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*Abstract*

*Chinese restaurants are now a cultural fixture, as American as cherry pie. Startlingly, however, there was once a national movement to eliminate Chinese restaurants, using innovative legal methods to drive them out. Chinese restaurants were objectionable for two reasons. First, they threatened white women, who were subject to seduction by Chinese men, through intrinsic female weakness, or employment of nefarious techniques such as opium addiction. In addition, Chinese restaurants competed with “American” restaurants, thus threatening the livelihoods of white owners, cooks and servers; unions were the driving force behind the movement.*

*The effort was creative; Chicago used anti-Chinese zoning, Los Angeles restricted restaurant jobs to citizens, Boston authorities decreed Chinese restaurants would be denied licenses, the New York Police Department simply ordered whites out of Chinatown. Perhaps the most interesting technique was a law, endorsed by the American Federation of Labor for adoption in all jurisdictions, prohibiting white women from working in Asian restaurants. Most measures failed or were struck down. However, Asians still lost; the unions did not eliminate Chinese restaurants, but they achieved their more important goal, extending the federal policy of racial exclusion in immigration from Chinese to all Asians. The campaign is of more than historical interest. As current anti-immigration sentiments and efforts show, even today the idea that white Americans should have a privileged place in the economy, or that non-whites are culturally incongruous, persists among some.*

# Introduction

This article explores a lost chapter in the history of racial regulation in the United States. For roughly thirty years, in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth, a national movement sought to use the law to eliminate Chinese restaurants from the United States. This effort, described as a “war,”[[3]](#footnote-4) is largely unknown.[[4]](#footnote-5)

Chinese restaurants were “a serious menace to society” for two reasons.[[5]](#footnote-6) First, by employing Chinese workers and successfully competing with other restaurants, white unionists claimed the restaurants denied “our own race a chance to live.”[[6]](#footnote-7) Chinese restaurants were also morally hazardous to white women; one observer noted that “[b]eer and noodles in Chinese joints have caused the downfall of countless American girls.”[[7]](#footnote-8) Accordingly, many Americans recognized “the necessity for stamping out” the “iniquitous Chinese Chop Suey joints.”[[8]](#footnote-9)

 The effort failed; “there are more Chinese restaurants in the United States than McDonald’s, Burger King, and KFC restaurants combined.”[[9]](#footnote-10) But the campaign, unsuccessful in its nominal goal, helped propagate the idea of Chinese as morally and economically dangerous, and contributed to the passage of the Immigration Acts of 1917[[10]](#footnote-11) and 1924,[[11]](#footnote-12) which almost completely eliminated Asian immigration to the United States.

 The movement against Chinese restaurants was led by labor unions. Part I discusses early important techniques, riot and boycott.[[12]](#footnote-13) Boycotts were at best partially successful. Protection of white women from sexual exploitation emerged as a key rationale for suppression.[[13]](#footnote-14) Concern with the moral dangers of Chinese was dramatically escalated in 1909 after Elsie Sigel, granddaughter of a Union general, was murdered by a New York Chinese restaurant worker who had “seduced” her.[[14]](#footnote-15) The case made the problem of moral contagion presented by Chinese restaurants a prominent national issue, and prompted new efforts to regulate Chinese restaurants.[[15]](#footnote-16) Part II discusses the white women’s labor bill, which prohibited women from working for Chinese or patronizing Chinese restaurants. Other methods of regulation included police-enforced segregation, and discriminatory licensing and enforcement practices.[[16]](#footnote-17)

Part III discusses the end of the war.[[17]](#footnote-18) For the most part, the legal efforts to suppress Chinese restaurants failed, and Chinese restaurants became an accepted, even traditional, feature of American society. Yet, the primary goal of the unions was achieved. Congress enacted laws restricting not just Chinese but all Asian immigration, with the aim of permanently ending Asian competition with white labor.[[18]](#footnote-19)

The article concludes by exploring the implications of this episode for American race law.[[19]](#footnote-20) The story is of historical interest, but it also reflects continuing contemporary controversies. One issue is the persistence sense of some in the United States that the national policy should be dedicated to the benefit of whites. It also sheds light on the depth and persistence of racism and hostility toward immigrants in the United States.

# Labor Unions & The Chinese Restaurant Threat

A. Union Opposition to Chinese Restaurants.

For most of United States history, the borders were open.[[20]](#footnote-21) Although criminal conviction, disease and certain other characteristics disqualified a prospective immigrant, until 1921, there were no numerical limitations on immigration.[[21]](#footnote-22) The open-border policy applied to all races except Asians.[[22]](#footnote-23) Particularly in the Western United States, political, moral and economic considerations led to a perceived “Yellow Peril,” the danger that untold numbers of racially dangerous Asians could come to the United States and undermine its basic character. Thus, while immigration in general was not numerically limited, Asian immigration was tightly controlled. Of course, in the late Nineteenth Century, United States law also resolved the fate of other non-white racial groups, Indians and African Americans.[[23]](#footnote-24)

Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882,[[24]](#footnote-25) but it did not end hostility toward Chinese.[[25]](#footnote-26) A key reason the anti-Chinese movement did not declare victory was that Chinese Exclusion statutes were facially temporary. Because Congress had to reconsider the question periodically, Chinese exclusion was a continuing political issue until it was made permanent in 1902.[[26]](#footnote-27) Even then, the issue was not closed. By 1902, Japanese and other Asian immigrants were migrating to the United States, and their racial assimilability and therefore their right to immigrate became prominent public policy questions.[[27]](#footnote-28)

Those Chinese in the United States had limited opportunities for employment. Some jobs required licenses which were limited to U.S. citizens, a status immigrant Chinese could never achieve because of racial restrictions on naturalization.[[28]](#footnote-29) Even without law, social discrimination restricted employment opportunities.[[29]](#footnote-30) Accordingly, many Chinese were employed in services and small businesses, such as restaurants and laundries.[[30]](#footnote-31)

Because Americans seemed to like Chinese food, the restaurant business seemed promising. The popularity of “chop suey” and other Americanized or American Chinese dishes resulted in “the subsequent sprouting of Chinese restaurants.”[[31]](#footnote-32) Their numbers grew rapidly in the late 19th and early 20th century.[[32]](#footnote-33) In 1870, with 63,000 Chinese residents in the United States, Chinese restaurants employed only 164 Chinese persons.[[33]](#footnote-34) By 1920, despite a decline in Chinese population and employment,[[34]](#footnote-35) over 11,400 workers were employed by Chinese restaurants in the United States.[[35]](#footnote-36)

To be sure, Chinese restaurants were regarded as exotic and potentially dangerous. In 1887, an aficionado wrongly predicted that “visions of kittens and rats would keep the Chinese restaurant from being largely patronized.”[[36]](#footnote-37) The *Denver Post* reported that local Chinese restaurant served dog meat “in a Chinese dish called chop suey;”[[37]](#footnote-38) a Missouri paper reported an investigation of “chop suey restaurants” based on “suspicion that they do not use fresh rats.”[[38]](#footnote-39) A In Bisbee, Arizona a Chinese restaurant allegedly had human children on the menu.[[39]](#footnote-40) In Jerome, Arizona whispered insinuations that the Chinese restaurants served “refuse and tainted meats” procured from trash barrels of the butcher shops[[40]](#footnote-41) led to calls that the city should “punish the Chinks for serving unpalatable food,”[[41]](#footnote-42) and that the Chinese “should be driven from the camp and that furthermore no more should be permitted to enter.”[[42]](#footnote-43) Nevertheless, while there were many suggestions that Chinese restaurants were “not so good either in a moral or a culinary way,”[[43]](#footnote-44) few claimed that the food was unpalatable in principle, that is, if not prepared with rats or dogs.

Unions opposed Asian immigration in general and Chinese restaurants in particular. The Cooks’ and Waiters’ Union is an ancestor of the modern-day UNITE-HERE. Its members competed directly with Chinese restaurants, and the union was a powerful force; by 1903, their membership exceeded 50,000.[[44]](#footnote-45) They were affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, which by 1914 claimed nearly 2,000,000 members.[[45]](#footnote-46) The unions strongly supported Chinese Exclusion[[46]](#footnote-47) and expansion of the exclusion policy to all Asian races.[[47]](#footnote-48) A report in the *Mixer and Server*, the union publication, explained:

View this matter from every angle, without heat or racial prejudice, and the fact stares us in the face that there is a conflict between the American wage-earner and the workers or employers from the Orient. Our Government has been compelled to close its doors to Asiatics in recognition of this fact.[[48]](#footnote-49)

In his famous essay *Meat v. Rice: American Manhood Against Asiatic Coolieism, Which Shall Survive*,[[49]](#footnote-50) American Federation of Labor President Samuel Gompers put the conflict in decidedly culinary terms. Unions saw the lower wage scales in Chinese restaurants as a threat,[[50]](#footnote-51) but rather than trying to unionize Chinese restaurants and their employees, unions sought to eliminate the “unfair” competition by driving the restaurants out of business. In this, the interests of unions sometimes dovetailed with the business interests of restaurant owners who would profit from the closure of their competitors.[[51]](#footnote-52)

B. Riot and Boycott

Asians were generally barred from union membership. The Cooks’ and Waiters’ Union excluded even United States citizens of Asian ancestry, because they were “true to one principle — nothing doing with either Chinks, Japs or other Asiatics.”[[52]](#footnote-53) To fight the “iniquitous chop suey joints,” unions demanded as a contract term that Asians be discharged[[53]](#footnote-54) and barred union members from working with Asians;[[54]](#footnote-55) Asian owners were not allowed to display union house or bar cards.[[55]](#footnote-56) Dealing with the Chinese inspired union creativity; reportedly, “[t]he first union label was used by San Francisco Cigarmakers in opposing the product of Chinese Cigarmakers.”[[56]](#footnote-57)

Early methods of eliminating Chinese competition included threats and violence.[[57]](#footnote-58) For example, Chinese restaurant owners in Selma, California, were “driven out” by organized labor.[[58]](#footnote-59) The *Salt Lake Tribune* reported “laboring men” “sen[t] them out of town,” and “their businesses were closed.”[[59]](#footnote-60) Similarly, Silverton, Colorado, unions ordered seventy Chinese residents to leave.[[60]](#footnote-61) Two-thirds departed within ten days.[[61]](#footnote-62) Silverton had six to eight Chinese restaurants; two weeks later, only two remained.[[62]](#footnote-63) The U.S. Secretary of State wrote to the Governor of Colorado calling for “protection of their rights of person, business and property.”[[63]](#footnote-64) Nevertheless, the efforts in Colorado were apparently successful; in 1914 Colorado authorities reported that of the few Chinese remaining most “follow mostly the laundry business in the smaller towns  . . . There are one or two uptown Chinese restaurants in Denver that are patronized by people that fancy this sort of cooking for a change, but they can scarcely be called in competition with the American establishments.” [[64]](#footnote-65)

Boycott was another important tool. In the course of debating a resolution to extend Chinese Exclusion to other Asian races, one delegate to the Socialist National Convention of 1910 captured the history when, speaking of the 1880s, he noted: “[O]ur fear was the Chinaman; and we sent train loads of men across this continent with the cry, ‘The Chinese must go.’ We instructed our men to boycott the Chinese laundries, Chinese restaurants, Chinese servants of all kinds. We fought the Chinamen and their exclusion took place.”[[65]](#footnote-66)

Boycott was national union policy. At the 1914 AFL convention, a New Jersey delegate introduced the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Chinese restaurants and Chinese laundries give no employment to American labor;

WHEREAS, Chinese are not eligible to citizenship; and

WHEREAS, American laundries and American restaurants give employment to American labor; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That this, the Thirty Fourth Convention of the American Federation of Labor, requests its affiliated membership to give their patronage to American laundries and restaurants.[[66]](#footnote-67)

The convention modified the resolution, approving an exhortation to “patronize union restaurants and laundries” and reminding members of existing support for systematic Asian exclusion.[[67]](#footnote-68) Because Chinese were generally excluded from membership, the resolution as passed was tantamount to a national boycott.

 Other unions also endorsed boycotts. In 1915, the Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance and the Bartenders International League voted to boycott “Japanese and Chinese Restaurants and Chinese Laundries,” and decreed that “that no members of our International Union be permitted to work with Asiatics, and that no House Card or Bar Label or Union Button be displayed in such places.”[[68]](#footnote-69) Notably, some members argued that the wiser course would be to invite Chinese into the union.[[69]](#footnote-70) But the prevailing sentiment was that the union should “chase the slant-eyed celestials and the little brown skinned fellows back to the place where they belong.”[[70]](#footnote-71)

The *Mixer and Server* and other media reported boycotts in cities across the country,[[71]](#footnote-72) including in Phoenix, Tucson[[72]](#footnote-73) and Willcox,[[73]](#footnote-74) Arizona, San Francisco,[[74]](#footnote-75) Brockton, Massachusetts,[[75]](#footnote-76) Duluth,[[76]](#footnote-77) Minneapolis, and St. Paul,[[77]](#footnote-78) Minnesota, Butte, Billings and Deer Lodge, Montana,[[78]](#footnote-79) Tonopah, Nevada,[[79]](#footnote-80) Cleveland, Ohio,[[80]](#footnote-81) El Paso, Texas,[[81]](#footnote-82) Ogden, Utah,[[82]](#footnote-83) and Casper, Wyoming.[[83]](#footnote-84) There were probably others that did not make the news.

 Chinese restaurants were inexpensive,[[84]](#footnote-85) and thus union members were tempted to patronize them boycotts notwithstanding. Leaders warned “thousands of these Asiatics find encouragement in this country” if their businesses are patronized, and eating Chinese food means “the continuation indefinitely of a terrible struggle against these barbarians.”[[85]](#footnote-86) Unions imposed fines to compel compliance,[[86]](#footnote-87) but, as one union organizer reported, “a lot of union men seem to have, I am sorry to say, a fancy for Chop Suey.”[[87]](#footnote-88)

Litigation in Cleveland, Ohio made clear that the boycotts of Chinese restaurants were of a different character than other sorts of labor action—not designed to recruit new union members or persuade businesses to sign a contract, they sought to render Asian workers unemployed, or shutter Asian businesses.[[88]](#footnote-89) In 1919, Cleveland unions recognized seriousness of “the Chinese situation” — “one small [Chinese restaurant] twenty years ago to all of 25 at the present time.”[[89]](#footnote-90) Union members picketed two new Chinese restaurants, the Golden Pheasant and the Peacock Inn;[[90]](#footnote-91) the latter responded with a lawsuit.[[91]](#footnote-92) Judge Martin A. Foran was uniquely suited to decide the case; he had been a member of Congress when the Chinese Exclusion Act was revised, and previously served as president of the Coopers International Union. He found that picketers encouraged patrons to eat elsewhere “on the ground that they are Chinamen and members of the yellow race, and that Americans should not patronize a Chinese restaurant, but should confine their patronage and support to restaurants operated by Americans or by white persons.”[[92]](#footnote-93)

 Judge Foran enjoined the picketing and scolded the unions, noting “that all men, even including Chinamen residents of the United States, stand equally before the law.”[[93]](#footnote-94) He noted that the picketing was not an attempt to unionize the workers: “no persons can become members who are not citizens by birth or naturalization . . . It is admitted that Chinamen cannot belong to any local of defendants’ international union.”[[94]](#footnote-95) Accordingly, the real aim was to “compel[] the management to discharge Chinese waiters and employ white waiters, and in default of so doing, compel the restaurant to cease doing business.”[[95]](#footnote-96) Similarly, during the Minneapolis boycott of 1902-03, “[t]he Chinese proprietors say they were directed to employ union men only but that this is impossible as Mongolians are barred from labor organizations.”[[96]](#footnote-97)

 Even when not enjoined, non-violent boycotts were rarely wholly successful. Judge Foran seems to have been right when he wrote:

the law of competition in business controls business relations as immutably as the law of gravitation controls matter. If a Chinaman can furnish better food at less cost than a white man, he will be patronized, and I know of no law that will compel or force any patron to pay a higher price for inferior food merely because it is prepared and served by a white man.[[97]](#footnote-98)

Since there was no law reserving the food business to whites, the unions sought to create one.

**II. Chinese Restaurants and the Law**

A. White Women and Chinese Restaurants

When boycotts failed, unions invoked another rationale for regulation: They harmed white women. Chinese restaurants were suspected of being locations for vice. Chinese restaurants and Chinatowns were often tourist attractions.[[98]](#footnote-99) Middle and upper class whites visited Chinatown restaurants out of “morbid curiosity” for an evening of “slumming.”[[99]](#footnote-100) Thus, the *Chicago Tribune* reported on an 1891 trip to New York’s Chinatown, where the English visitors admired the “cleanliness of the kitchen and cookery” of the restaurant; but, according to the article, they had only “seen the curious and clean side of Chinatown.”[[100]](#footnote-101) The visitors were then taken to the “dives of Chinese immorality” where “sternness and pity mingled in their faces” at the sight of young white girls smoking opium “face-to-face” with Chinese men.[[101]](#footnote-102) So-called “lobbygows” escorted and promised protection to Chinatown tourists, even hiring residents to act out stereotypical vices.[[102]](#footnote-103)

Newspapers offered lurid reports that Chinese restaurants were fronts for opium dens,[[103]](#footnote-104) and that Chinese men used opium “as a trap for young girls.”[[104]](#footnote-105) There were regular reports of young girls being “rescued from an opium den.”[[105]](#footnote-106) This statement from a Congressional hearing on regulation of opium is representative:

In the Chinatown of the city of Philadelphia there are enormous quantities of opium consumed, and it is quite common, gentlemen, for these Chinese or “Chinks,” as they are called, to have a concubine as a white woman. There is one particular house where I would say there are 20 white women living with Chinamen as their common-law wives. The Chinamen require these women to do no work, and they do nothing but smoke opium all day and night. A great many of the girls are girls of family, and the history of them is very pathetic. You will find those girls in their younger days out with sporty boys, and they got to drinking. The next step was cigarettes. Then they go to Chinese restaurants, and after they go there a couple of times and get a drink in them they want to ‘hit the pipe.’ They do it out of curiosity or pure devilishness.[[106]](#footnote-107)

The idea of white female victimization became a media trope. In 1899, *King of the Opium Ring* by Charles E. Blaney and Charles A. Taylor played at the Columbus Theater and the Academy of Music in New York.[[107]](#footnote-108) Later produced around the country, it featured a clown who rescued a young white woman from the balcony of a Chinese restaurant.[[108]](#footnote-109) Similarly, popular novelist Frank Norris exploited the “reputed Chinese fondness for slave girls . . . One of his white women characters, accompanied by her fiance, is kidnapped in broad daylight in a Chinese restaurant.”[[109]](#footnote-110) Movies depicted similar scenes,[[110]](#footnote-111) and renowned “realistic” artists painted Chinatown vistas.[[111]](#footnote-112) Thus, there was a popular perception that Chinese restaurants were purveyors of vice,[[112]](#footnote-113) and served as late-night substitutes for closed saloons.[[113]](#footnote-114) A modern analyst might approve of the evidence that rigid racial and gender codes of the time were relaxed in Chinese restaurants.[[114]](#footnote-115) Nevertheless, while flaunting exoticism and freedom generated patronage, the implication of something naughty or worse caused some to fear for the restaurants’ young white patrons.[[115]](#footnote-116)

 As early as 1899, the question was asked: ‘“Can any means be devised to prevent the employment of white girls in Chinese restaurants?”[[116]](#footnote-117) One observer noted that “[b]eer and noodles in Chinese joints have caused the downfall of countless American girls.”[[117]](#footnote-118)

Labor unions exploited the fear that Chinese restaurants were sources of moral contagion.[[118]](#footnote-119) A 1904 *Labor World* cover story featured the “iniquitous Chinese Chop Suey joints” of Minneapolis, calling “the attention of the people to the necessity for stamping out” such establishments.[[119]](#footnote-120) The restaurants were intrinsically immoral, and caused vice through economic degradation. The labor unions argued: “These institutions will bring cheap labor into the city. That will compel other restaurants to hire cheap labor. This will demoralize the restaurant workers, compel them to work for low wages and put hundreds of young women into positions of distressing temptation.”[[120]](#footnote-121)

 The *Bridgeport Herald* reported that “[m]any a young girl received her first lesson in sin in Chinese restaurants,”[[121]](#footnote-122) and the *Chicago Tribune* noted that

More than 300 Chicago white girls have sacrificed themselves to the influence of the chop suey ‘joints’ during the last year, according to police statistics . . . . Vanity and the desire for showy clothes led to their downfall, it is declared. It was accomplished only after they smoked and drank in the chop suey restaurants and permitted themselves to be hypnotized by the dreamy, seductive music that is always on tap.[[122]](#footnote-123)

Just as legal policy toward African Americans was driven by a concern about interracial relationships, some feared early Chinese restaurants because of the intense sexuality of Chinese men.[[123]](#footnote-124) Because of Chinese Exclusion, there were many more Chinese men than women in the United States.[[124]](#footnote-125) By some accounts, there were more than 25 males for every one female in 1890.[[125]](#footnote-126) Hence, it is not surprising that there was a demand for commercial sex in America’s Chinatowns,[[126]](#footnote-127) or that Chinese men sometimes married white women[[127]](#footnote-128) — a practice frowned upon even in jurisdictions not prohibiting interracial marriage.[[128]](#footnote-129) The *St. Louis Post* reported that Chinese Restaurants “are visited . . . often by respectable girls and women on sight-seeing expeditions, or [those] who have ‘the chop suey habit.’ The Chinese of these places soon find a way to form an acquaintance with young women customers who go to the place often . . . . In Hop Alley several Chinese have white wives.”[[129]](#footnote-130) A marriage certificate to a Chinese husband was “a frequent excuse” for a white woman’s presence in a Chinese restaurant,[[130]](#footnote-131) and a required one if she was to stay the night in New York’s Chinatown in 1909.[[131]](#footnote-132) Retired New York Police Commissioner William McAdoo claimed “[T]he so-called Chinese wives are probably, taken together, the most wretched, degraded, and utterly vile lot of white women and girls that could be found anywhere.”[[132]](#footnote-133) It “gave a girl a bad name” just to work in a Chinese restaurant.[[133]](#footnote-134)

Not all those visiting Chinatowns went for amusement or vice.[[134]](#footnote-135) Christian missionaries entered to evangelize, but sensational newspaper reports claimed that female missionaries too often succumbed to “the fatal lure of Chinese.”[[135]](#footnote-136) One clergyman explained: “I know the possible dangers of social intercourse between the races . . . so our Chinese school is watched very strictly.”[[136]](#footnote-137) A Kansas City detective thought that society should “prevent young girls from wrecking their lives by attempting to Christianize Orientals.”[[137]](#footnote-138) The oldest Chinese mission worker in New York stated that she did not “believe in young girls teaching Chinamen” because the Chinese continue to “hold a fascination for young American girls . . . after they once come in contact.”[[138]](#footnote-139) *Munsey’s Magazine* published “Woman’s Love of the Exotic” suggesting the public perception of the issue:

A DANGEROUS ASSOCIATION

[I]n the beginning, [they] were probably religious in their cast of thought; and they went down to Chinatown, at first, with the sincerest and most innocent motives. . . .

In time, familiarity brought about a new feeling, and made the interest a personal interest, quite as much as a religious one. The very fact that white men despise Chinese, and often ill-treat them, stirred what may be called a maternal instinct in the women who made themselves responsible for the welfare of their charges. Just as a mother loves most tenderly her most misshapen and ill-favored child, so these girls felt their hearts moved by the thought that their ‘converts’ had all the world against them. Then, again, the personality of the Orientals, with their insidious ways and fawning manners, made the appeal still stronger. Add to this the fact that religious emotion is very closely related to one that is physical, and we find a combination which explains why so many of these young women went astray, and why in their converts they ultimately found lovers.[[139]](#footnote-140)

Some worried young female missionaries would end up like other white women who “consort with the Mongolians for a thimble of the drug.”[[140]](#footnote-141)

1909 was critical for regulation of Chinese. In an era when many Americans used over-the-counter patent medicines containing opiates or cocaine,[[141]](#footnote-142) Congress passed the Smoking Opium Exclusion Act of 1909.[[142]](#footnote-143) And then, in June, 1909, came tragedy and disaster. As is recounted in Professor Ting Yi Lui’s award-winning book *The Chinese Trunk Murder*, Leon Ling, a New York Chinese restaurant worker, murdered Elsie Sigel, a young white missionary from a prominent family.[[143]](#footnote-144) In part because Ling was the subject of an unsuccessful national manhunt, the crime became a prolonged sensation.[[144]](#footnote-145)

Ms. Sigel was described as a Christian missionary seduced by her Chinese pupil.[[145]](#footnote-146) Lurid headlines such as *Was Strangled By Her Chinese Lover: Granddaughter of General Sigel Slain in the Slums of New York* captured public attention.[[146]](#footnote-147) Unfortunately for Chinese restaurants, not only was Ling a restaurant worker, but Ms. Sigel’s body was found in a trunk in Ling’s room above a Chinese restaurant, although one in Midtown Manhattan, not Chinatown.[[147]](#footnote-148) The subsequent “wave of suspicion” put Chinese restaurants across the country under the spotlight.[[148]](#footnote-149) An Oregon newspaper stated “that the Sigel revelations have disgusted the Americans, and at present it is considered bad form to eat in a Chinese restaurant.”[[149]](#footnote-150) Also, police and an alert citizenry often identified Asian men, more or less at random, as Leon Ling, and officers in all parts of the United States raided Chinese businesses looking for Ling or intercepting white female visitors.[[150]](#footnote-151) Describing a case of mistaken identity, a Connecticut newspaper reported that “[t]o be a Chinaman these days is to be at least a suspect in the murder of Elsie Sigel.”[[151]](#footnote-152)

The press followed the case for years. In 1911, the *Washington Post* and *The New York Times* made an obligatory reference to the Sigel murder in articles reporting on the capture of the then-notorious opium smuggler “Boston Charlie,”[[152]](#footnote-153) a case related to the Sigel murder only in that both cases involved Asians. The *Washington Post* stated that a “batch of letters” seized along with Charlie did not have “any bearing on the murder of Elsie Sigel by Leon Ling.”[[153]](#footnote-154)

The Sigel murder stimulated race-based regulation under the guise of “protect[ing] young women.”[[154]](#footnote-155) The *Washington Times* commented: “The Elsie Sigel case wasn’t enough . . . Every state in the union should pass laws that would prohibit a white girl from ever crossing a Chinaman’s threshold.”[[155]](#footnote-156)

 1. The White Women’s Labor Law

After the murder, there was a national movement to keep women out of Chinese restaurants. Arizona, Iowa, Massachusetts, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco, considered legislation or decrees banning white women from patronizing Chinese restaurants or being employed there. A bill also became law in Saskatchewan, Canada.[[156]](#footnote-157)

The national nature of the effort is reflected by the following resolution of the American Federation of Labor to exclude white women from Chinese and Japanese restaurants across the United States:

WHEREAS the evils arising from the employment of white women and girls in establishments owned or controlled by Chinese and Japanese constitute, both morally and economically, a serious menace to society; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Federation of Labor be requested to pledge its best endeavors to secure the passage of a law prohibiting the employment of white women or girls in all such establishments.[[157]](#footnote-158)

Notably, the text itself reflected the dual economic and moral motivation of the measure. In addition, it made clear that the menace was not presented by Chinese alone; other Asians were equally worthy of regulation.

 It is not clear that the ban, proposed before the Nineteenth Amendment, was congenial to women themselves.[[158]](#footnote-159) An article in the *Arizona Republican* in 1916 reported that a wealthy woman “advertised for a cook and in thirty days one replied. In the same column of the paper was an ad for a girl cashier in a Chinese restaurant and forty answered in one day.”[[159]](#footnote-160) Nevertheless, the idea turned into legislation or other action in a number of jurisdictions.

 The Pittsburgh City Council passed an ordinance in 1910 banning all women from Chinese restaurants as patrons or employees, and restricting their hours of operation. A supporter argued that many girls “are enticed into the restaurants on the plea of getting something to eat, and because of the novelty of the situation. Then they are persuaded to stay until it is too late for a girl to go a home, whose home rules are strict. The Chinese restaurants are only the opening wedge for worse resorts.”[[160]](#footnote-161) Notably, the police disagreed; the Captain of Detectives stated: “We have never had any trouble with those restaurants. The Chinese give us less trouble than any other class.”[[161]](#footnote-162)

Nevertheless, the City Council passed the measure 49-2.[[162]](#footnote-163) But in a virtuoso explanation of its legal defects, the Mayor vetoed the bill, explaining:[[163]](#footnote-164)

While the ordinance apparently treats the “Chinese” in an impersonal sense, it is plainly directed against the Chinese as a race . . . . The legal objections to this enactment are numerous and varied but I shall sum them up as to unreasonableness and discrimination as follows:

First: It invests the Director of the Department of Public Safety with unlimited discretion to grant or refuse said license, because he is not to grant the same “to any person who is not of good moral character,” and it need scarcely be said that what is or is not good moral character may be purely an arbitrary opinion.

Second: By implication it permits the Director to revoke said license in case of “the visit of disreputable persons to said restaurant or chop suey houses,” and here again the right to do business is subject to an arbitrary opinion of the director.

Third: The ordinance forbids the visit of women or girls to these restaurants, thus arbitrarily confining and limiting the business of the same.

Fourth: The hours for doing business at these places is fixed from six A.M. until midnight which is a restriction not imposed on any other restaurant in the city.

In short the ordinance contains throughout provisions which are unreasonable and plain discriminations and are clearly illegal and invalid under the laws of Pennsylvania as well as under the provisions in the Federal Constitution and have been so held in the courts both Federal and State.[[164]](#footnote-165)

Massachusetts saw a protracted effort to regulate Chinese restaurants. In 1910, Representative Donovan introduced the “yellow peril bill,”[[165]](#footnote-166) prohibiting all women under 21 from entering Chinese restaurants as patrons or employees, and requiring a non-Asian male escort for older women.[[166]](#footnote-167) Many legislators called the bill unconstitutional,[[167]](#footnote-168) some noting that the law applied to Chinese women married to Chinese men, and therefore forbade a Chinese woman from dining with her husband.[[168]](#footnote-169) Nevertheless, it passed a first reading 126 to 30,[[169]](#footnote-170) and a second reading 111 to 80.[[170]](#footnote-171) But Attorney General Dana Malone found that the bill “discriminates against the Chinese by reason of their nationality, and, therefore, if passed, would be unconstitutional and void.”[[171]](#footnote-172) This turned the tide; the House rejected the bill 117 to 53.[[172]](#footnote-173) After the bill was reintroduced in 1911,[[173]](#footnote-174) the House asked the Supreme Judicial Court for an advisory opinion,[[174]](#footnote-175) which unanimously found the law unconstitutional.[[175]](#footnote-176) The Court stated:

It subjects Chinese to an oppressive burden that deprives them of liberty which all others enjoy, and interferes with their right to carry on business, acquire property and earn a livelihood, and denies them the protection of equal laws. . . .

The classification of hotels and restaurants into those that are open to young women and those that are closed to young women is not founded upon a difference that has any just or proper relation to the professed purpose of the classification.[[176]](#footnote-177)

The bill was withdrawn the next day,[[177]](#footnote-178) although Representative Donovan pursued the idea in Boston in 1913.[[178]](#footnote-179)

 Serious attention was given to the idea in other jurisdictions. In September, 1912, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that police chief and future Mayor Charles E. Sebastian “says he will recommend to the Police Commission that an order be issued barring all white female help from oriental eating places, with the penalty that if the order is not instantly complied with that their license be revoked.”[[179]](#footnote-180) Two years later, the *Los Angeles Herald* reported that “[t]he police commission gave its unanimous approval today to the plan of Chief of Police Sebastian to exclude white girls as cashiers or waitresses from restaurants and cafes run by Japanese or Chinese.”[[180]](#footnote-181)

 San Francisco officials considered legislation preventing white women for working in Chinese and Greek restaurants.[[181]](#footnote-182) The City Attorney declared that while the legislation aimed at Greek restaurants amounted to “class legislation” and thus would be unconstitutional, validity of legislation aimed at Chinese restaurants “was a debatable question.”[[182]](#footnote-183) He reasoned that “if such places as generally operated are against the welfare of white women, it is more than probable that the constitutionality of the legislation as to them would be upheld on the ground of a reasonable exercise of the police power.”[[183]](#footnote-184) It does not appear that legislation was enacted.

The Montana State Federation of Labor at its 1915 convention proposed “to prohibit the employment of white women with, by or for males of the Chinese or Japanese races.”[[184]](#footnote-185) The delegates emphasized the proposal’s economic impact, noting: “this bill, if enacted into law, will go a long way towards decreasing the popularity of the Chinese restaurants in the State.”[[185]](#footnote-186) A bill was introduced making it “unlawful for any person . . . to employ in any restaurant, eating house, laundry or other occupations owned, conducted or controlled by persons of the Asiatic race, any female as a servant, waitress or employee therein within the State of Montana, except females of the Asiatic race.”[[186]](#footnote-187)

 The Montana Senate approved the bill, entitled “An act to prevent the employment of females in restaurants, eating houses, laundries, and other similar occupations controlled, or conducted by persons of the Asiatic race” 31-0 with nine abstentions.[[187]](#footnote-188) The House Committee on Corporations other than Municipal recommended concurrence in the Senate bill on March 2, 1915.[[188]](#footnote-189) However, on March 3, the House reported back to the Senate that on that day the Committee recommended that the bill be rejected and the House agreed.[[189]](#footnote-190) on Marc However, the U.S. Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan wrote to the House opposing the bill.[[190]](#footnote-191) In April 1915 report in the *Mixer and Server* explained:

The bill passed the senate, but no sooner was it turned over to its proper committee in the house than the wheels of opposition began to turn, and they did not stop until they reached the ‘big house’ in Washington, D. C., from whence returned an administration mandate signed by ‘Grape Juice’ Bryan, to the effect ‘That legislation of that character was very objectionable to the ‘royal’ dignitaries from the Orient,’ also, that the Secretary of State of the United States, was very much opposed to the passage of the bill.[[191]](#footnote-192)

In 1919, the Oregon Senate considered S.B. 183, prohibiting the “employment of white help in Chinese restaurants.”[[192]](#footnote-193) The bill failed, 13-14.[[193]](#footnote-194) Members of the Arizona legislature reportedly considered introducing legislation prohibiting white girls from working in Chinese restaurants,[[194]](#footnote-195) but it does not appear that a bill was introduced. In January, 1913, the outgoing Governor of Washington recommended the prohibition of white female help in all Chinese and Japanese restaurants;[[195]](#footnote-196) a bill was introduced in the Washington Senate but did not get out of committee.[[196]](#footnote-197)

There is one report of a ban imposed by judicial action. Iowa District Court Judge De Graff reportedly issued an order enjoining the owner of a Chinese restaurant from serving women. However, he quickly reversed himself, finding that it was “not equitable to enjoin the owner of a chop suey restaurant to prevent women from going to the restaurants.”[[197]](#footnote-198) Despite complaints from the saloonkeeper in the story below the restaurant about the “rough house” caused by women upstairs, the judge found that it “was not fair” to exclude the women from the restaurant when men were permitted to dine.[[198]](#footnote-199)

By the 1920s, it seemed clear that legislation targeting Chinese restaurants as such was unconstitutional. Harvard Professor William Bennett Munro wrote:

The provisions of an ordinance must apply equally to all persons in the same category. For example, it would not be a discrimination to provide that all restaurants shall be closed on Sundays while hotel dining rooms are permitted to remain open for the use of bona fide guests; but to stipulate that all Chinese restaurants shall remain closed while other restaurants are privileged to remain open would be a clear case of discrimination.[[199]](#footnote-200)

The same logic suggests that women may patronize restaurants without discrimination.

But if blatantly discriminatory laws were prohibited, facially neutral ones had a better chance of succeeding. In Connecticut, the unions succeeded in passing a facially neutral law apparently aimed at suppressing Chinese restaurants. A *Mixer and Server* report stated:

We are also putting up a fight against the Chinese restaurants, of which there is a large number established in the city of Hartford — considering the size of the city — and are well patronized by the working class. It is going to take some time and energy to educate the union men and women that no white man can compete with the Chinese restaurants as their mode of living, the low wages and the long hours and other conditions prevailing in their establishments they can afford to sell at a lower price than a white man. It is to be regretted to see union men, sneaking in the side doors of Chinese restaurants.[[200]](#footnote-201)

The Connecticut Legislature passed a law limiting the hours of women and children in hair dressing and manicuring establishments, photograph galleries, restaurants, cafes, and barber shops, and prohibit their employment between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.[[201]](#footnote-202) Authorities reported that “[a]s a practical proposition, the law affected the restaurants only . . . [and] with the exception of the Chinese restaurants, there were very few where women were employed at night,” and concluded that “[t]he effect of the law has been salutary and has justified the expectations of those in favor of it.”[[202]](#footnote-203)

 2. Emergency Police Authority to Protect White Women

For the reasons articulated by the Mayor of Pittsburgh, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, and Harvard’s Professor Monroe, discriminatory legislation targeting Chinese restaurants by name was legally problematic. Nevertheless, the law kept white women from patronizing or working in Chinese restaurants. The tool was emergency police authority, which was apparently more potent than legislation.

Most prominently in the wake of the Sigel murder but also on other occasions, police simply ordered white women and girls out of Chinese restaurants or neighborhoods. The head of the Washington, D.C. Police Department issued orders forbidding all “young white girls” from entering Chinese restaurants.[[203]](#footnote-204) In 1909, the probation officer of Kalispell, Montana ordered that “all white girls under twenty years of age working in Chinese restaurants of the city surrender their positions.”[[204]](#footnote-205)

Not surprisingly, New York saw an intense police reaction. Police vowed to end the “slumming” expeditions and the tourist attractions of Chinatown.[[205]](#footnote-206) In 1910, New York Deputy Police Commissioner Driscoll announced that he was going to “force white women away from Chinatown and keep them away.”[[206]](#footnote-207) He went after the fraudulent opium joints where tourists “were taken to be shown white women rolling opium pills in company with decrepit Chinese,”[[207]](#footnote-208) and a “chop suey restaurant where white girls ate in company with Chinese residents of the community.”[[208]](#footnote-209) Officers also noted white women residing with Chinese men and prepared a list for “Tenement House Inspectors.”[[209]](#footnote-210)

The New York police commissioner also reinstated a former rule “that all whites are to be driven out of [Chinese quarter] and the restaurants and other places kept by Chinese are to be closed at midnight.”[[210]](#footnote-211) With policeman patrolling each block, all visitors were asked where they were going.[[211]](#footnote-212) Unless the visitor had a satisfactory explanation, they were asked to leave.[[212]](#footnote-213)

Newspapers reported that on April 14, 1918 the NYPD carried out “chop suey raids” all over the city.[[213]](#footnote-214) The *Washington Herald* reported: “Thirty chop suey restaurants in New York’s tenderloin, from Broadway and Forty-second streets, through the upper West Side as far north as 110th street, were entered early today by scores of police and detectives in one of the most spectacular raids ever made here.”[[214]](#footnote-215) The restaurant doors were blocked,[[215]](#footnote-216) and officers asked approximately 1000 people why they were in Chinese restaurants.[[216]](#footnote-217) Of those questioned, 178 were ordered to the police station for further investigation,[[217]](#footnote-218) including women failing to show a wedding ring to prove they were married to their male companions.[[218]](#footnote-219) The price of freedom was a promise that “he or she would not be found in a Chinese restaurant after hours.”[[219]](#footnote-220) District Attorney Smith claimed that he realized that the “chop suey places are the worst dives in the city” and that he didn’t “care a snap about the protest that may be made after these raids.”[[220]](#footnote-221) The raid led to no arrests; Smith wanted to collect evidence to prosecute “the real owners of certain Chinese restaurants.”[[221]](#footnote-222) Smith claimed that parents of the community called him to action by sending over 100 letters claiming that their daughters had “been lured to chop suey houses and have been evilly treated or menaced.”[[222]](#footnote-223)

By April, 16, 1918, the Chinese restaurant owners retained counsel.[[223]](#footnote-224) According the *New York Sun*:

An up to date tong war seems to be brewing between the allied Chinese restaurants proprietors of New York and the District Attorney’s office. Four of the most prosperous chop suey dispensers indicated through their counsel yesterday they propose to make a stand against the authorities for the raids on Sunday morning, which they consider unwarranted and illegal.

At the same time James E. Smith, Assistant District Attorney, who conducted the visiting parties to thirty establishments, took the first step against the proprietors by applying for the names of the owners of each of the buildings in which the restaurants are situated. When he obtains these names from the city records he will ascertain who owns the restaurants. Later, it is understood, the proprietors will be subpoenaed to the Criminal Courts Building. . . . District Attorney Swann replied last night to the statement that his raid on the chop suey places was illegal by one of his mysterious, uncommunicative smiles.[[224]](#footnote-225)

The attorney for the restaurants protested: “It was illegal to order persons that were dining who were dining peaceably in these restaurants to leave.”[[225]](#footnote-226) Prosecutors planned to charge each owner with maintaining a public nuisance and urged the Board of Aldermen to require licenses of chop suey restaurants.[[226]](#footnote-227) According to the *New York Tribune*, “[t]he explanation from [District Attorney] Swann and his office are ingenious and various. . . . There seems no reason why Mr. Swann’s chop suey uplift campaign shouldn’t keep right on forever.”[[227]](#footnote-228) The *Washington Herald* reported that “James E. Smith, assistant district attorney of the county of New York . . . has declared war to the death on the chop suey caravansaries.”[[228]](#footnote-229)

 It is odd that police could force women out of Chinese restaurants when legislatures could not. Perhaps the explanation is exigency. Even today, there is a plausible argument that the police can order people to “move on” at their whim, and arrest them if they do not.[[229]](#footnote-230) Of course, police are free to act unilaterally, even forcibly, to protect lives and property in emergencies.[[230]](#footnote-231) Even today, authorities can discriminate on the basis of race when necessary to meet a pressing exigency.[[231]](#footnote-232) Police orders are temporary and specific, while laws are normally general and permanent (or at least open-ended) and thus represent a greater intrusion.

 In addition, the war against Chinese restaurants was fought in a largely pre-modern era of law. Because many of the provisions of the Bill of Rights did not apply to the states, the police were much freer. In that era, police regularly made “arrests on suspicion,”[[232]](#footnote-233) i.e., without probable cause or reasonable suspicion.[[233]](#footnote-234) New York Police Captain Alexander Williams reportedly stated “There is more law in the end of a policeman’s nightstick than in a decision of the Supreme Court.”[[234]](#footnote-235) These factors may explain why police believed they had broad authority to force compliance with what they deemed important rules of conduct.[[235]](#footnote-236) If white women and girls placed themselves at great and immediate risk by consorting with Chinese, the police had the authority to order them away or arrest them. Or, the explanation may be that this was an era when police lawlessness was difficult to control.

 C. Discrimination Against Chinese and Chinese Restaurants

 1. Citizenship Discrimination

An easy way to eliminate Asian restauranteurs would have been to require citizenship for licensure or employment; as they were ineligible for naturalized citizenship, this would likely have been an insurmountable barrier to those not born in the United States.[[236]](#footnote-237) Four Chinese restaurants in Portland, Oregon were denied liquor licenses on the ground that the owners were “not citizens and under the charter cannot be permitted to sell liquor.”[[237]](#footnote-238) Newspapers reported that the “Chinese places fought” back, but it was the white-owned Pekin Restaurant that challenged the denial.[[238]](#footnote-239)

The media reported several attempts by Chicago officials to implement a citizenship requirement outlawing Chinese restaurants. In 1906, the City Council considered a bill requiring special licenses of “chop suey” restaurants:[[239]](#footnote-240) “It shall not be lawful for any person to keep, conduct or manage any place in this city where any fruit, ice cream or chop suey is sold . . . unless a license therefor is first obtained.” [[240]](#footnote-241) The *Chicago Tribune* reported “[w]hen it was pointed out that the Chinese would be barred permanently as they cannot become citizens,” Alderman Harkin said the city “could get along without any chop suey places.”[[241]](#footnote-242) In 1918, it was reported that “Chicago’s Chinese colony was given a severe jolt when it was announced at the city collector’s office that many of them owning chop suey restaurants and other eating places would have to go out of business through inability to obtain licenses.”[[242]](#footnote-243) By 1922, the Chicago Municipal Code required those seeking restaurant licenses to have “good character and reputation,” and be “suitable for the purpose,”[[243]](#footnote-244) leaving ample room for discretion. But there was no requirement that applicants be citizens.

Massachusetts legislators proposed to limit victualer’s licenses to citizens. A union report explained that “The Chinese question here is indeed a serious one;”[[244]](#footnote-245) two months later a bill was introduced providing that “only persons who are citizens be granted victualers’ licenses.”[[245]](#footnote-246) But the legislation failed.[[246]](#footnote-247) The *Mixer and Server* reported that it “received an unfavorable report from the committee on legal affairs: they claim that the bill aims at Chinese restaurants and as the Chinese are not citizens and cannot become citizens that the bill is unfair.”[[247]](#footnote-248)

State laws requiring citizenship to operate a restaurant were probably doomed. As early as 1880, a California court invalidated a statute providing that “[n]o license to transact any business or occupation shall be granted . . . to any alien not eligible to become an elector.”[[248]](#footnote-249) In *Asakura v. City of Seattle*,[[249]](#footnote-250) a 1924 case involving a Japanese immigrant, the Supreme Court invalidated a Seattle ordinance restricting pawnbroker licenses to citizens.

Another method to eliminate Chinese restaurants would have been to prohibit Chinese from working. In 1914, Arizona enacted the Anti-Alien Employment Act prohibiting businesses from employing more than 20% noncitizens in their workforces.[[250]](#footnote-251) Because Chinese restaurants typically employed Asians,[[251]](#footnote-252) and Asians were racially ineligible to naturalization, the law would likely have compelled the closure of most or all Chinese restaurants. The February, 1914 *Mixer and Server* reported that the Cooks’ and Waiters’ Local 631 of Phoenix, Arizona has “been able, through their systematic work, to close a few Chinese restaurants, and now have American ones instead.”[[252]](#footnote-253) The report predicted that “before long every restaurant in Phoenix will be conducted by white people instead of the Chinks, as has been the custom for many years in Arizona.”[[253]](#footnote-254)

Chinese restaurant workers sued[[254]](#footnote-255) but before their case could be heard, a federal court struck down the statute based on a suit by an Austrian restaurant worker.[[255]](#footnote-256) In a decision upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, the district judge found that the right to labor was property and that the law violated equal protection.[[256]](#footnote-257) The November, 1915 Supreme Court decision presumably invalidated a similar Los Angeles ordinance passed in August, 1915 “designed to do away with the employment of Orientals in saloons and restaurants and give their places to citizens.”[[257]](#footnote-258)

 2. Licensing Discrimination

The growth of the regulatory state meant that more activity could be conducted only with the permission of the government. Just as Chinese laundries were discriminated against, as reflected by *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, Chinese restaurants were also targeted.

Court decisions and newspaper reports across the country reflect a policy of denying licenses to Chinese restaurants.[[258]](#footnote-259) Chicago imposed restrictive zoning. In 1911, a legislator asked the Corporation Counsel if Chinese restaurants could be excluded from Wabash Avenue. Counsel opined that “[t]he presumption that opium smoking and gambling will be indulged cannot be raised.” So long as the proprietors were law-abiding, “there is no warrant in the law of the land which would justify discrimination against the Chinese. Such is the opinion of the Supreme Court in the celebrated California laundry cases.”[[259]](#footnote-260)

Nevertheless, two weeks later, the City Council voted to order the Commissioner of Public Works and the Commissioner of Buildings “to refuse the issuance of permits for contraction or remodeling of any building or buildings by any Chinaman” in the district near Wabash Avenue and 23d Street; the resolution noted that “the Chinese in the city of Chicago are invading said neighborhood,” and their presence “will materially affect and deprecate the value of property in said vicinity.”[[260]](#footnote-261)

In El Paso, a boycott[[261]](#footnote-262) bore fruit when a number of Chinese restaurants closed.[[262]](#footnote-263) According to the American Federation of Labor’s journal: “There is a clear reason why” in El Paso in 1915 “six Chinese restaurants [were] replaced by Americans”; “Union men [were] appointed at the head of five departments in the city.”[[263]](#footnote-264) In Brockton, Massachusetts, unions also turned to regulators to oppose the renewal of the licenses of Chinese restaurants.[[264]](#footnote-265)

The courts also feared the moral qualities of Chinese. Illustrative is the 1891 rejection of a challenge to the city of Pittsburgh’s denial of incorporation to a Chinese club and restaurant. The court explained that incorporation was only authorized “where there is a worthy object, which cannot well be accomplished without incorporation” and “[c]onsidering who the subscribers are, and the purposes set forth in the articles of association, there would be great danger of the association being perverted to purposes injurious to the community.”[[265]](#footnote-266)

Similarly, in 1932 the New Jersey Supreme Court upheld the denial of a dance license to a Chinese restaurant because of the potential corruption of youth:

this license for music and dancing was desired by a corporation, some of whose officers were Chinamen . . . with the help entirely Chinese and the active management Chinese . . . . Now bearing in mind that the reason for the refusal to grant the license was, amongst other things, that it was detrimental to the young people of the neighborhood, it certainly cannot be said that there was an abuse of discretion.[[266]](#footnote-267)

While the reported cases do not always reflect racial considerations, they suggest that authorities had ample power to regulate Chinese restaurants using facially neutral statutes.[[267]](#footnote-268)

Regulatory boards and commissions reportedly denied licenses as a matter of policy. Los Angeles authorities denied a license to the Hong Kong Restaurant because “serving drinks with meals there [did] not meet the [police] chief’s approbation.”[[268]](#footnote-269) The *Los Angeles Herald* reported that “the police are opposed to Chinese chop suey restaurants outside of Chinatown,”[[269]](#footnote-270) because they have a “tendency to disturb the peace.”[[270]](#footnote-271) Similarly, the *San Francisco Call* reported on the denial of a license to a Chinese restaurant in Palo Alto: “There has never been a Chinese business house in Palo Alto and it has been the policy of the citizens to keep such places out at all hazards.”[[271]](#footnote-272)

The Omaha, Missouri excise board[[272]](#footnote-273) “issued an order closing all the chop suey restaurants, and giving as the reason for its action that the public sentiment appeared to be strongly opposed to such places.”[[273]](#footnote-274) The *Minneapolis Journal* reported that the liquor license of a Chinese restaurant owner had been revoked. “It is not likely that another license will be granted to a Chinese restaurant keeper as the mayor considers them incapable of handling boisterous, bibulous Americans.”[[274]](#footnote-275) The Mayor of Moline, Illinois reportedly “gave notice that no more chop suey houses would be allowed in Moline in connection with saloons and that the present one would have to close up.”[[275]](#footnote-276)

In March, 1914, the Massachusetts Commission for the Investigation of White Slave Traffic issued a damning report after investigating over 500 places, including many Chinese restaurants;[[276]](#footnote-277) a series of license denials followed. Yee Toy of Lynn was initially denied a license.[[277]](#footnote-278) The commissioners reasoned that “there should be no more Chinese restaurants in the city and that Chinese restaurants shouldn’t be allowed to compete with those of Americans as they have no interest here.”[[278]](#footnote-279) Mr. Toy successfully requested reconsideration, after presenting a a petition bearing 2,000 names.[[279]](#footnote-280) Mr. Toy received his license,[[280]](#footnote-281) but the following month, the police charged him with “assuming to be a common victualer.”[[281]](#footnote-282)

The Mayor of Malden, Massachusetts refused to sign a license because the restaurant employed no Americans.[[282]](#footnote-283) The Supreme Judicial Court issued a writ of mandamus requiring him to sign.[[283]](#footnote-284) In 1918, Charles Shue, one of Boston’s “best-known Americanized Chinamen” unsuccessfully applied for a restaurant license;[[284]](#footnote-285) the board decided that “no more licenses for Chinese restaurants would be granted.”[[285]](#footnote-286)

 3. Discriminatory Enforcement

To be sure, some misconduct reported in Chinese restaurants, or for which Chinese restauranteurs were convicted of crimes, represented actual wrongdoing. However, the special focus of law enforcement on Chinese may well have played a part. There is little reason to believe that Chinese were disproportionately inclined to lawbreaking. As David Harris has observed, “there is a connection between where police look for [crime] and where they find it.”[[286]](#footnote-287) Thus, the many reports of apparent selective enforcement, or promises to place Chinese restaurants under particular scrutiny, suggest at least the possibility that Chinese were arrested or deprived of licenses for conduct which would not have led to adverse action if committed by members of other groups.

In 1899, the Boston Police commissioners ordered all Chinese restaurants to close by midnight.[[287]](#footnote-288) The *Boston Daily Globe* reported that the action was “part of the commissioners plan to drive the Chinese places from Boston.”[[288]](#footnote-289) A month later, the *Boston Daily Advertiser* debunked “a rumor, which somehow got about town yesterday, to the effect that the board of police commissioners is seriously considering the question of closing up those Chinese restaurants for good and for all. It is doubtful whether any power is vested in the board to issue an arbitrary order of that kind.”[[289]](#footnote-290) However, “[i]t goes without saying that public morals would be much promoted by shutting them up and keeping them shut.”[[290]](#footnote-291)

 Chicago authorities also paid special attention to Chinese restaurants. In June 1905, the Chicago City Council considered a resolution calling for investigation of Chinese restaurants,[[291]](#footnote-292) and by October 1, the restaurants were under investigation by the State Attorney’s Office and the police.[[292]](#footnote-293) Officials were concerned about the presence of women during the night.[[293]](#footnote-294) They believed that the restaurants had taken the place of wine rooms, which had been banned by a previous mayor.[[294]](#footnote-295) The wine rooms and the restaurants could serve liquor at all hours, while saloons had to close by 1:00 a.m.[[295]](#footnote-296)

Reverend J. E. Copus reported in the *Rosary Magazine* that “[t]he police department has promised to ‘get after’ the ‘chop suey dump.’”[[296]](#footnote-297) The Chicago Police Chief ordered “[r]igid inspections at frequent intervals” of Chinese restaurants and ice cream parlors.[[297]](#footnote-298) Furthermore, the chief ordered “the prohibition of young girls or youths after reasonable hours.”[[298]](#footnote-299) A Chicago Police Lieutenant recommended revocation of the license of a Chinese restaurant for violating a midnight closing ordinance.[[299]](#footnote-300) The officer promised “a crusade on the many Chinese restaurants in his district.”[[300]](#footnote-301) In 1909, a Chicago Police Inspector noted that “Young white girls are daily insulted and even attacked by Celestials . . . .”[[301]](#footnote-302) The following year, the Chicago police chief issued a “special order” against the sale of liquor in Chinese establishments; this announcement was followed by raids.[[302]](#footnote-303)

The 1909 Elsie Sigel murder had continuing effects on policing.[[303]](#footnote-304) The St. Louis Police Chief stated: “The Chinese chop suey restaurants and Hop Alley will be closely watched by the police of St. Louis, who had their attention called to the Chinese problem in American cities by the murder of Elsie Sigel.”[[304]](#footnote-305) The Chief explained:

I cannot understand a white women’s desire to go into a Chinese restaurant and eat, but that is a problem for the women herself. We cannot molest her, and the restaurant has the right to stay open and the women the right to go there in preference to a white man’s restaurant if she desires.

But we can and will watch these places strictly. . . .

In my opinion, the immigration laws are too lax. There are too many Chinese of bad character permitted to enter the United States as things are now.[[305]](#footnote-306)

Given his attitude, it would hardly be surprising if police found violations in Chinese restaurants based on facts which would not have led to charges in other venues.

In 1909, the Chinese restaurants of Detroit were under close watch by the police.[[306]](#footnote-307) For example, the police “maintain[ed] a sharp lookout” on Sam Lee’s restaurant because there were “reports that white men and women have languished in the dark, smutty rooms under the restaurant and lived in the fumes of the opium rather than face the world as it is.”[[307]](#footnote-308) In 1911, the *Tulsa World* reported, “Two new enforcement officers . . . selected the much raided Chop Suey restaurant . . . for the scene of their first operations.”[[308]](#footnote-309) In January 1911, a *Pittsburg Press* reported headline reported “Big raid at Greensburg: Crusade against Chop Suey Dens and Foreign Restaurants.”[[309]](#footnote-310) In Washington, D.C. in 1914, the District Attorney advised officers to pay special attention to “restaurants where liquor is served to women, motion picture theaters, and Chinese restaurants.”[[310]](#footnote-311)

In May 1918, in Portland, Oregon the police raided over 65 establishments under the guise of an ordinance prohibiting “barred-doors” — the “victims of the anti-gambling crusade were mostly Chinese.”[[311]](#footnote-312) The lawyer for a Portland, Maine, Chinese restaurant closed by misbehavior by the soldiers, sailors and “lewd” women who patronized it,[[312]](#footnote-313) claimed that closing this restaurant, while ignoring misconduct in others, amounted to racial discrimination.[[313]](#footnote-314)

 In Minneapolis, a facially neutral bill was amended to facilitate enforcement against Chinese restaurants. Minneapolis Mayor J.C. Haynes wrote to the City Council, then considering an ordinance regulating restaurants and hotels, requesting that the law include authority to revoke licenses because of “certain abuses in some of these places, notably certain cafes and so-called chop suey houses.”[[314]](#footnote-315) The ordinance as enacted provided that licenses “shall be subject to revocation at any time by the City Council, in its discretion, or by the Mayor.”[[315]](#footnote-316)

 4. Prohibition of Private Booths

Chinese restaurants in the early decades of the 20th century typically had private booths consisting of small rooms with doors or curtains.[[316]](#footnote-317) A national movement to prohibit booths and private rooms was aimed at least in part in part at Chinese restaurants. The United States Public Health Service published a model ordinance prohibiting booths in restaurants, explaining:

recurring complaint was made that in “chop suey” places and in other types of refreshment places the boxes, partitions, and booths made favorable places of solicitation and operation for pimps and prostitutes. By requiring the partitions to be removed the entire establishment was thrown open to public gaze and opportunity of unlawful acts destroyed.[[317]](#footnote-318)

As the Supreme Court has noted, zoning requirements can impose a “substantial obstacle”[[318]](#footnote-319) on disfavored targets. But as late as 1971, the Supreme Court was reluctant to invalidate facially neutral laws because of discriminatory motivation. In *Palmer v. Thomson*, the majority wrote: “no case in this Court has held that a legislative act may violate equal protection solely because of the motivations of the men who voted for it.”[[319]](#footnote-320) Accordingly, laws prohibiting booths could be enacted with the frank purpose of disadvantaging Chinese restaurants. While *Yick Wo* prohibited discriminatory enforcement, those targeted would have to prove governmental misconduct.[[320]](#footnote-321)

 Ogden, Utah saw a prolonged battle against Chinese restaurants and repeated tests of prohibitions on booths; a version of the prohibition ultimately sustained remains in force.[[321]](#footnote-322) An April 4, 1902 article in the *Ogden Standard* reported that for “some years past it has been difficult for the restaurants, owned by white men and in which none but white employes [sic] is hired to make enough profit.”[[322]](#footnote-323) There were four Chinese restaurants in the city, but the article warned that more were coming.[[323]](#footnote-324) The hotel and restaurant employees organized, hoping “that more of the laborers patronage will be turned to the restaurants owned by white men and employing white help.”[[324]](#footnote-325) The Central Trades and Labor Council declared a boycott,[[325]](#footnote-326) and asked the City Council to “prohibit girls under 18 years of age from going to these places and asks the Council to abolish the wineroom system in vogue in such places.”[[326]](#footnote-327)

 The booth ordinance was passed, and it was predicted that it would require remodeling of a “dozen . . . Chinese restaurants on Twenty-fifth street alone.”[[327]](#footnote-328) The *Salt Lake Tribune* reported that the ordinance was “aimed at Chinese restaurants, as it appears, they were the only ones called upon to comply with the law.”[[328]](#footnote-329) On June 1, 1903, the *Salt Lake Herald* reported that Ogden’s Chinese restaurants were “hard to kill off” and “thriving in spite of opposition.”[[329]](#footnote-330) In March, 1904, Judge Rolapp of the District Court declared the booth ordinance invalid.[[330]](#footnote-331)

But the controversy did not end. The *Ogden Standard Examiner* continued to warn that danger “to the morals of young men and young women lies in the ‘chop suey’ houses.” [[331]](#footnote-332) In January 1918, Ogden considered a new booth ordinance[[332]](#footnote-333) Chinese restaurant proprietors claimed that the ordinance “represented racial prejudice, agitated by the restaurant trust and directed against all [O]rientals in that business here.”[[333]](#footnote-334) The ordinance was enacted and the police started a “crusade against the booths in the cafes and restaurants.”[[334]](#footnote-335) One Ogden citizen who rented space to a Chinese restaurant complained that this “appeared to him like persecution against the Chinese,” asking: “Why don’t you go after the white men who are violating the city laws as well as the Chinamen?”[[335]](#footnote-336)

In a test case, the proprietor of the Alhambra Café, a Chinese restaurant,[[336]](#footnote-337) was convicted;[[337]](#footnote-338) the Utah Supreme Court affirmed.[[338]](#footnote-339) The Court explained: “We know, as all men know, that the best and largest dining rooms everywhere are open, and that the respectable and law-abiding men and women do not seek closed booths or dark rooms when they go to a public eating place to eat their meals.”[[339]](#footnote-340)

Other booth regulations appeared across the country. In some cases, the regulations targeted Chinese restaurants. For example, the Mayor of Minneapolis ordered the closure of a Chinese restaurant for selling liquor without a license and concurrently ordered that “all booths be torn out of Chinese restaurants.”[[340]](#footnote-341) Given the major union boycott in Minneapolis,[[341]](#footnote-342) and the Mayor’s reported policy of denying liquor licenses to Chinese restaurants,[[342]](#footnote-343) this is hardly surprising. Following the “chop suey raids” of 1918, the New York District Attorney announced “the abolishment of private rooms in chop suey restaurants.”[[343]](#footnote-344) In other instances, news accounts, at least, do not make an explicit connection between the Chinese nature of the restaurant and the regulation. However, many jurisdictions banning booths also implemented or seriously considered other anti-Chinese restaurant measures, or had strong union activity against the restaurants, including Chicago,[[344]](#footnote-345) Los Angeles,[[345]](#footnote-346) Phoenix,[[346]](#footnote-347) Tucson,[[347]](#footnote-348) and cities in Massachusetts[[348]](#footnote-349) and Oregon.[[349]](#footnote-350)

III. Victory and National Immigration Policy

As the nineteen-teens turned into the twenties, something seemed to have changed. A 1919 union report indicated that in Boston there was “progress in the fight on the Chinese restaurants.”[[350]](#footnote-351) A 1921 report in the *Mixer and Server* from Detroit, Michigan suggests that by then union goals had been achieved: “I take pleasure in saying that the worst enemy that we have had to contend with here is beginning to wane and vanish, and we all wish him a speedy exit.”[[351]](#footnote-352)

If union members and competing restauranteurs sensed that the Chinese had been vanquished, they were correct. The Census, reported 107,488 Chinese in the continental United States in 1890, 89,863 in 1900, and 71,531 in 1910.[[352]](#footnote-353) The 1920 Census showed a further decline to 61,639.[[353]](#footnote-354) Anti-Chinese policies had reduced the population by almost half. And of course, ratification of the Eighteenth Amendment added a new set of legal tools to control Chinese restaurants.

The political goal sought by the unions had been almost fully realized. Members of races native to continental Asia had been barred by the Immigration Act of 1917.[[354]](#footnote-355) While Japanese immigration had been restricted by the Gentlemen’s Agreement of 1907-08,[[355]](#footnote-356) in 1924 they were explicitly barred by statute.[[356]](#footnote-357) In the Immigration Act of 1924, Congress tied immigration eligibility to racial eligibility to citizenship. The Naturalization Act of 1790 had limited eligibility to “free white persons,” people of African nativity and descent were made eligible after the Civil War.[[357]](#footnote-358) The Immigration Act of 1924 operated to provided that those racially ineligible to naturalization were also ineligible to immigrate.[[358]](#footnote-359) In addition the Immigration Act of 1921 had put temporary limits on European immigration,[[359]](#footnote-360) which in similar form would be made permanent in the national origins quota system included in the 1924 immigration law.[[360]](#footnote-361) For all of these reasons, native workers had reason to be confident that the problem of Asian immigration and competition with white workers had been permanently resolved.

Unions had argued that Chinese should not be allowed to compete with whites because they were not allowed to become citizens. Their precarious immigration and citizenship status made it easier for whites to expect that they were no threat. Indeed, keeping Chinese restaurants facilitated discrimination. Those suspected of being undocumented could be targeted by law enforcement. The Police raided New York’s Chinatown in 1925,[[361]](#footnote-362) resulting in the “largest seizure of Chinese under the Exclusion act ever made” in New York City.[[362]](#footnote-363) “More than 500 Chinese were gathered in by 100 detectives and half as many Federal agents, in Chinatown and environs.”[[363]](#footnote-364) *The* *New York Times* reported: “[t]he expulsion of so many Chinese badly crippled the Chinese chain restaurant and laundry business throughout the metropolitan district.”[[364]](#footnote-365) In addition, employers could threaten recalcitrant workers with deportation.[[365]](#footnote-366) As of 2017, Chinese restaurants continue to be immigration enforcement targets.[[366]](#footnote-367) Chinese immigration, and Chinese restaurants, had apparently been tamed.

Moreover, the perception of Chinese restaurants was in the process of changing. In New York, the Health Commissioner said “that a report had been made to him that the Chinese restaurants were the cleanest in New York.”[[367]](#footnote-368) Connecticut authorities reported that “[t]he Chinese restaurant is a feature in all towns and it is clean in its kitchen, cleaner than many other sorts in its linen and gives a more varied menu at a lower price, invariably.”[[368]](#footnote-369)

On both coasts, the “Chop Suey craze” continued, but often, slumming had been replaced with glamour:

Broadway between Time Square and Columbus Circle was home to fourteen big ‘chop suey jazz places.’ One Chinese night club owner, a former Essex Street laundryman, supposedly wore a huge diamond ring, rode in an imported car, and squired around a bottle-blond burlesque dancer. In San Francisco, most of these new nightspots were in Chinatown . . . . Featuring all-Chinese singers, musicians, chorus lines, and even strippers, clubs like the Forbidden City attracted a clientele of politicians, movie stars, and businessmen out for an exotic good time.[[369]](#footnote-370)

Bing Crosby, Bob Hope, Ronald Reagan, and other celebrities patronized the Forbidden City, a glamourous nightclub in San Francisco’s Chinatown.[[370]](#footnote-371) The first major Chinese cookbook was published in English in 1945; Chinese food had been tamed enough to have around the house.[[371]](#footnote-372)

 And yet, unions were right to fear that Chinese restaurants could be a Trojan Horse, an economic toehold giving the Chinese community a chance to grow. As Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Nathan Glazer noted in *Beyond the Melting Pot*, restaurants could be centers of economic activity for the larger community: “[t]he Chinese restaurant uses Chinese laundries, gets its provisions from Chinese food suppliers, provides orders for Chinese noodle makers.”[[372]](#footnote-373) In addition, a scholar explaining why Chinese Exclusion was partially repealed in 1943 noted

[a]n important factor . . . was their entrance into characteristic occupations held as a natural monopoly, notably, the hand laundry and Chinese restaurant . . . This occupational specialization destroyed ‘white’ labor’s fear of competition, while enjoyment of the Chinese cuisine and other services won for the “Celestial” the patronizing good-will, if not the friendship, of a substantial section of the American public.[[373]](#footnote-374)

Chinese restaurants not only provided Chinese people an opportunity to earn a living, they offered the possibility of somewhat more personal encounters with non-Chinese than was routine with a laundry.[[374]](#footnote-375)

**Conclusion: Remembering the War**

Recognizing that there was a war against Chinese restaurants offers several insights into American law. It is an example of how legal ideas can propagate. In this case, innovation occurred not through judges,[[375]](#footnote-376) international organizations,[[376]](#footnote-377) or colonial bureaucrats,[[377]](#footnote-378) or organizations of lawyers like the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws or the American Law Institute. Instead, labor organizations and the motivated private citizens who belonged to them obtained hearings for their ideas.

The war on Chinese restaurants is also an example of what Douglas NeJaime has called winning through losing.[[378]](#footnote-379) Unions and law enforcement declared war on Chinese restaurants, and the Chinese restaurants won. The innovative tool invented for the fight, banning white women from eating in Chinese restaurants, became law almost nowhere, and was likely legally untenable. Yet, the unions had their cake and they ate it too; they had the benefits of Chinese restaurants and simultaneously restricted competition with Asian workers through federal immigration laws.

Because the states lost the battles but won the war, the episode is reminiscent of the SB 1070 saga.[[379]](#footnote-380) Arizona’s SB1070, enacted in 2010 and copied by many states, sought to impose state systems of regulation on undocumented immigrants.[[380]](#footnote-381) Unlike their predecessors in state legislatures in the first decades of the 20th century, modern legislators insisted on enacting the laws and subjecting them to judicial tests even though the statutes were palpably unconstitutional;[[381]](#footnote-382) the Supreme Court struck down SB 1070 in 2012.[[382]](#footnote-383)

Though a legal failure, SB 1070 was a smashing political success. It contributed to making immigration an important issue in the 2016 presidential campaign. SB 1070 attempted to allow state and local police to enforce federal immigration law; much of what it proposed to do is on the Trump Administration’s agenda. The failure and unconstitutionality of local measures did not make political impulses disappear, it channeled them to the branch and level of government with the power to act, just as the drumbeat of the economic and moral danger posed by Chinese restaurants and other Asian activities, and the inability to regulate them at the state level, contributed to a climate in which Asian Exclusion could dramatically expand in 1917 and 1924.

The episode also helps explain the idea of Asian Pacific Americans as a cognizable group. Of course, Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Indians, Cambodians, Vietnamese, Pilipinos, and members of all other Asian national groups have different cultures and histories, often different languages, and sometimes distinct appearances. Yet, for legal purposes, they were often amalgamated as a single race, because the public perception of them was that they were all part of the same yellow peril. Concerned about Chinese, restaurant legislation, like federal immigration legislation, often targeted Asians as an undifferentiated group.

The story reveals that Asian Pacific American legal history, and, for that matter, history, has been under-investigated. It is no surprise that Arizona, California, Montana, Oregon, and Utah targeted Asians; those states enacted laws prohibiting Asians from intermarrying with whites,[[383]](#footnote-384) and owning land.[[384]](#footnote-385) Given their animus, additional discriminatory actions were predictable. But the eastern and midwestern states of Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania had no race-based miscegenation or land laws. Yet, those states or cities within them carried on heretofore unexplored legal attacks on Chinese economic activity.

One advantage revealed by campaigns against Chinese restaurants is that the Chinese enjoyed some diplomatic protection of their interests. In 1901, the Chinese legation filed a claim for damages with the State Department for mistreatment by Americans.[[385]](#footnote-386) When the Pittsburgh City Council threatened discriminatory legislation, Chinese restaurant keepers could seek help from their ambassador, and invoke their treaty rights;[[386]](#footnote-387) a letter from the Secretary of State shut down an anti-Chinese restaurant bill in Montana.[[387]](#footnote-388) When Chinese men around the country were harassed by the police after the murder of Elsie Sigel, members of the community could call “on the Chinese Legation and afterward went to the State Department [to protest] the manner in which . . . the Chinamen of New York, Philadelphia, and other large cities of the country are being persecuted by police.”[[388]](#footnote-389) Of course, invoking diplomatic assistance hardly assured victory. But it was almost certainly better than nothing. By contrast, African Americans and Indians in the United States could rarely turn to an outside power for protection.

 Perhaps the most important implication of the campaign is that it represents another chapter in the persistent, systematic economic exploitation of people of color in the United States. For example, the Constitution protected slavery, designed to derive advantage from involuntary African American labor.[[389]](#footnote-390) After the Civil War, Reconstruction, and Redemption, in many parts of the country African Americans were compelled to work by a compromised criminal justice system.[[390]](#footnote-391) Similarly, Latinos in the United States have often labored without the opportunity for equal treatment.[[391]](#footnote-392) The Indian tribes once possessed priceless real estate, now they do not.[[392]](#footnote-393) Later, the United States held a fortune in Indian property “in trust,” an obligation which, in the decades it has been in force, has been honored occasionally if at all.[[393]](#footnote-394)

Chinese Americans and other Asian Americans were also targeted by law, for economic reasons. On its face, the method was different. Southern planters and other business owners desired African American labor at below-market prices, illegally importing enslaved persons before the Civil War,[[394]](#footnote-395) and, even after the formal abolition of slavery, using law to prevent African American migration out of the South.[[395]](#footnote-396) With Chinese and other Asians, the concern was economic competition with workers on the Pacific coast, and the legal solution was exclusion, both of future competitors and of those already present in the United States, with little regard for their lawful presence or the fact that some were citizens.

California’s anti-Asian alien land law, which prohibited Asians from owning agricultural land, was intended “to discourage the coming of Japanese into this state.”[[396]](#footnote-397) Laws prohibiting land ownership by Asians, adopted throughout the West, were upheld by the Supreme Court.[[397]](#footnote-398) Targeting businesses owned by or employing Chinese would likewise encourage their departure.[[398]](#footnote-399) Discrimination against Chinese laundries is reflected in the celebrated case of *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*,[[399]](#footnote-400) which exemplifies the decades-long West Coast effort to prevent Chinese laundries from gaining an economic foothold and becoming permanent competitors.[[400]](#footnote-401) The effort to drive out lawful Chinese residents is reminiscent of the periods of economic difficulty when persons of Mexican ancestry, citizen and noncitizen alike, were “repatriated” to Mexico to ease their competition for jobs with whites.[[401]](#footnote-402) Although the specific techniques used against various non-white groups differed, they shared the underlying idea that public policy should be structured to benefit white Americans.

Even now, Chinese restaurants run for people of all races often by American-born U.S. citizens seem to contribute to the conceptualization of Asians as perpetual foreigners. During a moment of tension with China, “[a] radio station disc jockey in Springfield, Illinois suggested boycotting Chinese restaurants.”[[402]](#footnote-403) U.S. citizen Wen Ho Lee, a nuclear scientist of Chinese racial ancestry wrongly accused of spying for China may have been charged in part because of Chinese restaurants. A witness “noting something nefarious about the number of Chinese restaurants in Los Alamos;” an investigator reportedly said “just the fact that there are five Chinese restaurants here meant that the Chinese government had an interest.”[[403]](#footnote-404)

The Trump Administration’s actions and ideology seem to reflect traditional suspicion of Asians. The Department of Homeland Security recently proposed to collect social media information solely from people from one country, China.[[404]](#footnote-405) Steve Bannon, now a senior White House official, hosted a radio show in 2015; during an interview, Donald Trump said “You know, we have to keep our talented people in this country,” but Bannon disagreed, saying “When two-thirds or three-quarters of the CEOs in Silicon Valley are from South Asia or from Asia, I think. . . A country is more than an economy. We’re a civic society.”[[405]](#footnote-406) Bannon wildly overestimated the number of Asian CEOs; “A May 2015 study found that 27 percent of professionals working in Silicon Valley companies were Asian or Asian-American. They represented less than 19 percent of managers and under 14 percent of executives, according to the report.”[[406]](#footnote-407) Of course, many American citizens are of Asian racial ancestry. It is unfortunate, but, as this article shows, nothing new, that some believe that only white citizens can be a part of this nation’s civic society.[[407]](#footnote-408)
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