Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation

Evelyn Nakano Glenn[1]

Abstract

Understanding settler colonialism as an ongoing structure rather than a past historical event serves as the basis for an historically grounded and inclusive analysis of U.S. race and gender formation. The settler goal of seizing and establishing property rights over land and resources required the removal of indigenes, which was accomplished by various forms of direct and indirect violence, including militarized genocide. Settlers sought to control space, resources, and people not only by occupying land but also by establishing an exclusionary private property regime and coercive labor systems, including chattel slavery to work the land, extract resources, and build infrastructure. I examine the various ways in which the development of a white settler U.S. state and political economy shaped the race and gender formation of whites, Native Americans, African Americans, Mexican Americans, and Chinese Americans.

In this article I argue for the necessity of a settler colonialism framework for an historically grounded and inclusive analysis of U.S. race and gender formation. A settler colonialism framework can encompass the specificities of racisms and sexisms affecting different racialized groups—especially Native Americans, blacks, Latinos, and Asian Americans—while also highlighting structural and cultural factors that undergird and link these racisms and sexisms. I offer here a first rough sketch of a settler colonialism–framed analysis of racial formation in certain critical periods and places in the United States. I engage with recent theoretical work that views settler colonialism as a distinct transnational formation whose political and economic projects have shaped and continue to shape race relations in first world nations that were established through settler colonialism. My aim is to avoid lumping all racisms together, even for the benign purpose of promoting cross-race alliances

to fight racial injustice. Equally, I wish to avoid seeing racisms affecting various groups as completely separate and unrelated. Rather, I endeavor to uncover some of the articulations among different racisms that would suggest more effective bases for cross-group alliances.

In the latter regard, one implication of taking settler colonialism seriously is to advance decolonization as a necessary goal in the quest to achieve race and gender justice. Indeed, the elaboration of the settler colonialism framework has been closely paralleled by the development of decolonial critiques of racial justice projects that aim to achieve liberal inclusion, rather than liberation, of

[1]University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

Corresponding Author:
Evelyn Nakano Glenn, University of California, 506 Barrows Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720.2570, USA.
Email: englenn@berkeley.edu

subordinated groups. Theorists of decolonialism, such as Walter Mignolo (2007) and Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2011), argue that the case for liberal inclusion can only be made by working within the narratives, logics, and epistemologies of modernism. Yet, these are the very narratives, logics, and epistemologies that undergird settler colonial projects. Thus, strategies and solutions that adhere to modernist concepts of progress, individuality, property, worth, and so on are fated to reproduce the inequalities that colonialism has created. Mignolo and Maldonado-Torres argue for the necessity of challenging and rejecting modernist concepts. They propose that the border thinking and philosophy of women of color feminists offer counter-hegemonic narratives, logics, and epistemologies that enable the imagining of liberation for men and women of color. What I draw on from decolonial theory is an intersectional perspective, one that recognizes gender, sexuality, and race as co-constituted by settler colonial projects.

Before further elaborating the settler colonial framework, I will contextualize my project by briefly reviewing previous efforts to develop conceptual models to analyze and compare racisms affecting varied racialized groups in the United States.

BEYOND THE BLACK-WHITE BINARY?

American sociologists developed the concept of "ethnicity" to refer to relations among groups marked by cultural and language difference, while "race" referred to groups marked by supposed somatically visible difference. These scholars recognized that racial groups were also characterized by cultural distinctions, but in practice, the study of ethnic relations generally focused on intraracial relations, especially among whites from different national origins, while the study of race focused in interracial group relations and inequality between and among groups marked as white and black. Indeed, the vast majority of sociological studies of racism and racial inequality have focused on white-black conflict and disparities. This attention was warranted given the long history of black subjugation and the unique structural position blacks occupied as property under the regime of chattel slavery. Jared Sexton (2010:46) noted, "Because Blackness serves as the basis of enslavement in the logic of a transnational political and legal culture, it permanently destabilizes the position of any nominally free Black population." Indeed, after Emancipation

and the end of Reconstruction, white supremacy was reinstated in the former slave states by measures that subjected nominally free blacks to legal, political, and economic conditions as close to slavery as possible. Blacks were systematically disfranchised, super-exploited, confined, and terrorized in multiple ways. Denied any freedom wages in the form of land, freed people were ensnared in debt bondage under the sharecropping system, arbitrarily imprisoned and put to forced labor under the convict labor system, and kept in check by legal and vigilante terrorism.

Finally, a century after formal emancipation, with the gains won by the Civil Rights Movement in the United States and the growing ethnic, racial, and religious diversity of the U.S. population, especially as non-Hispanic whites have approached becoming a numerical minority, race scholars have shifted more attention to racism affecting other groups, particularly Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans.

One strategy has been to cluster racialized groups together under an umbrella term, such as "non-Whites," "people of color," or "third world minorities." By identifying commonalities in their experiences of subordination, exploitation, and exclusion, theorists hoped to promote coalitional organizing to fight racism. The internal colonialism model, originally devised by Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) to account for the condition of African Americans, was elaborated by Robert Blauner (1972) in his influential volume *Racial Oppression in America* to encompass African Americans, Native Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans. According to Blauner (1972:53), these racialized minorities (Colonized Minorities) "share a common situation of oppression" that differed from the situation of European immigrants (Immigrant Minorities), namely, "forced entry into the larger society" (as opposed to voluntary entry by European immigrants), subjection to various forms of coerced labor (as opposed to participation in free labor), and colonizer cultural policy that "constrains, transforms, or destroys original values, orientations, and ways of life." *Racial Oppression* became a foundational text for students and scholars of Chicano-Latino, Native American, and Asian American Studies during the 1970s and 1980s.

A second approach has been to focus on the common processes by which groups are formed (and reformed) as racial groups—that is, are identified by social and political institutions and self-identify as distinct races. This approach bypasses the problem of mapping racialized groups in a

conceptual space or in a hierarchy of groups. Michael Omi and Howard Winant took this approach in their seminal work, *Racial Formation in America*, originally published in 1989 and reissued in revised versions in 1994 and 2014. Omi and Winant argued that in the United States, "Race is a fundamental axis of social organization." At the same time, they recognized race not as fixed but as "an unstable and 'decentered' complex of social meaning constantly being transformed by political struggle" (Omi and Winant 1994:13). Indeed, the last decades of the twentieth century saw racially defined groups engaging in political struggle to challenge the structural and cultural violence of colonialism, apartheid, and racial-ethnic cleansing. One result of these struggles is that "we have now reached the point of fairly general agreement that race is not a biologically given but rather a socially constructed way of differentiating human beings" (Omi and Winant 1994:55). Omi and Winant (1994:63) caution, however, that "the transcendence of biological conceptions of race does not provide any reprieve from the dilemmas of racial injustice and conflict nor from the controversies over the significance of race in the present."

A third approach to the imperative for a more comprehensive understanding of race has been to retain the white-black poles as the anchors of a hierarchical U.S. racial system but to expand the hierarchy to include other racialized groups between the poles. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (1997) developed what he called a "racialized social system" approach to analyzing how a society's economic, political, social, and political stratification is structured by the placement of actors into racial categories. In other writings (e.g., Bonilla-Silva 2009) he argues that U.S. racial stratification is undergoing transformation into a tri-partite Latin American style system consisting of blacks, whites, and an intermediate category of honorary whites. Bonilla-Silva examines the ranking of various Asian and Latino groups on an array of measures, including income, schooling, educational attainment, occupational status, self-identity, attitudes toward blacks, rates of intermarriage, and residential segregation. These rankings provide support for his hypothesis that some Asian groups (e.g., Chinese and Koreans) and some (generally lighter skinned) Latino groups (e.g., Chileans and Argentines) are being assimilated "upward" to become accepted as whites or else are being absorbed into an intermediate stratum of "honorary whites." Concurrently, other Asian groups (e.g., Hmong and Cambodians) and darker skinned

Latinos (e.g., many Puerto Ricans) are being assimilated "downward" to become part of an expanded category that he calls the "collective Black."

Still another approach has been taken by non-U.S. origin scholars who pioneered postcolonial studies (e.g., Bhabha 1994; Gilroy 1995; Hall 2003) and by U.S. Latino/a thinkers who pioneered border studies and feminist decolonial studies (e.g., Anzaldua 2012; Lugones 2010; Sandoval 2000). These scholars have stressed the indeterminacy of racial categories and the fluidity and hybridity of racial identities. Such conceptions make eminent sense of a world where large swathes of populations emigrate and move across borders, where borders are constantly contested and changed, and where individuals and cultures mix and merge. Moreover, some ethnic groups in the United States have long embraced a hybrid identity, most prominently Mexican Americans, many of whom celebrate their mixed Indigenous/Spanish heritage (*mestizaje*), and Filipinos. Regarding fluidity, recent empirical work by Aliya Saperstein and Andrew Penner (2010, 2012) analyzes national longitudinal data over two decades and finds that individuals' racial self-identification and others' classification of them shift over time. Generally, becoming successful and of high status leads to shifts in self-identification and social assignment toward "white," while becoming unsuccessful and low status (including being incarcerated) leads to reassignment to "black." A concurrent development has been the destabilization of sex and gender designations and identities by feminist thinkers such as Judith Butler (2006) and empirically studied by researchers such as Lisa Diamond (2009), which unfortunately I do not have space to elaborate on here. Yet, despite the increased recognition of the instability and ambiguity of race and gender categorizations, they remain persistent and resilient principles for organizing hierarchical relations within and between societies. How are we to account for this seeming contradiction?

AN ALTERNATIVE STARTING POINT

I now turn to an exposition of settler colonialism as an alternative starting point for a framework that can generate a more historically and structurally grounded analysis of racial inequality in the United States, one that pays attention to variation across time and place while also being attentive to structures that link these differing cases. It is

a framework that is amenable to intersectional understanding because it is widely understood that colonial projects simultaneously structure race, gender, class, and sexual relations within and between colonists and the colonized. Moreover, since settler colonial projects are transnational in scope, a settler colonialism framework invites investigation of cross-national connections and comparisons.

The concept of settler colonialism has been most clearly elaborated by scholars of indigenous studies, especially in Australia, Canada, and the United States. It is a framework that highlights commonalities in the history and contemporary situation of indigenous peoples in many parts of the world. However, although it may seem to be best suited to explain the racialization and treatment of indigenous peoples, I agree with Patrick Wolfe (1999) that settler colonialism should be seen not as an event but as an ongoing structure. The logic, tenets, and identities engendered by settler colonialism persist and continue to shape race, gender, class, and sexual formations into the present.

Scholars of settler colonialism argue that it is a distinct form of colonialism that needs to be theorized separately from colonialism more generally. In contrast to classic colonialism whose aim is to take advantage of resources that will benefit the *metropole*, settler colonialism's objective is to acquire land so that colonists can settle permanently and form new communities. Lorenzo Veracini (2011) compares the narrative arc of classic colonialism and settler colonialism to the difference between a circle and a line. In classic colonialism, the narrative, as in the *Odyssey*, takes a circular form, "consisting of an outward movement followed by interaction with exotic and colonized 'others' in foreign surroundings, and by a final return to an original location" (p. 205). In contrast, "the narrative generally associated with settler colonial enterprises rather resembles the *Aeneid*, where the traveler moves forward along a story line that can't be turned back" (p. 206). Settler colonists do not envision a return home. Rather, they seek to transform the new colony into "home."

The differing goals of classic colonialism and settler colonialism lead to a second major difference: their confrontation with *indigenes.* In classic colonialism, the object is to exploit not only natural resources but also human resources. Native inhabitants represent a cheap labor source that can be harnessed to produce goods and extract materials for export to the *metropole*. They also serve as consumers, expanding the market for goods produced by the *metropole* and its other colonies. Goods and raw materials, like colonists, follow a circular path in classic colonialism.

In settler colonialism, the object is to acquire land and to gain control of resources. To realize these ambitions, the first thing that must be done is to eliminate the indigenous occupants of the land. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways: genocide, forced removal from territories desired by white settlers, and confinement to reservations outside the boundaries of white settlement. It can also be accomplished through assimilation. Assimilation can be biological (e.g., through inter-marriage to "dilute" indigenous blood) and/or cultural (e.g., by stripping *indigenes* of their culture and replacing it with settler culture).

The second thing that must be done is to secure the land for settlers. This can be accomplished by imposing a modernist property regime that transforms land and resources (sometimes including people) into "things" that can be owned. This regime consists of such elements as mapping and marking boundaries to delimit an object that is to be owned, a system for recording ownership, and legal rules for ownership and sale of objects defined as property. Indigenous people generally understand the land and their relationship to it very differently, viewing themselves as being provided for by the land and in turn as living in harmony with the land and having a sense of responsibility for its welfare. Settler society does not recognize indigenous conceptions and from their own perspective of land as property, views indigenes as failing to make productive use of it.

THE LOGIC AND PRACTICES OF U.S. SETTLER COLONIALISM

I turn now to the specific case of U.S. settler colonialism. Walter Hixson (2013:29) argues that the British settler colonial project in North America was unique from those of its Spanish and French rivals: "Like the Spanish and the French, the English embraced patriarchy, private property, and Christianity, but the emphasis on the settlement of families and communities distinguished them." Spanish male colonists were spread thinly across vast vistas of land. French traders and missionaries were surrounded by indigenous people with whom they had to coexist. The French also were overwhelmingly male and often took Indian mistresses and wives with whom they formed Metis (mixed) communities. "By contrast European women migrated with men and children to settle in the

English colonies." This family-based colonization in combination with its rural character proved to be advantageous, enabling "a steady westward migration towards the agricultural frontier as the threat of Indian attack diminished" (Elliott 2006:43–44).

With regard to the elimination of the indigene, settlers adopted all of the aforementioned policies at one time or another. Hixson (2013) documents the almost continuous history of settler colonial ethnic cleansing. Regular outbreaks of warfare occurred throughout the seventeenth, second half of the eighteenth, and the nineteenth centuries as settlers pressed up against lands inhabited or used by Native Americans first in the East and then in the Midwest and finally the West. Some genocidal campaigns were carried out by official military forces of the *metropole* or the colonies, while others were unauthorized actions by settler vigilantes. Attacks launched by vigilantes were likely to be particularly brutal and to involve the slaughtering of women, children, infants, and the elderly. Hixson notes that in 1609 when hostilities broke out between the English settlers in Jamestown and Native Americans in the region, the leader of the colony, James Smith, "pioneered the tradition of irregular warfare in the 'New World' by burning and razing Indian homes and agricultural fields" (p. 31). Warfare escalated during and after the Civil War as American settlers pushed to occupy the remaining land in the West and Native tribes fought to preserve their ways of life. The Massacre at Wounded Knee (1890) that resulted in the death of 300 Sioux warriors was one of the last major battles and mostly ended Indian armed resistance (Brown 2007:439–50).

A little known aspect of genocidal raids and warfare was the enslavement of indigenous survivors, particularly women and children. In colonial New England, the selling of Indian slaves on the international market in the Caribbean and South America helped defray the costs of the Powhatan Wars. Settler men spoke of their desire for Native American women whom they could use as domestic servants and sex slaves. In the South, according to Alan Gallay (2009:57), "Only through warfare could Carolinians obtain the slaves they desired to exchange for supplies to build their plantations." In California between 1850 and 1863, Walter Hixson (2013:125) writes, "Some 10,000 Indians were sold into servitude. American slave traders often killed the parents of Indian children so they might be seized and trafficked."

Conflicts over territory were also resolved by removal and relocation under treaties that were agreed to by Native Americans induced to sign by false promises and duress. During the presidency of Andrew Jackson, and at his urging, the U.S. Congress passed The Indian Removal Act of 1830 (IRA). The IRA targeted the "five civilized tribes" of the southeast (Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole), so called because they had gone furthest in adopting the culture and ways of life of white settlers (including the ownership of black slaves). Through treaty, these tribes were prevailed upon to cede their traditional lands in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida in exchange for land west of the Mississippi. The Choctaw, Creek, and Chickasaw were the first to be removed, and they suffered the loss of thousands of men, women, and children who died en route to the West. Cherokees waged a long legal battle that delayed removal until 1838. At that point, the U.S. government sent in 7,000 troops to force the Cherokee into stockades and then sent them on a forced march to the West with inadequate provisions. On the "Trail of Tears," at least 4,000 Cherokees perished from hunger, cold, and disease. The Seminoles resisted militarily, waging two wars, the second of which did not end until 1858, at which point most Seminoles had been relocated to Oklahoma. Even so, one hardy band of Seminoles managed to hold out in Florida, where their descendants still live (Foreman 1974; Perdue and Green 2008).

Near the end of Indian armed resistance in the West in the 1880s, federal Indian policy turned decisively toward assimilation, or as it was often dubbed, "Americanization." The aim was to phase out Indian treaty rights and other special statuses so as to absorb indigenous peoples into settler society. The twin prongs of Indian assimilation policy were land allotments and education. Under the Dawes Act of 1887, the federal government divided tribal land into individual allotments. Heads of households were entitled to 160 acres, single individuals to 60 acres, and those under 18 to 40 acres (Debos 1973). By allotting larger holdings to heads of households, the program was designed to encourage the formation of heteropatriarchal nuclear households. Proponents of allotment believed that owning and cultivating individual plots would transform Indian men into citizen farmers and Indian women into farm wives. Importantly, the large surplus left after allotments was made available to white settlers and railroad companies for development. The net result of allotment policy was to dramatically reduce the amount of land owned by Indians collectively and individually. In 1887, before the start of allotment, Indians owned

138 million acres; that amount was reduced to 54 million acres by 1934 when the allotment program was terminated (McDonald 1991).

Special education for Indian children was meant to complement allotment by preparing Indians for new productive roles in American society. Starting in the 1880s, reformers' designs for Indian children consisted of two components: child removal and placement in boarding schools. Education officials at the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) favored compulsory removal so as to limit the influence of Indian mothers. Estelle Reed, a longtime Superintendent of Indian Schools, explained, "The Indian child must be placed in school before the habits of barbarous life become fixed and there he must be kept until contact with our life has taught him to abandon his savage ways and walk in the path of Christian civilization" (Superintendent of Indian Schools 1900:426). Over a 24-year period from 1879 to 1902, the federal government established over 150 boarding schools, of which 25 were off-reservation (Reyhner and Eder 2004). BIA recruiters were hired to convince parents to enroll their children, with the promise that their children would be fed, housed, and educated so that they could improve their lives.

Once at school, Indian children were given haircuts and issued settler clothing. They were prohibited from speaking their native languages and from practicing native religions and rituals. The curriculum focused on gender-typed vocational training. Boys were trained in farming and trades and girls in domestic skills. Even though most federal officials placed more emphasis on "civilizing" Indian men, they were persuaded to try to educate Indian girls under the tutelage of white female teachers. They blamed Indian women for the "backwardness" of Indian men. In their view, the fact that Indian women did heavy physical labor and were ignorant of modern housekeeping methods accounted for Indian men's laziness and disinterest in material progress. If Indian women could be educated to focus on the household and to desire better furnishings, Indian men would be impelled to work hard to acquire material goods (Stremlau 2005). Thus, assimilation was intended to instill a sense of gender-appropriate duties and obligations. Ultimately, the aim of Indian schooling was to impose "social death." Col. Richard C. Pratt, founder and head of the Carlisle Indian School, proclaimed in a speech given in 1892:

A great general has said that the only good Indian is a dead one, and that high sanction of his destruction has been an enormous factor in promoting Indian massacres. In a sense, I agree with the sentiment, but only in this: that all the Indian there is in the race should be dead. Kill the Indian in him, and save the man. (Pratt 1973:260)

The decades of the 1940s to the 1960s saw still another shift in settler policy toward Native Americans. The intent was to assimilate Native Americans as individuals into settler society and to break their communal orientation and tribal ties. In 1953 the U.S. Congress passed legislation terminating the tribal status of many Indian groups. Termination of tribal status meant the loss of legal standing as a sovereign dependent nation and the end of federal aid, protections, and services, such as health care, which had been provided by the Indian Health Service. Many reservations were also terminated and reservation land sold off, primarily to non-Indians. Tribal members were unilaterally made U.S. citizens, subject to taxes and state laws from which they had been exempt. Over the next decade the government terminated 109 tribes and removed 2.5 million acres of trust land (Fixico 1986, 2000; Ramirez 2007).

A linked policy was to disperse Indians away from reservations. The Indian Relocation Act of 1956 paid moving expenses and provided vocational training and job placement to Native Americans willing to leave their reservations for 9 government-designated urban centers (Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Jose, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Dallas). Indian men were tracked into low-level, dead end jobs, and Indian women were directed into domestic service in white households. Many relocated Indians found that the promised jobs and stipends did not materialize and fell on hard times in the city; some returned to the reservation. The relocation policy resulted in the dispersal of the Indian population. An estimated 750,000 Native Americans migrated to cities between 1950 and 1980. Whereas in 1940 only 8 percent of Native Americans resided in cities, by 2012, 70 percent did (T. Williams 2013).

In the city, Native Americans often found community with members of other tribes, leading to the development of a pan-Indian orientation; intermarriage across tribes increased the proportion of Indians with multi-tribe identities. With the rise of the black civil rights movement, Native Americans began to organize for the cause of self-determination for Indian people. This activism included legal challenges to termination and relocation policy that

eventually succeeded (LaGrand 2005; Smith and Warrior 1997).

U.S. SETTLER COLONIALISM AS A RACE-GENDER PROJECT: DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL IDENTITY AND NORMALIZATION OF GENDERED WHITENESS

In this section, I describe U.S. settler colonialism as a race-gender project. By that I mean that it transplanted certain racialized and gendered conceptions and regimes from the *metropole* but also transformed them in the context of and experiences in the New World. What emerged out of the settler colonial project was a racialized and gendered national identity that normalized male whiteness. Since settlers initially were exogenous others seeking to claim rights to land and sovereignty over those who already occupied the land, they needed to develop conceptions of indigenous peoples as lesser beings, unworthy of consideration. They harnessed race and gender to construct a hierarchy of humankind. Conceiving of indigenous peoples as less than fully human justified dispossessing them and rendered them expendable and/or invisible. Land occupied or used seasonally by *indigenes* was conceived of as *terra nullius* (empty land or land belonging to no one) and therefore available for taking by white settlers. Simultaneously, settlers conceived of themselves as more advanced and evolved, bringers of progress and enlightenment to the wilderness. Masculine whiteness thus became central to settler identity, a status closely tied to ownership of property and political sovereignty. The latter in turn articulated with heteropatriarchy, which rendered white manhood supreme with respect to control over property and self-rule. This entailed settler wives being denied an independent legal identity; instead, her identity was merged into that of her husband, and her property and labor were under his control. Further, it was presumed that "heteropatriarchal nuclear-domestic arrangements, in which the [white] father is both protector and leader should serve as the model for social arrangements of the state and its institutions" (Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill 2013:13).

Settlers may initially identify with the imperial power and submit to its rule, but over time their interactions with *indigenes* and experiences in the colony set them apart from the population in the *metropole*. American settlers attached their identity to the land itself, to the mythologized common experience of settlement, and often to the shared goal of self-government. Frontiersmen and women became symbols of what it meant to be American. This new identity helped to bridge differences of class, ethnicity, and nationality that might otherwise have divided them. Thus, there was greater equality among the *settlers* than existed at the time among inhabitants of the *metropole*. European immigrants to the United States who moved west to take advantage of inexpensive frontier lands were quickly granted American citizenship rights and considered equals among their peers in matters of local government.

Some settlers also appropriated indigenous symbols, attributes, and skills, as in the case of American frontiersmen who wore buckskin and cowboys, range-riders, and backwoodsmen who adopted native trapping, hunting, and riding techniques. Turner's ([1893] 1920:4) essay refers to frontiersmen discarding train travel for traveling by birch canoes, wearing hunting shirts and moccasins, planting Indian corn, and even shouting war cries and taking scalps in "orthodox Indian fashion." Of course, the vast majority of white Americans did not actually ride canoes or wear buckskin. However, they identified with fictional or mythical characters (e.g., Leather Stockings, Paul Bunyan) or emblematic exemplars who did (e.g., Daniel Boone, Buffalo Bill).

Walter Hixson (2013:3) characterizes the emulations of indigenes as expressions of settler ambivalence:

> The colonizer desired the colonized other, for example for his attunement with nature or sexual liberation, and yet was repulsed by his primitiveness and the dangers he posed. The slippages and uncertainty with the colonizer's identity, including taking on some of the characteristics of the "savage," produced anxiety and instability.

Importantly, the adoption of indigenous symbols and attributes differentiates settlers from residents of the *metropole*, whom settlers may scorn as "over-civilized." In the U.S. case, the appropriation of indigenous symbols and practices contributed to the forging of a new national identity separate from that of the *metropole* and supporting the case for self-government.

Another element common to settler colonialism, one that certainly characterizes U.S. settler colonialism, is the "denial and disavowal of the

history of violent dispossession of the indigenes" (Hixson 2013:12). Lorenzo Veracini (2010:14) opines,

> The settler hides behind his labour and hardship (the settler does not dispossess anyone; he "wrestles with the land" to sustain his family) . . . the settler enters a "new, empty land to start a new life;" indigenous people naturally and inevitably "vanish;" it is not settlers that displace them.

In short, "settler colonialism obscures the conditions of its own production." Veracini adds that settler colonialism's need to disavow any foundational violence is such that "even when settler colonial narratives celebrate anti-indigenous violence, they do so by representing a defensive battle ensuring the continued survival of the settler community and never as a founding violence per se" (p. 78).

The encounter with the indigene can be viewed as the founding moment for the formation of U.S. whiteness. The "savage" and eliminable indigene is racialized as "other" in contrast to the "civilized" sovereign settler, who becomes "white." Whiteness also becomes synonymous with the nation. Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2008:85) explains,

> The USA as a White nation state cannot exist without land and clearly defined borders, it is the legally defined and asserted territorial sovereignty that provides the context for national identification of Whiteness. In this way . . . Native American dispossession indelibly marks configurations of White national identity.

Melissa Lovell (2007:3) observes, "Settler colonialism is an example of an institutionalised or normalised (and therefore mostly invisible) ideology of national identity." She also points to the associated invisibility and normalization of whiteness. "White people are able to define Whiteness as normality and to position themselves as full citizens whilst pushing non-White people (including migrants and indigenous people) to the margins or even outside of the boundaries of citizenship."

Native American legal scholar Robert A. Williams, Jr. goes further, attributing the establishment of a U.S. white racial dictatorship to settler resolve to erase Indians from the land:

> An overtly racist, hostile, and violent language of Indian savagery can be found in the first official U.S. legal document promulgated by the Founding Fathers, the Declaration of Independence. . . . [This] racist, organizing iconography of the Indian as irreconcilable and inassimilable savage other continued after the Revolution as one of the core organizing beliefs inspiring the Founders' vision of America's growth and potentiality as a new form of expansionary White racial dictatorship in the world. (R. Williams 2005:39)

While acknowledging the centrality of enslaved blacks to the formation of white racial identity, R. Williams argues that the Founders' first Indian policy "was the inaugural step in defining a White racial identity for the United States as a nation" (p. 48).

THE LOGIC AND PRACTICE OF RACIALIZED SLAVERY AND EXPLOITATION

As stated in the earlier exposition on the defining characteristics of settler colonialism, U.S. settler colonialism has been driven by the impulse to gain sovereignty over land, bodies, and labor by turning them into private property that can be bought, exploited, and sold. In this section, I analyze examples of how this impulse and the institutionalization of property regimes affected not only Native Americans but also other racialized groups in the past and present. Arvin et al. (2013:12) point out that

> within settler colonialism, it is exploitation of land that yields supreme value. . . . Extracting value from the land also often requires systems of slavery and other forms of labor exploitation. These simultaneous processes of taking over the land (by killing and erasing the peoples with previous relationships to that land) and importing forced labor (to work the land as chattel slaves to yield high profit margins for the landowners) produced the wealth upon which the U.S. nation's world power is founded.

Initially, American colonists made use of enslaved Native Americans, immigrant white indentured servants and convicts, and enslaved Africans. However, Americans came to favor black chattel slaves, finding them more profitable, especially for plantation labor in the South. What emerged was a triadic system that brought together the industry of the white settler, the land of dispossessed Native Americans, and the forced labor of

enslaved Africans to produce European and white American wealth. Patrick Wolfe (2011:273) notes, "Ubiquitously, colonizers have encoded and orchestrated this complexity by reference to some version, however inchoate, of the doctrine of race. In the sound-bite vocabulary of race, the three points of the Atlantic triangle . . . Africa, America and Europe became chromatized as Black, Red, and White respectively."

The establishment of black chattel slavery has been fundamental to U.S. conceptions of race in black-white terms. The distinction between the eliminability of indigenous peoples (for land) and usefulness of blacks (as property and for productive and reproductive labor) held as long as slavery remained in place. Thus, rules governing racial classification of Native Americans and blacks differed. For Indians, miscegenation diluted indigeneity such that mixed people were disqualified for tribal membership and therefore for coverage by treaty rights and entitlement to land allotments. Reducing the indigenous population entitled to treaty rights and land served the interests of white settlers and capitalists by opening up more land for them to own and exploit. In contrast, for blacks, miscegenation perpetuated blackness and increased the population of enslaveable people. The growth of the black slave population was consonant with the goals of increasing white property. The black-white binary came to be mapped onto other dichotomies that defined American identity: freedom-slavery, humanity-animality, owner of property–being property, and citizen-noncitizen. Given the transformation of Native Americans into ghosts, it is not surprising that everyday conceptions of race came to be organized around a black-white binary rather than a red-white binary.

These contrasting positions of eliminable Native Americans and enslavable and exploitable blacks were rooted in historical circumstances that have changed over time. With the dismantling of chattel slavery and emancipation, blacks in some places and in some situations became positioned more similarly to Native Americans as surplus population, therefore more eliminable. Patrick Wolfe (2006:404) notes that prior to emancipation, "as valuable commodities, slaves had only been destroyed in extremis." Indeed, historian Walter Johnson (2013) has calculated that on the eve of the Civil War, in 1860, the value of slaves exceeded the value of all railroads and factories in the United States. However, once slavery was abolished and Reconstruction ended, the U.S. witnessed the rise of Jim Crow terrorism, lynching, legally mandated segregation, and criminalization-imprisonment targeting blacks. Still, their "dispensability was

tempered" as long as blacks "continued to have value as a source of super-cheap labour."

In more recent times, particularly since the 1980s, blacks have lost their value as labor due to deindustrialization, globalized production, and immigration of workers from the global south to provide even cheaper labor. Racial zoning of American cities has hardened, and incarceration rates of blacks, particularly black men, have soared. Michelle Alexander (2012) has aptly dubbed the phenomenon of mass incarceration of blacks as the "New Jim Crow." Even more starkly, Wolfe (2006) has proposed the term "structural genocide" to cover a range of eliminatory practices from mass killing to spatial removal to biological and cultural assimilation, all of which have been employed to deal with Native Americans and to some extent with blacks.

Ruth Gilmore (2007) analyzes the massive growth of the California prison population disproportionately made up of African American men. She relates this growth to the diminishing demand for black labor by tracking the tandem rise in numbers of unemployed and of prisoners between 1973 and 1996.

Her analysis exposes the prison industrial complex as a key instrument of "structural genocide" directed against blacks. This notion is consistent with Gilmore's (2007:28) definition of racism as "the state-sanctioned or legal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerabilities to premature death." Another prominent instrument of "structural genocide" is social and spatial containment in impoverished inner city ghettos. Gilmore (2007:74) points out that the "concentration effect of sociospatial apartheid" includes "increased vulnerability to intentional and accidental violence, leading to premature death from a variety of causes."

SETTLER COLONIALISM AND GENDERED AND RACIALIZED OTHERS

I next turn to settler colonial mobilization of race and gender to manage "exogenous others" beyond the indigenes and enslaved blacks. In contrast to virtuous or potentially virtuous exogenous others (typically European immigrants) who may be selected for gradual inclusion, *undesirable exogenous others* (typically racialized immigrants) were considered morally degraded, sometimes irredeemably so. Settler colonialism's response to undesirable exogenous others has often swung (and still does) between the poles of "elimination" and coercive "exploitation."

In making connections between settler colonial treatment of undesirable exogenous others and the treatment of Native Americans and African Americans, I am not assuming a commensurability between anti-black racism or anti-Indian racism and other racisms. The so-called Afro-pessimist school of thought argues for the singularity of anti-black racism, which is rooted in the unique conditions of chattel slavery (Patterson 1985; Sexton 2010, 2011; Wilderson 2010). In his exegesis of Afro-pessimism, Jared Sexton (2010) contends that despite the fact that some non-black groups have at times labored under conditions similar to blacks, they have not been subject to the rule of slave law. He goes on to argue "the 'social death' in which one is denied kinship entirely by the force of law, is reserved for the 'natal alienation' and 'genealogical isolation' characterizing slavery" (Sexton 2010:41). Thus, the analogizing of people of color suffering to black suffering "bear(s) a common refusal to admit to significant differences of structural position born of discrepant histories between Blacks and their political allies, actual or potential" (Sexton 2010:47–48).

I agree that racisms targeting different groups are not identical and that different racisms cannot be made equivalent by drawing analogies between differing forms of subordination, for example between chattel slavery and labor exploitation. However, I do argue that the structure of U.S. settler colonialism rests on social, economic, and political underpinnings that link racisms. In making the argument, I eschew constructing or adjudicating a hierarchy of suffering but work at uncovering some of the underpinnings.

Among the groups that can be considered under the rubric of "undesirable exogenous others" are Mexicans and Chinese. They are each single nationality groups that are often subsumed under broader designations, Hispanics/Latinos and Asian Americans, respectively. For purposes of this analysis, I hone in on the specific groups—Mexicans and Chinese—rather than the broader heterogeneous groupings because of their long history in the United States and their prominent representation in popular culture and political-legal discourse. Also relevant is that the period of these groups' initial incorporation into the United States coincided with the westward expansion of U.S. settler colonialism and its project of final elimination of indigenes during the second half of the nineteenth century. While the category of exogenous other seems to fit the Chinese, who were viewed and treated as inalterably alien, it may seem incongruent to characterize

Mexicans in that way. But, as Mae Ngai (2004:131–32) points out, "When Anglos confronted Mexicans, they perceived Mexicans as foreigners even though the majority of the Anglos themselves had also migrated to the Southwest at the same time.

I now turn to examine settler colonialism's confrontation with Mexicans and Chinese, focusing on the specific racialization and control strategies aimed at these "undesirable exogenous others."

MANIFEST DESTINY: SETTLER COLONIAL EXPANSION INTO THE SOUTHWEST

In many ways the confrontation between Anglo settlers and Mexicans in the American Southwest was a continuation of U.S. settler colonialism's restless expansion. As in the case of settler colonial takeover of Indian land, Anglo takeover of northern Mexico was a race-gender project. In the settler imagination, a feminized and backward Mexican race was giving way to a freedom-loving, democratic progressive Anglo-Saxon or "American" race. Anglo settlers viewed Mexican men as weak, pusillanimous, and above all, lazy. Simultaneously, they depicted Mexican women as alluring and available, awaiting and welcoming Anglo-Saxon men. The sexual conquest of Mexican women as a metaphor for political conquest was often quite explicit (Almaguer 2008:60–62; de Leon 1983:9–10; Horsman 1981:233).

Anglo settlers dispossessed Mexican landowners and agriculturalists through a combination of legal and extra-legal means: "taxation, boundary manipulation, theft, and juridical means such as delaying land grant claims" (Velez-Ibanez 1996:62). The closing off and privatizing of communal grazing lands and transformations in the economy constrained the ability of ordinary Mexicans to maintain their pastoral ways of life. Mexican men were increasingly forced into seasonal migratory wage work initially as sheepshearers, vaqueros, and later in railroad construction, mining, and agricultural field labor. Women and children remained in their home villages and engaged in domestic production and subsistence agriculture (Deutsch 1989).

Up until the 1930s, the U.S.-Mexico border remained highly porous. The movement of Mexican nationals into the American Southwest (and back to Mexico) was not policed. Mexican immigrants entered freely and worked alongside Mexican Americans. After World War I, agriculture in California, Texas, and Arizona boomed. The

mode of farming "shifted from small and medium family-owned and run farms and sharecropping to large commercial farms owned by banks, lawyers, and merchant investors" (Ngai 2004:130). These agribusinesses required a large mobile labor force to move with the seasons for cotton, sugar beets, vegetables, and fruit. They welcomed migrants from Mexico to join the ranks of an exploitable migratory workforce.

Racialization of Mexican Americans was complicated by the fact that under the terms of the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the United States agreed to grant "the enjoyment of all the rights of citizenship of the United States to all of the varied people recognized as citizens by the Mexican government." The settler colonial formula that required whiteness as a condition of citizenship in some sense dictated the reverse logic that if Mexicans were American citizens they must be white. Thus, before the 1930s the U.S. government did not distinguish Mexicans from whites for official purposes, including the U.S. census (Haney Lopez 1996; Reisler 1976).

However, everyday practices of Anglo settlers and local governments were based on different understandings. In some times and places, Anglos differentiated between "Indian" and "Spanish" Mexicans, based on skin tone and class; in other times and places, they considered all Mexicans to be "mestizo" or "colored." The Texas and New Mexico constitutions gave citizenship rights to "free Whites" and "citizens of Mexico," while the California and Arizona constitutions limited suffrage to "Whites" and "White" citizens of Mexico. On an everyday level, Anglo interpretations of Mexicans' race varied, but by the 1910s it was converging toward lumping all Mexicans into the category of "non-White" or "colored" (Almaguer 2008; Weber 1992). Ngai (2004:131) notes that the concentration of Mexican immigrants in migratory agriculture "stoop labor" was central in their racial formation in the United States. They were branded by such epithets as "greasers" or "dirty Mexicans."

After World War II, particularly after the Civil Rights gains of the 1960s and 1970s, some U.S.-born Mexican Americans were able to move into white-collar and professional occupations and middle-class neighborhoods. However, the ranks of Mexican Americans were swelled by new immigrants, who were drawn by the demand for labor in agriculture, gardening and maintenance, food services, sweatshops, domestic service, and construction. In 1965, the U.S. Congress passed a new immigration law that eliminated national quotas and replaced them with "need" criteria, including labor demand, family reunification, and political asylum. While opening up immigration from previously barred areas, such as Asia, the 1965 Act severely reduced entry from Mexico and Central and South America. The restrictions did not deter economic migrants seeking to escape poverty, however, so the number of "illegal" immigrants from Mexico increased. Undocumented immigrants readily found employment in low wage jobs, but lack of legal status constrained their employment choices and left them unprotected and vulnerable to wage theft and many other forms of exploitation.

For nearly a century after the U.S. takeover, much of the lower Southwest constituted a broad borderland where peoples and cultures mixed and merged to create distinct new styles of food, music, and arts. Residents continued to cross the international border more or less freely to work, shop, and visit friends and family, sometimes commuting back and forth on a daily basis to jobs on the U.S. side and returning to homes on the Mexican side. Towns and metropolitan areas also spanned national borders. The two largest binational metropolitan areas are the San Diego–Tijuana complex and the El Paso–Ciudad Juarez–Las Cruces complex. The latter, with a population of 2.7 million, is the largest bilingual binational workforce in the Western hemisphere. However, with the imposition of stricter border control at the U.S.-Mexico line after 1965, Mexicanos could no longer move freely within their traditional lands. Those who crossed without papers became undesirable "illegal immigrants."

As undesirable exogenous others, Mexicans have been subjected to control by four main technologies: (a) containment (separation and segregation), (b) erasure (cultural assimilation), (c) terrorism (violence, lynching), and (d) removal (expulsion, deportation). I will give brief examples of how these technologies were deployed to control Mexican Americans.

Containment

Mexican Americans in the Southwest were kept contained through segregation in almost all aspects of life. In many towns, they lived in designated areas that lacked enclosed sewers and paved streets. They worked in a segregated labor market that restricted them to the most menial jobs. Social spaces were organized to reinforce distance between Anglos and Mexicans. In public sites such as stores, theaters, and restaurants, Mexicans were

allowed to be present only at certain restricted times or in segregated areas. For example, in some Texas towns, Mexicans were allowed only in the balcony sections of theaters, to sit only at counters or to use take-out at Anglo-run restaurants, to use the municipal swimming pool on the day before the pool was cleaned, and to shop on the Anglo side of town only on Saturday mornings (Foley 1999; Haas 1995; Montejano 1987).

School segregation was mostly de facto, an outgrowth of segregated housing patterns. However, many school districts established separate schools for Mexicans, even busing Mexican children to these schools. De jure segregation was technically illegal because the federal government and some state constitutions considered Mexicans to be "white." Mexican parents mounted legal challenges to separate schools for Mexicans. When Santa Paula, California, school officials were forced to admit Mexican students to two predominantly white schools in the mid 1920s, they had special showers constructed in which Mexican students were required to bathe each day. Using the hygiene argument protected school boards in California districts from charges of illegal segregation because the state school board allowed administrators to bar children from attending school or to segregate them if they were "filthy" or "unhealthy" (Hernandez 1983; Menchaca 1995).

Erasure

Regarding cultural erasure through assimilation, Carlos Velez-Ibanez (1996:66) describes education of Mexican children in Arizona as conveying the message "that their considerable poverty stemmed from their backward Mexican culture and language." Their education in Anglo-taught schools focused on

> eliminating obviously 'foreign' accents in Spanish, prohibiting the language from being spoken, and advising that Anglo Saxon models of work, morality, and government were to be imitated. . . . The school curriculum was designed to erase language, culture, social relations, food preferences and a sense of cultural lineage.

Curricula were aimed not at preparing Mexican children for assimilation into the middle classes but at training them for a limited future as reliable and diligent workers. Curricula for Mexican children emphasized learning basic English and arithmetic skills, inculcation in the ideals and values of American society, development of good habits such as cleanliness and punctuality, and acquiring gender-appropriate vocational or domestic skills. Mexican girls studied sewing and mending, while Mexican boys were trained in carpentry, repairing shoes, basketry, haircutting, and blacksmithing (Haas 1995; P. Taylor 1930).

Terrorism

Perhaps the least known aspect of Mexican American history is the extent of racial terrorism and mob violence against Mexicans. Combing data from newspaper stories, photographs, letters, journals, and diplomatic records, historians William Carrigan and Clive Webb (2013) were able to compile data on 547 Mexican victims murdered by Anglo mobs between 1848 and 1928. Reasoning that only a small percentage of instances could be documented in surviving sources, they argued,

> From the California Gold Rush to the last recorded instance of a Mexican lynched in public in 1928, vigilantes hanged, burned and shot thousands of persons of Mexican descent in the United States. The scale of mob violence against Mexicans is staggering, far exceeding the violence exacted on any other immigrant group and comparable, at least on a per capita basis to the mob violence suffered by African Americans. (Carrigan and Webb 2013:1)

Removal

During times when there was a demand for labor, Mexicans were desirable as a source of super-exploitative labor doing the dirty work that Anglos considered beneath them. However, when work was scarce, they were considered expendable, a threat to community stability, and a drain on the economy. During the Great Depression, agriculture in the Southwest was especially hard hit, and hundreds of thousands of farmworkers were thrown out of work. In an effort to reduce welfare burdens, local officials organized mass "repatriation" drives. Welfare officials would grant temporary relief to impoverished Mexicans on the condition that they repatriate to Mexico at public expense. An estimated 350,000 to 600,000 Mexicans, many of them born in the United States and therefore American citizens, were put on trains and sent en masse to Mexico in the 1930s (Guttierez 1996; Reisler 1976). A second large-scale expulsion took place during 1954 under "Operation Wetback," a U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service sponsored

campaign to apprehend and deport undocumented agricultural workers. INS officials boasted that Operation Wetback had succeeded in apprehending and deporting some 1,300,000 "illegals" (Velez-Ibanez 1996:289).

A third era of mass deportation was ushered in by a series of new immigration and deportation laws enacted between 1996 and 2003 that elevated militarization of the U.S.-Mexico border and intensified surveillance in the interior of the United States. Different new laws increased deportations by expanding the categories of non-citizens eligible for deportation, restricting the ability of migrants to appeal deportation, eliminating judicial reviews of deportation orders, and creating a new agency, the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) charged with "apprehending, detaining and deporting 'criminal and fugitive' non-citizens long after their arrival" (Hagan, Rodriguez, and Castro 2011:1375–76). In 2013, 369,000 undocumented immigrants were deported ("America's Deportation Machine" 2014). In 2009, 72 percent of deportees were from Mexico, of which only 33 percent were for criminal violations. As in the case of the Depression era deportations, most of those deported in this recent wave have strong ties to the United States such as long residence, a home, and/or family members. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) estimated that close to three-fifths of undocumented immigrants have lived in the United States for more than a decade (Ewing 2014).

PERPETUAL ALIENS IN OUR MIDST

Around the same time that Mexicans in the Southwest were incorporated into the United States under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, gold was discovered near Sutter's Mill in northern California in 1848. Thousands of mostly young males rushed in from the East and Midwest and from Latin America and Europe to prospect for gold or to supply goods and services to the miners. Among the motley and polyglot gold rushers, the largest group of foreign workers was Chinese, comprising up to a quarter of miners in some counties (Kanizawa 2005). These comprised the first cohort of immigrants who left Guangdong Province to work in California and other parts of the West. Thereafter, during a period of open immigration from 1850 to 1882, over 300,000 mostly young men were recruited to work on railroads and in agriculture, mining, and manufacturing. They initially came

over under contracts with labor brokers that bound them for a fixed term, usually seven years (Ling 1912). When federal legislation was passed in 1862 outlawing contract labor, labor brokers switched to a credit ticket system that bound workers until they could pay off their debts.

Some men of the merchant class brought wives or concubines, but the vast majority of Chinese immigrants were laborers who came alone. Over half left wives behind in China. As "sojourners," they worked to send remittances to relatives and to accumulate enough capital to acquire land in China. Many apparently succeeded in returning because according to the U.S. Census, the Chinese population never reached more than 107,000 during the nineteenth century. The Chinese population remained overwhelmingly gender-skewed, with the ratio of men to women ranging from 18.58:1 in 1860 to 26.79:1 in 1890 (Glenn 1983).

Chinese labor filled demands in parts of the economy that in the American South would have been delegated to enslaved blacks. However, some white settlers (as well as federal policy) opposed the introduction of slavery into California and other western territories and states, and after Emancipation, white Californians opposed the entry of free blacks. Instead, they turned to imported labor from Asia. Chinese immigrants were tracked into work gangs laying railway tracks, clearing fields, and digging ditches for irrigation; they were also recruited into agricultural field labor, mining, and manufacturing. Finally, they filled the need for reproductive labor for the largely male Western population, as cooks, laundrymen, and domestic servants.

Chinese laborers were sometimes "negroized" in popular culture due to their relegation to dangerous and backbreaking work usually assigned to blacks and their roles vis-à-vis white workers (Aarim-Heriot 2003). However, they were more often depicted through orientalist tropes. Advertisements, editorial cartoons, and popular fiction portrayed "Chinamen" doing "women's work" as laundrymen, houseboys, and cooks. Much excellent scholarship has documented, dissected, and analyzed more than a century of Sinophobia, including not only racist depictions of the Chinese in popular culture but also anti-Chinese pronouncements by representatives of white labor, white politicians, and white officials, as well as outbreaks of moral panics and health campaigns focused on Chinatowns (e.g., McClain 1994; Saxton 1975; Shah 2001).

As undesirable exogenous others, Chinese were controlled via some of the same technologies as

Mexicans, specifically: (a) containment (separation/segregation), (b) terrorism (mob violence), and (c) removal (expulsion). For the most part, there was little focus on assimilation aside from Christian missionary efforts to convert Chinese and to rescue Chinese women from prostitution. White settler society viewed the Chinese as inassimilable, and it strongly opposed miscegenation, especially between white women and Chinese men. However, settler colonialism adopted two other powerful technologies to manage the Chinese: (d) restriction/disablement and (e) exclusion.

Containment

I will not elaborate on segregation because of the well-known phenomenon of the concentration of Chinese in Chinatowns that were viewed as simultaneously unclean and vice-ridden and as exotic tourist attractions. There were also segregated schools for Chinese children in San Francisco and for "Oriental" students in the Sacramento Delta region through the 1930s.

Terrorism and Removal

I combine terrorism and removal because much of the white mob violence against the Chinese was aimed not so much at killing or lynching individuals but at destroying Chinese settlements and expelling all Chinese from a neighborhood, town, or city. Starting in 1850, with the driving out of Chinese miners from the gold fields and the seizing of their assets, white American settlers carried out more than 200 "roundups" and expulsions of Chinese over the next half-century. Jean Pfaelzer (2007:xix) asserts, "Surely the term expulsion doesn't fully represent the rage and violence of those purges. What occurred along the Pacific coast, from the gold rush through the turn of the century, was ethnic cleansing."

The ethnic cleansing drives peaked in the 1880s, with Chinatowns in Los Angeles, San Jose, Seattle, and Tacoma being destroyed by white mobs. Pfaelzer (2007) was able to find documentation for cases of mobs or vigilantes driving out Chinese residents from nearly 200 towns in the Pacific states. "Following expulsions, mobs or vigilantes seized Chinese fishing boats, nets, vegetable gardens, laundries, stores, and homes then they burned down rural Chinatowns" (Pfaelzer 2007:253–54). David Courtwright (1996:158) wrote: "As with Indians to whom Whites often compared the Chinese, the way such killings were carried out revealed a deep, almost feral hatred.

Chinese men were scalped, mutilated, burned, branded, decapitated, dismembered, and hanged from gutter spouts."

Restriction/Disablement

Perhaps the most characteristic technology employed to manage the Chinese was the use of legal restrictions designed to disable Chinese immigrants from making a living, putting down roots, procreating, and acquiring property, in short to become long-term and self-regenerating residents and citizens. The city of San Francisco, with the largest population of Chinese residents, passed several ordinances to hobble Chinese laundries. The State of California passed laws that imposed special taxes on Chinese miners and fishermen and that barred Chinese from testifying in criminal or civil cases and from employment on county irrigation projects (McClain 1994; Sandemeyer 1991).

Most disabling were laws banning Chinese immigrants from owning land. As early as 1879, Oregon's first constitution included a section granting "White foreigners" the same rights in land as native citizens but added, "No Chinaman, not a resident of the state at the adoption of [this] constitution, shall ever hold any real estate or mining claim" (Lazarus 1987:217). Such forthright racial language was made unnecessary by the passage of the federal Naturalization Act of 1870. This law limited the right to become American citizens to "White persons and persons of African descent," thus barring Asians from becoming naturalized citizens and creating a new category for them of "aliens ineligible for citizenship." Thereafter, states and municipalities could pass restrictive legislation targeting Chinese (and later other Asians) without specific reference to race. Thus, California's rewritten constitution of 1879 extended land rights to foreigners of the "White race or of African descent who were eligible to become United States citizens" (Lazarus 1987:216). Washington's state constitution of 1889 prohibited "ownership of lands by aliens, other than those who in good faith have declared their intentions to become citizens of the United States" (Lazarus 1987:232). If property/land ownership was the defining entitlement of the white settler, then the Chinese immigrant was the quintessential alien "other."

While settler culture valorized the heteropatriarchal family as the moral foundation of its society, white settlers restricted Chinese immigrants' ability to form such families. The passage of the Page Act in 1875 prevented Chinese immigrant men who might otherwise have sent for wives from

doing so. Supposedly designed to prevent entry of Chinese, Japanese, and "Mongolian" prostitutes, contract laborers, and felons, the Page Act was mostly used to bar Chinese women under the fiction that they were all prostitutes (Abrams 2005:701). Alternatively, many Chinese sojourners might have formed relationships with local women, as Chinese male immigrants did in the Philippines and Peru (Hunt and Walker 1974; Wong 1978). This avenue was closed by the passage of state anti-miscegenation laws that banned marriage between Chinese and whites (Pascoe 2009). Together, the Page Act and state anti-miscegenation statutes served to worsen the gender imbalance of the Chinese community and reduce its ability to maintain itself or grow through procreation.

Exclusion

The single most powerful technology employed to manage the Chinese was legal exclusion. The earliest legislation to restrict Chinese immigration was the Page Act, which, as mentioned previously, curtailed the entry of Chinese women but did little to cut the flow of male Chinese laborers. This goal was finally accomplished with the passage of the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, which barred Chinese laborers from immigrating for a period of 10 years and prohibited Chinese already in the United States from becoming citizens. The Chinese Exclusion Act ended a long era of open immigration and for the first time regulated entry based on national origin. It foreshadowed later legislation that applied exclusion to other Asian groups and limited entry based on national origin. The Immigration Act of 1924 prohibited immigration from an area defined as the Asian Pacific Triangle and set limits on immigration from southern and Eastern Europe (Ngai 2004).

Some Chinese men aspiring to immigrate managed to find a few loopholes in the law. For example, some were able to enter as "paper sons," the supposed offspring of American-born Chinese (Hsu 2000). Without these subterfuges, the Chinese population in the United States might have disappeared altogether. As it was, by 1930, the Chinese population in the United States had shrunk to 74,954, three-quarters of whom were male. With the paucity of females, the growth of an American-born generation entitled to citizenship was very slow. Thus, Chinese exclusion "made [Chinese] into permanent foreigners and guaranteed they would be but a small marginalized population in America for nearly 100 years" (Ngai 2004:18).

This situation began to change during World War II. In 1943, in response to China's position as a wartime ally, the U.S. government repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act and created a token quota of 105 entrants per year. It also agreed to make permanent residents eligible for citizenship. Opening the gates wider were the Brides Act of 1946 that allowed entry of wives and children of citizens and permanent residents and the Immigration Act of 1953 that gave preference to relatives of citizens. For the first time in 60 years, sizable legal immigration flowed from China, and for the first time ever, the majority of newcomers were women. Finally, the passage of the previously mentioned 1965 immigration law that replaced national quotas with need criteria strongly favored Chinese immigrants, who disproportionately qualified under the family reunification and labor needs criteria.

These new immigrants entered at a time when racial exclusion in housing and employment was waning due to the implementation of anti-discrimination laws passed in the wake of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. These reforms enabled college-educated Chinese Americans and scholar professional immigrants to enter occupations and industries previously barred to them and to live in integrated neighborhoods and suburbs. However, the majority of Chinese immigrants were not middle class. Over half of the Chinese entering each year had been employed as service workers, operatives, craftsmen, or laborers prior to entry from Hong Kong or China. Moreover, a significant proportion of professional, managerial, and white-collar entrants experienced downward mobility into blue-collar and service jobs due to language and licensing difficulties. Approximately two-thirds of immigrant Chinese in the United States are not fluent in English.

Over the next five decades, the Chinese community in the United States grew dramatically, ballooning from 236,084 in 1960 to an unprecedented 4,010,114 by 2010. Many Chinese Americans have fared well in terms of education, family income, and occupational achievement; however, others have not. Chinese still confront discrimination or even Sinophobia in their dealings with white Americans. A consistent issue is that Chinese Americans are often seen and treated as foreigners—from somewhere else—by other Americans. A Pew Research survey conducted in 2012 found that 72 percent of Chinese American respondents felt that discrimination against their group was a problem (Pew 2013). Within white settler society, the relative success of some Chinese and other Asian Americans have been assigned various roles:

as a middleman minority that can act as a buffer between whites and blacks, as a model minority to help hide the history of genocide/slavery, or as an exotic other to display the nation's tolerant multiculturalism.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The most widely used sociological frameworks for theorizing race relations in the United States have focused on generating analyses that encompass not just anti-black racism but also anti-Latino and anti-Asian American racisms. What these frameworks share is an appreciation that racial hierarchy and inequality are not simply the products of individual beliefs and attitudes but are built into American social structure and that whites have historically benefited from racial inequality. I have found each of the major frameworks, internal colonialism, racial formation, and racialized social systems, useful in my own work in comparative race and gender studies. However, what these theories do not explicitly consider is whether and in what ways U.S. national and regional racial systems may be unique and/or idiosyncratic because they have grown out of distinct material, social, and cultural circumstances, in this case, U.S. settler colonialism.

I have offered the concept of "settler colonialism as structure," as a framework that encourages and facilitates comparativity within and across regions and time. I believe that a settler colonial structural analysis reveals the underlying systems of beliefs, practices, and institutional systems that undergird and link the racialization and management of Native Americans, blacks, Mexicans and other Latinos, and Chinese and other Asian Americans that I have described herein.

What are these underlying systems/structures? First, the defining characteristic of settler colonialism is its intention to acquire and occupy land on which to settle permanently, instead of merely to exploit resources. In order to realize this goal, the indigenous people who occupy the land have to be eliminated. Thus, one logic of settler colonial policy has been the ultimate erasure of Native Americans. This goal was pursued through various forms of genocide, ranging from military violence to biological and cultural assimilation. British settler colonialism in what became the United States was particularly effective because it promoted family settlement right from the beginning. Thus, the growth of the settler population and its westward movement was continuous and relentless.

Settler ideology justified elimination via the belief that the savage, heathen, uncivilized indigenes were not making productive use of the land or its resources. Thus, they inevitably had to give way to enlightened and civilized Europeans. The difference between indigenes and settlers was simultaneously racialized and gendered. While racializing Native ways of life and Native Americans as "other," settlers developed their self-identities as "white," equating civilization and democracy with whiteness. Indian masculinity was viewed as primitive and violent, while Indian women were viewed as lacking feminine modesty and restraint. With independence from the *metropole*, the founders imagined the new nation as a white republic governed by and for white men.

Second, in order to realize a profitable return from the land, settlers sought to intensively cultivate it for agriculture, extract resources, and build the infrastructure for both cultivation and extraction. For this purpose, especially on large-scale holdings that were available in the New World, extensive labor power was needed. As we have seen, settlers in all regions enslaved Native Americans, and the transnational trade in Native slaves helped to finance the building of Southern plantations. However, in the long run, settlers could not amass a large enough Indigenous slave workforce both because indigenes died in large numbers from European diseases and because they could sometimes escape and then survive in the wilderness. Settlers thus turned to African slave labor. Slave labor power could generate profit for the owner in a variety of ways: by performing field labor, processing raw materials, and producing goods for use or sale and by being leased out to others to earn money for the owner.

What linked land taking from indigenes and black chattel slavery was a private property regime that converted people, ideas, and things into property that could be bought, owned, and sold. The purchase, ownership, and sale of property, whether inanimate or human, were regularized by property law or in the case of chattel slaves, by slave law. Generally, ownership entails the right to do whatever one wants with one's property—to sell, lend, or rent it and to seize the profits extracted from its use.

The elimination of Native Americans and the enslavement of blacks form two nodes that have anchored U.S. racial formation. Redness has been made to disappear, such that contemporary Native Americans have become largely invisible in white consciousness. In contrast, blackness has been made

hypervisible, and blacks are constantly present as an imagined threat to whites and the settler colonial social order. As pointed out earlier, Indianness is thought to be diluted and then to disappear through miscegenation, while blackness is thought to be continually reproduced even through generations of miscegenation. In this respect as well as others, the racialization of blacks—the irredeemability and dehumanization of blacks—has been incommensurable with the racialization of other groups.

Nonetheless, the racialization of certain (in Lorenzo Veracini's term) exogenous others has been a prominent feature of settler colonial societies. In the United States, some groups have been recruited and/or tracked into hard labor and super-exploited because they can be induced to work by need and kept in place by restricted mobility. For a nation that purports to stand for freedom, opportunity, and equality, the United States has had a long history of imposing coercive labor regimes, social segregation, and restricted mobility on many of its residents. Racializing certain groups as insufficiently human serves to justify subjecting them to oppression, subordination, and super-exploitation. Thus, conditions of compelled labor short of chattel slavery—contract labor, sharecropping, payment in scrip, wages paid only after completion of a long period of work—were legally allowed and commonly imposed on racialized others even after the abolition of slavery. These practices were designed to immobilize and disable workers' ability to survive by other means and thereby tie down theoretically free workers. These forms of coercion might be labeled de facto slavery because they do not involve ownership of the person and the enforcement of slave law.

The experiences of national and local policies toward Mexicans and Chinese were examined herein to help illuminate the linked processes of racialization and super-exploitation in U.S. settler colonialism. Racialization has been integral to resolving the contradiction between settler ideologies of freedom, equality, and progress and the unfreedom, inequality, and denial of mobility and citizenship rights to Mexican Americans in the Southwest and Chinese Americans in the Far West. The various technologies of control and management (segregation, cultural erasure, terrorism, expulsion, and legal exclusion) served the interests of capitalism by enabling landowners, plantation owners, and railroad companies to super-exploit these exogenous others. At the same time, racialization of "others" enabled white workers to reap a psychic reward, the so-called "wages of whiteness" to succor the wounds inflicted by class inferiority.

The case studies of Mexican Americans and Chinese Americans further illustrate the importance of paying attention to both the specificities and differences and the connections and commonalities among and between the experiences of various racialized others. Some of the major technologies for control and management of racialized groups were similar, most prominently the use of terrorism. It could be argued that the continuous history of genocide against Native Americans helped to normalize the use of extreme violence against non-white "others." Extreme violence was rationalized as necessary to ensure settler security. As described, not only blacks, but also Mexicans and Chinese were subjected to extreme and disproportionate violence that might well be characterized as ethnic cleansing. And, as in the case of the denial of the founding violence against Native Americans, white settler culture either denied or forgot its violence toward Mexicans and Chinese by magnifying the threat they posed not only to individual whites but also to the nation.

The technology of erasure through cultural assimilation practiced on Native Americans was also employed on Mexican Americans. In both cases, schooling was intended to prepare girls and boys for gender-appropriate domestic and vocational skills. The speaking of children's natal languages was punished, and mainstream (white/Anglo) ways of living were valorized. Education was also intended to teach racialized children "their place" in American society, that is, to accept and be satisfied with a limited future. The technologies unique to Mexicans and Chinese were those of mass deportation and legal exclusion. Native Americans could be and were removed to remote reservations in the United States and in a few instances driven across the Southern border into Mexico, but they were not legally deported. Removal of freed blacks and resettling them in Africa was tried after the Civil War, but the number of those removed was only a small proportion of the population. Whites in the South were able to re-impose a white supremacist order that could control and super-exploit black labor. However, once the transcontinental railroad was completed, Chinese labor was not strictly necessary in the West, and moreover, as immigrants, the Chinese could more easily be subjected to expulsion and exclusion. In fact, the Chinese were the first immigrant group subject to exclusion, first through the Page Act of 1875 and the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and then through the Immigration Act of 1924 that extended exclusion to cover other Asian peoples.

As described earlier, for nearly a century after the U.S. takeover of the Southwest, Mexican nationals and Mexican Americans were able to cross back and forth across the southern border more or less freely. However, this situation began to change during the 1920s with the establishment of the U.S. Border Patrol. Because of high unemployment during the Great Depression, Mexican Americans became the first group subject to mass deportation. A second large-scale deportation occurred during another period of unemployment in the 1950s under Operation Wetback. The first decades of the twenty-first century saw the creation and establishment of a vast federal machinery for "safeguarding" our borders, ostensibly to battle terrorism. This machinery has been wielded primarily against Mexicans, who are viewed as constituting a different kind of threat, a menace to "mainstream" American (white) culture. Thus, the majority of deportees continues to be immigrants from Mexico.

Throughout my historical analyses of settler colonial structures and practices as they developed in relation to Indigenous peoples, blacks, Mexicans, and Chinese, I have tried to apply an intersectional lens that views race and gender as co-formations. The bulk of the discussion has perhaps focused greater attention on race and racialization; however, gender has been present throughout the text. I pointed out that the settler project constructed various racialized gender and gendered racial dualisms. The white race was masculinized in relation to feminized black, red, or yellow races. Settler ideology also defined appropriate gender relations within the settler family and community, variously using Indian, black, and "others" as negative foils. White settler society understood extreme gender differentiation as a mark of civilization and thus attempted to shape white womanhood toward domesticity and dependency. Importantly, white women were viewed as needing to be protected by white men, particularly from the dangers posed by the primitive or perverse male sexuality of Natives, slaves, and exogenous others. Thus, for example, lurid tales of Indian capture of white women and their rescue by white soldiers circulated widely in settler culture. Meanwhile, Indian, black, and exogenous women were viewed variously as shameless, docile, alluring, or unfeminine because they did "men's work."

Settler colonialism also had different effects on men and women from subjugated groups as shown in several instances discussed in the main text. For example, it was mentioned that Indian women were more likely to be enslaved, while adult Indian men were more likely to be killed. Relatedly, Indian women were also more likely to be brought into settler households to be sex slaves and domestic servants. As for the Chinese, although male laborers were eventually subject to exclusion, women had been legally excluded earlier and more stringently on the assumption that all Chinese women attempting to enter were prostitutes. In contrast, Mexican women were sometimes viewed more favorably than Mexican men and were thought to be appropriate wives for Anglo men. As for enslaved blacks, women were subjected to gender-specific violence such as rape but not exempted from the same kinds of physical punishment and heavy field labor to which slave men were subjected.

I will now briefly consider the implications of the present analysis in relation to anti-racist politics. Given that many different groups have been victimized by racial violence, exclusion, and dehumanization, coalitions among racialized minorities are desirable and necessary. I suggest that coalitions are best built by recognizing the specific histories of racialized minorities other than our own. Our understandings ideally should reckon with (a) commonalities, (b) relations and connections, and (c) differences. All of these are highlighted by this settler colonial analysis. Many commonalities have emerged from the case analyses, including experiences of genocide and terrorism that have been inflicted, justified, and "forgotten" or deemphasized by settler society. Also having emerged are relations/connections in the experiences of different groups that complicate their positionality vis-à-vis one another. Thus, for example, the analysis might lead us to ask whether and in what ways racialized minorities might position themselves in relation to the territorial dispossession of Native Americans. Finally, some significant differences have emerged; for example, only blacks were subjected to chattel slavery, which is a condition of social death and subjection by slave law that even those who worked under conditions of extreme coercion did not share.

A final thought: in this article I have suggested that a settler colonialism framework for analyzing and understanding race and gender in America will have certain advantages over other frameworks, most specifically in the strength of its historicity and in a fuller incorporation of the role of Native Americans in how racism and gender oppression have developed and continue to operate. A question with which I have not dealt is to what extent can a settler colonial framework relate to and interact with other frameworks such as internal colonialism,

racial formation, and racialized social systems. My belief is that there are significant insights and analytical methods offered by each of the frameworks and that the addition of settler colonialism to the mix may help us to work toward a higher level theoretical model that can be widely used by social scientists both in the United States and internationally. I suggest that a fruitful next task will be for us to explore and discuss the connections and relationships among the various frameworks, with a new awareness of the distinct historical, social, and cultural understandings brought to our table by the settler colonialism framework.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Aarm-Heriot, Najia. 2003. *Chinese Immigrants, African Americans, and Racial Anxiety in the United States*. Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Abrams, Kerry. 2005. "Polygamy, Prostitution, and the Federalization of Immigration Law." *Colombia Law Review* 105(3):641–716.

Alexander, Michelle. 2012. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Color Blindness*. Rev. ed. New York: The New Press.

Almaguer, Tomas. 2008. *Racial Faultlines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

"America's Deportation Machine: 'The Great Expulsion.'" *Economist*, February 12, 2014. Retrieved October 2, 2014 (http://www.economist. com/news/briefing/21595892-barack-obama-has-presided-over-one-largest-peacetime-outflows-people-americas).

Anzaldua, Gloria. 2012. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. 4th ed. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Arvin, Maile, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill. 2013. "Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy." *Feminist Formations* 25(1):8–34.

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Blauner, Bob. 1972. *Racial Oppression in America*. New York: Harper-Collins.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism." *American Sociological Review* 62(3):465–80.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2009. "The Latin Americanization of U.S. Race Relations: A New Pigmentocacy." Pp. 40–60 in *Shades of Difference: Why Skin Color Matters*, edited by E. N. Glenn. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Brown, Dee Alexander. 2007. *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West*. 2nd ed. New York: Holt McDougal.

Butler, Judith. 2006. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Carmichael, Stokely and Charles V. Hamilton. 1967. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Vintage.

Carrigan, William D. and Clive Webb. 2013. *Forgotten Dead: Mob Violence against Mexicans in the United States, 1848–1928*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Courtwright, David T. 1996. *Violent Land: Single Men and Social Disorder from the Frontier to the Inner City*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

De Leon, Arnoldo. 1983. *They Called Them Greasers: Anglo Attitudes toward Mexicans in Texas, 1821– 1900*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Debos, Angie. 1973. *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Deutsch, Sarah. 1989. *No Separate Refuge: Culture, Class, and Gender on an Anglo-Hispanic Frontier in the American Southwest, 1880–1940*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Diamond, Lisa M. 2009. *Sexual Fluidity: Understanding Women's Love and Desire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Elliott, J. H. 2006. *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America, 1492–1830*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ewing, Walter A. 2014. "More Immigrants Are Being 'Removed' from the United States Than Ever Before." Immigration Policy Center, American Immigration Council. Retrieved October 2, 2014 (http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/ growth-us-deportation-machine).

Fixico, Donald. 1986. *Termination and Relocation: Federal Indian Policy, 1945–1960*. Albuquerque: University of Mexico Press.

Fixico, Donald. 2000. *The Urban Indian Experience in America*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Foley, Neil. 1999. *The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Foreman, Grant. 1974. *Indian Removal: The Emigration of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians*. Rev. ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Gallay, Alan. 2009. *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670– 1717*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. 2007. *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gilroy, Paul. 1995. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 1983. "Split Household, Small Producer and Dual Wage Earner: An Analysis of

Chinese-American Family Strategies." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 45(1):35–46.

Guttierez, David G. 1996. *Walls and Mirrors: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants, and the Politics of Ethnicity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Haas, Lizbeth. 1995. *Conquests and Historical Identities in California, 1769–1936*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hagan, Jacqueline Maria, Nestor Rodriguez, and Brianna Castro. 2011. "Social Effects of Mass Deportations by the United States Government, 2000–2010." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(8):374–91.

Hall, Stuart. 2003. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." Pp. 233–46 in *Theorizing Diaspora: A Reader*, edited by J. Evans Braziel and A. Mannur. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Haney Lopez, Ian F. 1996. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. New York: New York University Press.

Hernandez, Jose Amaro. 1983. *Mutual Aid for Survival: The Case of the Mexican American*. Malabar, FL: Kreiger.

Hixson, Walter L. 2013. *American Settler Colonialism: A History*. New York: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Horsman, Reginald. 1981. *Race and Manifest Destiny: the Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hsu, Madeline. 2000. *Dreaming of Gold, Dreaming of Home: Transnationalism and Migration between the United States and South China, 1882–1943*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hunt, Chester L. and Lewis Walker. 1974. *Patterns of Intergroup Relations in Various Societies*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Publications.

Johnson, Walter. 2013. "King Cotton's Long Shadow." *New York Times*, December 13, 2013. Retrieved June 15, 2014 (http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/03/30/king-cottons-long-shadow/?_php=true&_type=blogs&_r=0).

Kanizawa, Mark. 2005. "Immigration, Exclusion, and Taxation: Anti-Chinese Legislation in Gold Rush California." *The Journal of Economic History* 65(3):779–805.

LaGrand, James B. 2005. *Indian Metropolis: Native Americans in Chicago, 1945-75*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Lazarus, Mark. 1987. "An Historical Analysis of Alien Land Law: Washington Territory and State: 1853-1889." *University of Puget Sound Law Review* 12(1):197–246.

Ling, P. 1912. "The Causes of Chinese Immigration." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 39:74–82.

Lovell, Melissa. 2007. "Settler Colonialism, Multiculturalism and the Politics of Postcolonial Identity." Refereed Paper presented at the Australasian Political Studies Association Conference, September 12-15, 2007. Retrieved May 1, 2014 (http://www.academia.edu/610004/Settler_ Colonialism_Multiculturalism_and_the_Politics_of_ Postcolonial_Identity).

Lugones, Maria. 2010. "Toward a Decolonial Feminism." *Hypatia* 25(4):742–59.

Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2011. "Thinking through the Decolonial Turn: Post-continental Interventions in Theory, Philosophy, and Critique—An Introduction." *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production in the Luso-Hispanic World* 1(2):1–15.

McClain, Charles J. 1994. *In Search of Equality: The Chinese Struggle against Discrimination in Nineteenth Century America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

McDonald, Janet A. 1991. *The Dispossesion of the American Indian, 1887–1934*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Menchaca, Martha. 1995. *Mexican Outsiders: A Community History of Marginalization and Discrimination in California*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2007. "Delinking: The Rhetoric of Modernity, the Logic of Coloniality and the Grammar of De-coloniality." *Cultural Studies* 21(2):449–514.

Montejano, David. 1987. *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1886–1986*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. 2008. "Writing Off Treaties: White Possessions in the United States Critical Whiteness Studies Literature." Pp. 81–98 in *Transnational Whiteness Matters*, edited by A. Moreton-Robinson, M. Casey, and F. Nicoll. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Ngai, Mae M. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in American*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Pascoe, Peggy. 2009. *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Patterson, Orlando. 1985. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Perdue, Theda and Michael Green. 2008. *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*. New York: Penguin Books.

Pew Research Report. 2013. *The Rise of Asian Americans*. Rev. ed. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved October 5, 2014 (http://www.pewsocial-trends.org/files/2013/04/Asian-Americans-new-full-report-04-2013.pdf).

Pfaelzer, Jean. 2007. *Driven Out: The Forgotten War Against Chinese Americans*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pratt, Richard H. 1973. "The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites." Pp. 260–71 in *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian" 1880–1900*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ramirez, Renya. 2007. *Native Hubs: Culture, Community, and Belonging in Silicon Valley and Beyond*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Reisler, Mark. 1976. *By the Sweat of Their Brow: Mexican Immigrant Labor in the United States, 1900–1940*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Reyhner, John and Jeanne Eder. 2004. *American Indian Education: A History*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Sandemeyer, Elmer Clarence. 1991. *The Anti-Chinese Movement in California*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Sandoval, Chela. 2000. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Saperstein, Aliya and Andrew M. Penner. 2010. "The Race of a Criminal Record: How Incarceration Colors Racial Perception." *Social Problems* 57:92–113.

Saperstein, Aliya and Andrew M. Penner. 2012. "Racial Fluidity and Inequality in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 118:676–727.

Saxton, Alexander. 1975. *The Indispensable Enemy: Labor and the Anti-Chinese Movement in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sexton, Jared. 2010. "People-of-Color-Blindness: Notes on the Afterlife of Slavery." *Social Text* 28(2):31–56.

Sexton, Jared. 2011. "The Social Life of Social Death: On Afro-Pessimism and Black Optimism." *InTensions Journal* 5:1–47.

Shah, Nayan. 2001. *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Smith, Paul Chaat and Robert Allen Warrior. 1997. *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*. New York: New Press.

Stremlau, Rose. 2005. "To Domesticate and Civilize Wild Indians: Allotment and the Campaign to Reform Indian Families, 1875–1887." *Journal of Family History* 30(3):265–86.

Superintendent of Indian Schools. 1900. Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools. In *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Taylor, Paul S. 1930. "Mexican American Labor in the United States: Dimmit County, Winter Garden District, South Texas." *University of California Publications in Economics* 6(5).

Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Feb 2, 1848, Article IX. Retrieved September 9, 2014 (http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/guadhida.asp).

Turner, Frederick Jackson. [1893] 1920. "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." Pp. 1–38 in *The Frontier in American History*. New York: Henry Holt.

Velez-Ibanez, Carlos. 1996. *Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2010. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. New York: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2011. "Telling the End of the Settler Colonial History." Pp. 204–18 in *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity, and Culture*, edited by F. Bateman and L. Pilkington. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weber, David J. 1992. *The Spanish Frontier in North America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wilderson, Frank B. III. 2010. *Red, White & Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Williams, Robert A., Jr. 2005. *Like a Loaded Weapon: The Rehnquist Court, Indian Rights and the Legal History of Racism in America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Williams, Timothy (April 13, 2013). "Quietly, Indians Reshape Cities and Reservations." *The New York Times*, April 13, 2013. Retrieved June 2014 (http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/14/us/as-american-indians-move-to-cities-old-and-new-challenges-follow.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0).

Wolfe, Patrick. 1999. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. New York: Cassell.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4):387–409.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2011. "Race and the Trace of History: For Henry Reynolds." Pp. 272–96 in *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity, and Culture*, edited by F. Bateman and L. Pilkington. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wong, Bernard. 1978. "A Comparative Study of the Assimilation of the Chinese in New York City and Lima, Peru." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 20:335–58.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Evelyn Nakano Glenn is professor of Gender & Women's Studies and Ethnic Studies and Founding Director of the Center for Race and Gender at the University of California, Berkeley. Her teaching and research focus on race, gender, immigration, labor, and citizenship. She is the author of *Forced to Care: Coercion and Caregiving in America* (Harvard University Press); *Unequal Freedom, How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor* (Harvard University Press); and *Issei, Nisei, War Bride: Three Generations of Japanese American Women in Domestic Service* (Temple University Press). She served as 2009–2010 President of the American Sociological Association.