance. Under this system of pigmentocracy, inequality will actually worsen but creation of the intermediary category allows Whites to remain at the top of the social structure, and insulates them from race-based challenges to the equality gap.

Bonilla-Silva finds proof of the coming pigmentocracy in the already-existing and ever-widening socioeconomic gaps between the groups he identifies as Whites, Honorary Whites, and the Collective Black. Honorary White Asian Americans (e.g., Japanese, Koreans, Chinese) have outpaced the socioeconomic gains made by Asian American groups in the
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collective Black (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodian, Hmong). Social psychologists believe that recognition of the differences “in income, occupational status, and education” contribute to identity and group formation. The empirical data is only one source of the identity work needed to reify the Honorary White category, however. In addition to recognizing these group distinctions, potential entrants to the intermediary group must also make meaning of them. Awareness of differences and the assignment of normative values to those differences propels the process by which distinctions between groups become racialized and understood by both members of the nascent intermediary group and Whites alike.

According to Bonilla-Silva, as this process takes place, those in the formative intermediary group begin to take on “White-like . . . attitudes.” In the Asian American community, the heritage of colorism facilitates the claimed distinctions between lighter-skinned, socioeconomically privileged groups and darker-skinned, socioeconomically disadvantaged groups. The sense of belonging to the Honorary White group is then reinforced by the superordinate group. Whites already report more positive associations with groups in the Honorary White category than they do those in the Collective Black. And the mixed-race children of White and Asian couples are twice as likely to be classified as White compared to the children of Black and White couples.

V. REJECTING WHITENESS

When Asian Americans made legal claims to Whiteness in the past, courts rejected those claims in order to maintain the strict separation of the races along the Black/White binary. In the context of the coming pigmentocracy, however, Honorary White status can be read as a sort of
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invitation to Whiteness, which Asian Americans are positioned to either accept or reject. But the terms of such a bargain should be made clear. Accepting Honorary White status will not cure structural inequalities that subordinate all people of color nor will it shield Asian Americans from the microaggressions of everyday racism.

A. The Model Minority Myth and the Affirmative Action Debate

The O’Reilly quote in the Introduction to this Article is a typical exposition of the Model Minority Myth (the Myth). In the context of the pigmentocracy, the Myth is perpetrated by Whites against the Collective Black to maintain the established social order by creating space for an intermediary group of Honorary Whites.126 The Myth is the origin story of the Honorary White group. According to the Myth, Honorary Whites (i.e., light-skinned Asian Americans) have achieved educational and economic success because of their individual efforts.127 The Myth further provides that, without assistance from the State and despite experiencing virulent racism in the past, Asian Americans have managed not only to reach parity with Whites, but according to a variety of indicators, to have surpassed them.128

But the Myth is a myth, and it was concocted to serve a specific social purpose.129 The term was coined in 1966 after William Petersen published an article in The New York Times Magazine called “Success Story, Japanese-American Style.”130 In touting the significant accomplishments of Japanese Americans in the twenty years after World War II, Petersen presented Asian Americans and Black Americans as foils to each other’s minority group experience. 131 Although both groups faced “color prejudice,” Petersen claimed, Japanese Americans were doing “better than any other group in our society, including native-born whites.”132 Unlike other “problem minorities,” Petersen asserted, Japanese Americans relied on their own bootstraps—hard work and education—to obtain higher
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employment levels than White Americans and lower crime rates than Black Americans.\textsuperscript{133}

Petersen’s article was published in the wake of two major successes of the Black-led Civil Rights Movement—the 1964 Civil Rights Act\textsuperscript{134} and the 1965 Voting Rights Act.\textsuperscript{135} These civil rights achievements coincided with another Congressional triumph—the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act.\textsuperscript{136} The 1965 immigration law allowed for an unprecedented wave of Asian immigrants to enter the United States.\textsuperscript{137} Previously denied entry because of racially exclusionary laws, post-1965 Asian immigrants were beneficiaries of the U.S. government’s new immigration policy focused on family reunification and recruitment of highly-skilled workers.\textsuperscript{138} At this time in U.S. history, not only were people of color growing in numbers, they were now able to exercise political power. Radical Black Power and other People’s Liberation movements that sought to expose institutional racism and the breadth of White supremacy were gaining traction in mainstream society.\textsuperscript{139} Among the radical visions that accompanied these times were statements of self-love—\textit{Black is beautiful}; \textit{Brown Pride}—that challenged Eurocentric standards of beauty.\textsuperscript{140}

The Model Minority Myth was designed to mollify the societal tensions brought to the fore by these burgeoning social movements. The success of Asian Americans was intended to serve as proof that racism was not to blame for the failure to achieve the American Dream. Rather, the Myth promoted the notion that poor conditions in Black communities
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were the result of Black cultural inadequacies.\textsuperscript{141} Positioned as a wedge in a social system that subordinates Black people, many—though not all—Asian American groups thrived.\textsuperscript{142}

The myth of the Asian model minority has endured. For twenty years after Petersen’s article, “the media presented virtually no other image of Asian Americans.”\textsuperscript{143} All Asians groups were viewed and treated as equivalent as a result of this singular image of success. Gradually, the Myth also laid the foundation for “reverse-discrimination” claims raised in political and judicial fora.

Asian Americans have become the new face of the affirmative action debate. In 2014, the California state senate was prepared to vote on an initiative (SCA-5) that would reverse the effects of Proposition 209 and restore the ability of universities to consider race as a factor in admissions decisions.\textsuperscript{144} The measure was aimed at increasing the numbers of Latinos, African Americans, and Native American students in the public university system, populations which had dropped precipitously after 2009.\textsuperscript{145} Although a majority of Asian Americans support affirmative action,\textsuperscript{146} vocal and well-organized Chinese American groups quashed the state senate’s efforts.\textsuperscript{147} The anti-SCA-5 campaign included misleading statements characterizing the measure as a racial quota, and its constituents effectively lobbied three key Asian American senators, killing the bill.\textsuperscript{148}

In the courts, Asian American advocacy groups submitted four amicus briefs to the Supreme Court to help it decide a challenge to the University of Texas’s (UT’s) race-conscious undergraduate admissions process—two in support of the Petitioner Abigail Fisher\textsuperscript{149} and two in support of UT.\textsuperscript{150}
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Fisher’s amici argued that UT’s admissions process amounted to unlawful “racial balancing,” which, they argued, has a discriminatory impact on Asian Americans. Amici for UT directly challenged the assertion that UT’s admissions process disadvantaged Asian American students in any way. Moreover, the Asian American Legal Defense Fund argued that the UT policy of race-conscious, individualized review was beneficial to all students, but in particular to Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

After the Supreme Court’s 2014 ruling in Fisher, the future of race-conscious admissions policies in higher education is in doubt. The next test may come from an Asian American plaintiff. In December 2014, Students for Fair Admissions (SFFA), an Austin-based group, filed two lawsuits challenging undergraduate admissions policies at Harvard University and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (UNC). In order to find suitable plaintiffs for these complaints, SFFA launched a widespread advertising campaign targeting Asian Americans. Billboards and posters proclaimed: “Were You Denied Admission to the University of Wisconsin-Madison? It may be because you’re the wrong race.”
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photo of a young, earnest-looking Asian American woman in a business suit is displayed next to this message. The pattern repeats on two analogous sites seeking applicants who were denied admission to Harvard and UNC.  

B. Interracial Coalition Building

Under the pigmentocracy model described above, as Honorary Whites grow in number and status, the intermediary group will more readily serve as a buffer of interracial conflict. As the Model Minority Myth demonstrates, the success of those groups holding intermediary status will provide fertile ground for allowing colorblind ideology to take root and flourish. Bonilla-Silva fears that entrenchment of colorblind ideology will produce the same effects in the rest of civil society, potentially leading to Latin American-like disgust for discussions about “race,” and concludes: “We need to short-circuit the belief in near-whiteness as the solution to status differences and create a coalition of all ‘people of color’ and their White allies.”

Yet, it is not a fait accompli that Asian Americans will leave the ranks of people of color for the privileges of Honorary Whiteness. Asian American groups continue to champion the cause of affirmative action and humane immigration law reform. After 9/11, the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) was one of the first national organizations to publicly oppose the indefinite detention of suspected terrorists. The JACL remains a staunch defender of civil liberties, and opposed the 2011 National Defense Authorization Act that codifies the Executive’s powers to indefinitely detain U.S. citizens. Each of these events has important
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implications about the future of interracial coalitions for race equality and social justice. Interracial coalitions for racial justice are impossible, however, “so long as each group constantly seeks to improve its position in the racial hierarchy by appeasing Whites.”169

Asian Americans are strategically poised to credibly articulate a racial justice narrative that exposes historical race-based deprivations and, on this platform, to advocate for appropriate remedial measures for ourselves and for other peoples of color. Asian Americans were historically excluded by racial segregation, but have materially benefited from the Black-led civil rights struggles to integrate educational institutions.170 Yet some Asian American groups—Hmong, Cambodians, Laotians, and Vietnamese—remain underrepresented in higher education and stand to gain ground through race-based affirmative action programs.171 In accessing higher education through affirmative action policies, Asian Americans will not lose ground to Blacks and Latinos.172 The same is true of race-conscious hiring practices in private businesses and in government.

Honorary White identity offers only the illusion of the power and status associated with Whiteness because, in the pigmentocracy, the superordinate group always maintains its dominant position. Taking a stance in favor of affirmative action would necessarily mean rejecting the invitation to Honorary White status in favor of interracial coalition building with Black Americans and other peoples of color.173 It is a recognition that the intermediate status accorded to Honorary Whites is not really about access to the privileges of Whiteness, but is instead complicity in a color and race hierarchy that devalues Blackness. When Asian Americans reject this formulation, it is one way to communicate the belief that Black and Brown lives have value; that Black lives matter.
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C. #Asians4BlackLives

On February 11, 2015, the Brooklyn District Attorney filed an indictment against New York police officer Peter Liang, charging him with manslaughter in the second degree. The previous November, while on vertical patrol in a Brooklyn housing project, Officer Liang fired his gun in a dark stairwell. The bullet ricocheted off a wall and entered the chest of twenty-eight-year-old Akai Gurley, killing him. Gurley became yet another victim in the long list of police killings of unarmed Black people that has come to dominate the nightly news. The wrinkle in this too-familiar narrative is that Officer Liang is Chinese American.

The Asian American community reacted to Liang’s indictment in various ways. A group of Chinese Americans organized a petition, demanding that the indictment be withdrawn. Over 100,000 people signed the petition, which favorably compared the Gurley shooting to the police-involved deaths of Michael Brown and Eric Garner. Because the unindicted police in the latter two cases were White, the petition declares that Liang is being scapegoated because he is not White. By contrast, CAAAV: Organizing Asian Communities (CAAAV), an Asian American non-profit advocacy group, released a statement supporting the Liang indictment, and drawing attention to the systemic problem of police impunity.

In April 2015, fifty additional Asian American groups joined
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CAAAV and published an open letter (in English and Chinese).\textsuperscript{182} The letter read, in part: “The fact that Officer Liang is Asian American shouldn’t mean that we...support him unequivocally. Quite the opposite—it should compel us to think about what justice looks like and how Asian Americans can contribute to the movement for police accountability and broader racial justice.”\textsuperscript{183} Both responses indicate an awareness of how proffered Honorary White status inflicts harm on the Asian Americans grouped together in that intermediate race category. But whereas the petition signers are narrowly focused on the negative impact on Officer Liang as a Chinese American, CAAAV and its coalition members have articulated a broader perspective, connecting anti-Black police violence to systemic flaws in political and economic structures, of which the criminal justice system is just one part.\textsuperscript{184}

\section*{VI. CONCLUSION}

Although the Black/White binary is the dominant framework for understanding interracial relations in the United States, successful coalition work between different peoples of color requires an understanding of how an intermediate group labeled “Honorary Whites” can be manipulated by the existing power elites to maintain a system of racial subordination. Affirmative action and movements for police accountability in the face of racialized violence targeting Black bodies are two of the multitude of contemporary issues on which Asian Americans can assert their collective voice in coalition and alliance with other communities of color. The work of building and maintaining interracial coalitions is not easy and is always fraught with complicated questions of shared and divergent interests, but the choice to engage in this work recognizes that peoples of color share many struggles and are more capable of addressing those shared struggles as an organized assembly.
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