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INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic “first became real” for most Americans in March 2020.\(^1\) Since then, a wave of anti-Asian hate and violence has swept the country, as more than 10,000 “hate incidents” have been reported against Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AAPIs),\(^2\) including the 2021 killing of six Asian American women in the Atlanta area.\(^3\) The videos of senseless attacks against AAPIs, many of whom were older and vulnerable, were horrific and disturbing.\(^4\)

---


3. Two others were also killed for a total of eight murders at three spas. See Annika Kim Constantino, Atlanta Spa Shooter Who Targeted Asian Women Pleads Guilty to Four of Eight Murders, CNBC (July 27, 2021, 12:37 PM), https://www.cnbc.com/2021/07/27/atlanta-spa-shooter-who-targeted-asian-women-pleads-guilty-to-four-counts-of-murder.html [https://perma.cc/2YQ3-9WU2]. While the killer—a twenty-one-year-old white man—claimed otherwise, the murders appeared to be racially motivated. See infra note 308 and accompanying text for a further discussion of the Atlanta shootings.

But what is perhaps more disturbing is that this is nothing new, for there is a long history of hostility and violence against Asian Americans in this country, a history that is not well known. In this Essay, we examine that history, before offering some thoughts about how we might finally escape the cycle of discrimination and violence that has plagued persons of Asian descent in this country since the arrival of the first immigrants.

This Essay is based on a presentation we gave at the 2021 Convention of the National Asian Pacific American Bar Association (NAPABA) in Washington, D.C., with a team from the Asian American Bar Association of New York (AABANY). AABANY has been presenting reenactments of historic cases involving AAPIs since 2007, and this presentation on anti-Asian violence was its thirteenth reenactment. Despite their small numbers and limited resources—early litigants included, for example, laborers, laundrymen, a grocery store owner, women accused of being prostitutes, and a clerical worker—Asian Americans have not been afraid to fight for their rights, and many of their cases reached the U.S. Supreme Court. Our reenactments have focused not just on the legal principles


5. NAPABA is the largest AAPI membership organization in the country, with some 60,000 members, including lawyers, judges, law professors, and law students. See Who We Are, NAPABA, https://www.napaba.org/page/who_we_are [https://perma.cc/G2MU-3VSC] (last visited Mar. 4, 2022). It holds a national convention annually.

6. AABANY is the largest AAPI bar association in New York with more than 1,500 members. See About AABANY, AABANY, https://www.aabany.org/page/A1 [https://perma.cc/T7MS-29A7] (last visited Mar. 4, 2022). The team for this presentation included, in addition to the authors, Vincent Chang, Yang Chen, Francis Chin, Anna Mercado Clark, Andrew Hahn, Linda Lin, Clara Ohr, Yasuhiro Saito, and the Honorable Ona Wang. Four team members helped in the development of the presentation but were unable to attend: John Bajit, the Honorable Kiyo Matsumoto, Concepcion Montoya, and David Weinberg. This Essay reflects their work, and we are grateful.


8. See generally Chae Chan Ping v. United States, 130 U.S. 581 (1889) (laborer challenged Chinese Exclusion laws); Gabriel J. Chin, Chae Chan Ping and Fong Yue Ting: The Origins of Plenary Power, in IMMIGRATION LAW STORIES 7, 9–11 (David A. Martin & Peter H. Schuck eds., 2005); Case of the Chinese Laborers on Shipboard, 13 F. 291, 292, 294–95 (C.C.D. Cal. 1882) (petitioners were members of the crew of an American steamship who departed from San Francisco to Australia and were denied admission to United States on ship’s return based on Chinese Exclusion Act).


10. See generally Jew Ho v. Williamson, 103 F. 10, 12 (C.C.N.D. Cal. 1900) (Chinatown grocer challenged constitutionality of quarantine of Chinatown based on fears of bubonic plague).


13. In the early years, these individuals were often represented by lawyers who “were not working pro bono, nor were they what would now be called public interest lawyers; they
presented in these cases but also on the stories of these individuals, and our programs have proven to be effective and popular teaching tools.\(^{14}\)

In Part I of this Essay, we review the historical background and dynamics that set the stage for the hostility against the early arrivals from Asia. In Part II, we highlight a number of the acts of violence and discrimination against Asian Americans in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In Part III, we discuss two examples of more contemporary anti-Asian violence: the murder of Vincent Chin in 1982 and the case of the Vietnamese Fisherman against the Ku Klux Klan in 1981. Finally, in Part IV, drawing on our review of this history, we identify some of the causes of anti-Asian hate and consider some suggestions on how to end the hostility and violence once and for all.

I. BACKGROUND

The Gold Rush of 1849 brought tens of thousands of would-be miners to California from all around the world, including Europe, Mexico, South America, Australia, and, of course, China. Among the visitors, only the Chinese drew widespread resentment and hostility.\(^{15}\) The views of Mallie Stafford, a New England woman who accompanied her husband to California to mine for gold, were typical of public sentiment. In her memoir, published in 1884, she observed the following about the early days of the Gold Rush:

represented trusts and railroads more often than humble toilers like their Chinese clients.” Chin, supra note 8, at 10. They were able to hire “high quality legal counsel” because the Chinese associations pooled their resources. Id. at 9–10. Eventually, public interest lawyers did come onto the scene, including lawyers affiliated with the American Civil Liberties Union in the internment cases. See, e.g., Endo, 323 U.S. at 284.

14. The scripts and accompanying slides are made available to students, schools, law firms, bar associations, and other organizations for educational purposes. One of our scripts, Building Our Legacy: The Murder of Vincent Chin, which was developed with Frank H. Wu, now the President of Queens College, City University of New York, and other members of AABANY, has been presented approximately thirty times, all over the country and even in Europe with a cast including European lawyers. See Building Our Legacy: The Murder of Vincent Chin, AABANY, https://reenactments.aabany.org/building-our-legacy-the-murder-of-vincent-chin/ [https://perma.cc/LFM4-38RM] (last visited Mar. 4, 2022). The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has a webpage devoted to reenactments on its civic education website, drawing from programs created by AABANY, the Federal Bar Council American Inn of Court, and the Second Circuit Staff Attorney’s Office. See Reenactments—Historic Courtroom Theater, JUST. FOR ALL: CTS. AND THE CMTY., https://justiceforall.ca2.uscourts.gov/reenactments_home.html [https://perma.cc/Q5DX-59RX] (last visited Mar. 4, 2022). For another example of a law review article adapted from one of our reenactments, originally presented at a Just the Beginning Foundation conference, see Denny Chin & Kathy Hirata Chin, Constance Baker Motley, James Meredith, and the University of Mississippi, 117 COLUM. L. REV. 1741 (2017).

15. See MAE NGAI, THE CHINESE QUESTION: THE GOLD RUSHES AND GLOBAL POLITICS 3–5, 22–23 (2021); BETH LEW-WILLIAMS, THE CHINESE MUST GO: VIOLENCE, EXCLUSION, AND THE MAKING OF THE ALIEN IN AMERICA 35 (2018) (noting that many Irish, German, and Italian migrants were finding work in different industries in the U.S. West, “but assumptions about racial difference made the Chinese foreign competitors instead of future compatriots”). While the gold seekers were not the first Chinese to migrate to the United States, the Gold Rush brought large numbers of Chinese to America for the first time. See NGAI, supra, at 35–36 (increasing from 325 arrivals from China in 1849 to 20,000 in 1852).
As we approached that part of the road which lay along the banks of the Yuba, mining camps became more numerous, some very attractive and pretty villages enlivening the scene. Here the innovations of the Chinamen were observed. Already in the early history of California they were beginning to crowd white men to the wall. At first they worked mines that white men had deserted, but gradually in their own unobtrusive way, possessed themselves of some of the most valuable surface or placer mines. But they worked their mines on a far different principle from that of others. Others paid their laborers high wages, boarding them on the best the country afforded. The Chinaman brought bands of ignorant Coolies from China, who were in reality mere slaves, subject to his commands and entirely obedient to his authority; he fed them on the cheapest diet, rice and other cheap articles of food, shipped from his own country; the clothing, too, was brought ready-made from China; they slept in tents or cabins deserted by other miners, on bunks made of boards and sacks for bedding, and a sort of stool or box for a pillow. In this way the Chinaman spent none of his golden gains in the country, but steadily and persistently robbed the country of its golden treasure. He sucked the life-blood from her veins, laid open her rich arteries of treasure, and in unremitting toil gathered it up and shipped it to his own land.16

The “specter of Chinese coolies” was quickly weaponized by politicians, including the first governor of California, John Bigler, elected in 1851. Bigler won that election by fewer than 500 votes, and he faced a tough battle for reelection. To rally support, he seized on racist tropes.17 In April 1852, he urged the state legislature to control Chinese immigration:

The subject which I deem it my duty to present for your consideration... is the present wholesale importation to this country, of immigrants from the Asiatic quarter of the globe. I am deeply impressed with the conviction that, in order to enhance the prosperity and to preserve the tranquility of the State, measures must be adopted to check this tide of Asiatic immigration, and prevent the exportation by them of the precious metals which they dig up from our soil without charge, and without assuming any of the obligations imposed upon citizens. I allude, particularly, to a class of Asiatics known as “Coolies,” who are sent here, as I am assured, and as is generally believed, under contract to work in our


17. Ngal, supra note 15, at 86 (“By tarring all Chinese miners as ‘coolies,’ Bigler found a racial trope that compared Chinese to black slaves, the antithesis of free labor, and thereby cast them as a threat to white miners’ independence. In fact, the specter of Chinese coolies was of a piece with racist policy toward African Americans.”); Lew-Williams, supra note 15, at 19 (“From the 1850s to the 1870s, anti-Chinese violence and anti-Chinese politics overlapped, fed off each other, and must have seemed indistinguishable to Chinese migrants.”).
for a term; and who, at the expiration of the term, return to their native country.

. . . .

. . . [V]ast numbers of [the Chinese] are immigrating hither, not, however, to avail themselves of the blessings of a free Government. They do not seek our la[n]d as “the asylum for the oppressed of all nations.” They have no desire (even if permitted by the constitution and laws) to absolve themselves from allegiance to other powers, and, under the laws of the United States, become American citizens. They come to acquire a certain amount of the precious metals, and then return to their native country.  

Bigler was reelected, and his “gambit to weaponize the Chinese Question” . . . set down the enduring myth that Chinese labor . . . was unfree. That kind of ‘big lie’ would persist throughout the rest of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth.”

18. John Bigler, Address to the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, in JOURNAL OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 373, 373–74 (1852). In fact, the Chinese were not eligible to be naturalized as U.S. citizens, as the Naturalization Act of 1790 limited naturalization to “any alien, being a free white person.” Act of Mar. 26, 1790, ch. 3, § 1, 1 Stat. 103, 103–04 (repealed 1795). The statute was modified over the years, most notably following the Civil War by the extension of the right of naturalization to “aliens of African nativity and to persons of African descent.” Act of July 14, 1870, ch. 254, § 7, 16 Stat. 254, 256; see Ozawa v. United States, 260 U.S. 178, 189, 198 (1923) (holding that “person of the Japanese race born in Japan” was not eligible for naturalization because he “is clearly of a race which is not Caucasian”); United States v. Thind, 261 U.S. 204, 210, 214–15 (1923) (holding that person from India, who was according to some scientific authorities “Caucasian,” was ineligible for naturalization because the words “free white person” are “to be interpreted in accordance with the understanding of the common man,” and do not include “the body of people to whom [Thind] belongs”). The federal naturalization laws retained some form of race qualification until 1952. See Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, Pub. L. No. 82-414, § 311, 66 Stat. 163, 239 (“The right of a person to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race or sex or because such person is married.”).


20. NGAI, supra note 15, at 137; see id. at 87 (“Bigler’s success in tarring the Chinese as a ‘coolie race’ gave California politicians a convenient trope that could be trotted out whenever conditions called for a racial scapegoat.”). Labor organizations also seized on the anti-Chinese sentiment as “a recruiting opportunity” and “a ploy to strengthen local assemblies.” LEW-WILLIAMS, supra note 15, at 118.
In fact, the Chinese were not indentured laborers, and they contributed significantly to their new country. They paid the foreign miners’ taxes, helped build local economies in remote areas as well as in urban areas such as San Francisco, and contributed to the development of trade between China and America, trade that benefited both countries. Among the Chinese arrivals were educated individuals who spoke English. They pushed back

---


22. In 1850, California passed the first foreign miners’ tax, which applied not just to the Chinese, but to all foreign miners. See Act of Apr. 13, 1850, ch. 97, §§ 1, 5, 1850 Cal. Stat. 221, 221–22. It proved difficult to enforce, however, and was repealed within a year. See McCLELLAN, supra note 9, at 10 & n.9. Additional taxes were imposed that were “aimed primarily at the Chinese.” Id. at 12. In 1862, the California legislature passed a law explicitly targeting the Chinese, entitled “An Act to protect Free White Labor against competition with Chinese Coolie Labor, and to discourage the Immigration of the Chinese into the State of California.” Act of Apr. 26, 1862, ch. 339, 1862 Cal. Stat. 462, invalidated by Lin Sing v. Washburn, 20 Cal. 534 (1862). The California Supreme Court struck down the law, holding that it violated the U.S. Constitution because the power to regulate foreign commerce belonged to the federal government. See Lin Sing, 20 Cal. at 579–80.

23. NGAI, supra note 15, at 24–26, 37–41, 48–50, 96–97, 103 (“In fact Chinese poured millions into the California economy: in 1861, for example, in addition to paying the foreign miners tax, they contributed $14 million, which included customs duties on imports; the purchase of American products; payment of steamboat and stage passenger fares and freight charges; and water charges and buying claims.”).

24. Indeed, the success of the Chinese contributed to the resentment. See LEW-WILLIAMS, supra note 15, at 35 (“Soon it was Chinese economic success, and not just their slavish reputation, that fed fears of the ‘yellow peril.’”).
against Governor Bigler and the stereotype of the Chinese coolie. Tong Achick, a leader of a family association, and Hab Wa, a merchant, wrote a letter to the Governor:

“The Chinamen have learned with sorrow that you have published a message against them. Although we are Asiatics, some of us have been educated in American schools and have learned your language, which has enabled us to read your message in the newspapers for ourselves and to explain it to the rest of our countrymen. . . . We have determined to write you as decent and respectful a letter as we could, pointing out to your Excellency some of the errors you have fallen into about us.” . . . [The] Chinese in California include[ ] laborers as well as tradesmen, mechanics, gentry, and teachers; “none are ‘Coolies’ if by that word you mean bound men or contract slaves.” . . . “The poor Chinaman does not come here as a slave. He comes because of his desire for independence.”

Achick and his colleagues made little headway. Because of a number of factors—economic competition; the politicization of racism to rally support; the pressures of national crisis, including war; differences in language, culture, and appearance; notions that Asians are forever foreigners; the use of AAPIs as scapegoats and as a wedge between minority groups; and pure racism—the violence and hostility continued and proliferated.

II. HISTORIC HOSTILITY AND VIOLENCE

We turn first to acts of hostility and violence against Asian Americans in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. There were scores of incidents. While there is much overlap, it is useful to sort the incidents into three broad categories: mob violence, expulsions, and governmental discrimination.

A. Mob Violence

There were many incidents of mob violence in the latter part of the nineteenth century and continuing into the twentieth century. These attacks reveal that anti–Asian American sentiment permeated many areas of civic life—from the populace to the legislatures to the court system. We highlight four of these incidents: Los Angeles, California, in 1871; Rock Springs, Wyoming, in 1885; Hells Canyon, Oregon, in 1887; and Watsonville, California, in 1930.

25. NGAI, supra note 15, at 89–90.
26. See infra Part IV.
Illustration 2: Chinese Emigrants Pelted During the Los Angeles Massacre of 1871

1. Los Angeles Massacre of 1871

On October 24, 1871, a gunfight broke out between two Chinese gangs in Los Angeles. A white man—a popular rancher—was killed in the cross fire. A police officer was also shot. As word of the shootings spread, a mob of several hundred men went on a rampage, seeking revenge. They rounded up every Chinese male they could find and hanged at least fifteen of them, including a fifteen-year-old who had arrived from China just a week earlier. This was the largest mass lynching in American history. Several others were fatally shot, bringing the total number of Chinese killed to at least eighteen—10 percent of the Chinese population at the time.


30. The count of the number killed has varied. See, e.g., Lucas, supra note 29 (“Of the 18 deaths, 15 are Chinese residents hanged by a mob . . . .”); Kevin Waite, The Bloody History of Anti-Asian Violence in the West, NAT’L GEOGRAPHIC (May 10, 2021),
the dead Chinese had played any role in the encounter that led to the outbreak of violence; the others were innocent bystanders.\(^{31}\)

The next day, a leading newspaper of the time, the *Daily Alta California*, described the scene:

> The most terrible night Los Angeles has ever known has just been passed. Twelve hours ago, fifteen stark, staring corpses hung ghastly in the moonlight, while six, seven or eight others, mutilated, torn and crushed, lay in our streets, all of them Chinamen. The sad results came, first, of their own bitter feuds between themselves; next of the infuriated passions of a few of their number, and lastly, of the demoniacal excitement of the lower classes of our community. Horrible beyond description has been the history of these last few hours. Chinamen, helpless, torn and mangled, more dead than alive, have been dragged by an infuriated, senseless and reckless crowd, through our peaceable streets, in the very face of the better portion of the community, to finish what little was left of their agonized existence at the end of a rope, midst the exultant shouts and jeers of the mob.\(^{32}\)

One of the victims was Dr. Gene Tong, a respected physician who treated both white and Asian patients.\(^{33}\) A writer who studied the historical record described what happened:

> As Tong was dragged along the street, he tried to strike a bargain with his captors. He could pay a ransom, he said. He had $3,000 in gold in his shop. He had a diamond wedding ring. They could have it all.

Instead of negotiating, one of his captors shot him in the mouth to silence him. Then they hanged him, first cutting off his finger to steal the ring.\(^{34}\)

---

\(^{31}\) See Paul R. Spitzerri, *“Shall Law Stand for Naught?”: The Los Angeles Chinese Massacre of 1871 at Trial*, 3 CAL LEGAL HIST. 185, 185 (2008).

\(^{32}\) Many Others Wounded and Killed—In All Twenty-One Dead, supra note 30. See generally Zesch, supra note 28, at 136–44.

\(^{33}\) See John Johnson, Jr., *How Los Angeles Covered Up the Massacre of 17 Chinese*, LA Wkly. (Mar. 10, 2011), http://www.laweekly.com/news/how-los-angeles-covered-up-the-massacre-of-17-chinese-2169478 [https://perma.cc/QF5R-EZTZ] (“Of all the Chinese in Los Angeles, Dr. Gene Tong was probably the most eminent and beloved among both his countrymen and Americans. He could have made much more money hanging his shingle in the American part of town. But Tong stayed in the Alley, dispensing both traditional and modern cures from a small shop in the decrepit Coronel Building.”).

\(^{34}\) Id.
Twenty-five men were indicted for the murder of the Chinese, but only ten men went to trial. The prosecutors faced significant hurdles. Given the frenzied nature of the rioting, it was difficult to determine who did what to whom. Moreover, as interpreted by the California Supreme Court in People v. Hall, a California statute barred Chinese witnesses from testifying against any white person. In 1854, the court held that Chinese testimony was inadmissible against a “free white citizen” charged with murdering a Chinese victim.

In the face of these difficulties, the prosecutors focused on the murder of the well-regarded Dr. Tong. The first defendant to go to trial was Curly Crenshaw, a twenty-two-year-old man of Irish descent, a drifter known to have a “reputation of the worst sort.” The Daily Alta California summarized the testimony of Ben McLaughlin, a bystander who provided the prosecution’s “strongest testimony”:

It is in substance as follows: Know defendant; recognize him as Curly, or A.L. Crenshaw: saw him on the night of the riot at Rapp’s saloon; saw him go out with the pistol in his hand and get on the roof of the Coronel building; saw him go backward and forward on the roof; could not say whether he shot, there were so many shooting at the time; he was one of a crowd afterward shooting into a corral [sic] behind the building; it was after the cutting of holes in the roof and after taking the hose down from the roof; after most of the shooting was over I was standing in front of Rapp’s; Mike Madgin came around; he said that there was a crowd on Upper Negro alley threatening to break into a house; “Curley” or Crenshaw

---

35. See Zesch, supra note 28, at 180, 188, 196.
36. Id. at 185–87.
37. 4 Cal. 399 (1854).
38. Id. at 399, 405. In fact, the statute made no reference to the Chinese, but provided that “[n]o Black, or Mulatto person, or Indian” was permitted to testify “against a White man.” Id. at 399 (quoting Act of Apr. 16, 1850, ch. 125, § 14). The court interpreted the words to bar testimony from Chinese witnesses as well. See id. at 403–04. Some years later, the statute was amended to include an explicit reference to the Chinese, and the California Supreme Court affirmed the dismissal of a robbery indictment against a defendant who was part white and part Black—a “mulatto” in the words of the majority and a “negro” in the words of the dissent—where the only witnesses were Chinese, on the ground that a statute that would permit “a class of persons deemed unworthy to testify against a white person” but would “yet allow them to testify against a black person in a similar case” would violate the right of the latter to equal protection. People v. Washington, 36 Cal. 658, 659, 666–67, 672–73 (1869). These rulings left Chinese victims of crimes by white and Black assailants with no recourse, where the only witnesses were Chinese. The ban on Chinese testimony remained in place until 1872, when the California legislature revised the state’s penal and civil codes. See McClain, supra note 9, at 42 & n.224 (first citing Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1879, 1880; and then citing Cal. Penal Code § 1321).
39. See Zesch, supra note 28, at 188 (“District Attorney Cameron Thom wisely chose to prosecute only Dr. Tong’s murder at this stage. He stood to win juror sympathy by focusing on the most renowned victim, a popular Chinese physician who treated non-Asian patients and helped them find Chinese workers.”).
was there; he said that he killed three; he talked considerably about shooting Chinamen for some time.\textsuperscript{41}

McLaughlin, however, could testify to nothing specific about Dr. Tong’s death.\textsuperscript{42} Crenshaw took the stand in his own defense. He admitted having drinks and supper at Rapp’s Saloon, but he said that he then headed home to bed. He denied telling Ben McLaughlin that he had killed three Chinese.\textsuperscript{43} After Crenshaw’s testimony, the parties rested and the lawyers gave their summations.\textsuperscript{44} Despite the violence directed against the Chinese, no Chinese witnesses had testified, because of the bar on Chinese testimony against white persons.\textsuperscript{45} After deliberating for just twenty minutes, at 9:45 p.m. on February 17, 1872, the jury returned its verdict, finding Crenshaw guilty of manslaughter.\textsuperscript{46}

In a second trial beginning on March 18, 1872, nine other rioters were tried together as accessories to the murder of Dr. Tong.\textsuperscript{47} Over the course of seven days, an unusually long period of time for trials of that era, District Attorney Cameron Thom called more than thirty witnesses.\textsuperscript{48} On March 27, 1872, the jury found two defendants not guilty, but convicted the remaining seven defendants of manslaughter.\textsuperscript{49}

Crenshaw and the seven defendants convicted in the second trial were sentenced just three days later, on March 30, 1872.\textsuperscript{50} Crenshaw was sentenced to three years’ imprisonment.\textsuperscript{51} The others received sentences ranging from two to six years.\textsuperscript{52} On appeal, however, the California Supreme Court reversed the convictions, concluding in a terse decision issued May 21, 1873, as follows:

The indictment in this case is fatally defective in that it fails to allege that Chee Long Tong [Dr. Tong] was murdered. The charge attempted against the defendants is that they were accessories before the fact to the crime of murder. It is alleged that the defendants did stand by, aid, abet, assist, advise, counsel, and encourage one John Doe and one Richard Roe to feloniously, unlawfully, willfully, deliberately, premeditatedly, and of their malice aforethought, one Chee Long Tong to kill and murder. Admitting that the defendants did all these things, still it does not follow by necessary legal conclusion that after all any person was actually murdered. It is the settled rule of criminal pleading that in an indictment against a person intended to be charged as an accessory before the fact in the crime

\textsuperscript{41} Trial of One of the Los Angeles Rioters—Verdict of the Jury, \textit{supra} note 40; see ZESCH, \textit{supra} note 28, at 193.
\textsuperscript{42} See ZESCH, \textit{supra} note 28, at 193.
\textsuperscript{43} See id. at 193–94.
\textsuperscript{44} See id. at 194.
\textsuperscript{45} See People v. Hall, 4 Cal. 399, 405 (1854).
\textsuperscript{46} See Trial of One of the Los Angeles Rioters—Verdict of the Jury, \textit{supra} note 40; ZESCH, \textit{supra} note 28, at 195.
\textsuperscript{47} See ZESCH, \textit{supra} note 28, at 196, 198.
\textsuperscript{48} See id. at 198.
\textsuperscript{49} See id. at 200.
\textsuperscript{50} See id. at 201.
\textsuperscript{51} See id.
\textsuperscript{52} See id. at 201–02.
of murder, every allegation is necessary which would be necessary had the
indictment been against the principal felons themselves.

Unless, therefore, it can be maintained that an indictment against a
principal for the crime of murder would be sufficient, even though it did
not appear that the death of the party assaulted had ensued, it is difficult to
see how the indictment here is to be sustained. The authorities are uniform
that in either case it is indispensable that it appear by the indictment that
death has resulted from the assault and wounding charged.

Judgment reversed and remittitur to issue forthwith.53

As a result of the reversal, and as the prosecution did not seek new
indictments or new trials, no one was held accountable for the murder of
eighteen (or more) Chinese Americans in the Los Angeles massacre of
1871.54

2. Rock Springs Massacre of 1885

On September 2, 1885, in Rock Springs in the Wyoming territory, some
150 white coal miners and others who worked for a coal company owned by
the Union Pacific Railroad attacked their Chinese coworkers, killing
twenty-eight, wounding fifteen others, and driving several hundred more out
of town.55 The white miners had periodically engaged in strikes to protest
wage cuts and work conditions.56 The railroad started bringing in Chinese
men to work the mines, and by 1885, there were nearly 600 Chinese working
at Rock Springs.57 The Chinese miners were willing to work for lower
wages, which meant lower wages for the white workers as well.58 The white
workers had asked the Chinese coworkers to support their efforts to obtain
higher wages, but the Chinese miners were not willing to strike.59 The
Chinese miners became easy scapegoats for the resentful white workers.60

53. People v. Crenshaw, 46 Cal. 65, 65–66 (1873); see Zesch, supra note 28, at 207–09.
54. See Spitzerri, supra note 31, at 222–24 (“What we do know, however, is that ‘law did
stand for naught,’ in the matter of seeking justice for the eighteen dead Chinese, most certainly
completely innocent of any complicity in the shootout that preceded the Massacre.”).
55. See generally Chinese Miners Are Massacred in Wyoming Territory, Hist. (Apr. 13, 2021),
56. See Rea, supra note 55.
57. See id.
58. See id.
60. Chinese Miners Are Massacred in Wyoming Territory, supra note 55 (“Searching for
a scapegoat, the angry miners blamed the Chinese.”).
On the morning of September 2, a fight broke out between white and Chinese miners in the No. 6 mine. A Chinese miner was killed with a pick to his skull, and a second Chinese was badly beaten. At the No. 3 mine, white miners shot and killed several Chinese coworkers. A mob of armed white miners and other railroad workers, joined by women and children, attacked Chinatown, looting many homes and shacks. The mob set seventy-nine homes on fire. Some Chinese were driven out of hiding by the flames and killed in the streets; others burned to death in their cellars. Hundreds more were chased out of town and into the surrounding hills.

Illustration 3: Massacre of Chinese at Rock Springs, Wyoming in 1885

The New York Times described the scene two days afterward as follows:

A glance over the battleground of Wednesday reveals the fact that many of the bullets fired at the fleeing Chinamen found their mark. Lying in the smoldering embers where Chinatown stood were found 10 charred and shapeless trunks, sending up a noisome stench, while another, which had evidently been dragged from the ashes by boys, was found in the sage brush nearby. The search resulted in the finding of the bodies of five more

61. See Rea, supra note 55.
62. See id.
63. See id.
64. See id.
65. See Chinese Miners Are Massacred in Wyoming Territory, supra note 55; Rea, supra note 55.
66. See Chinese Miners Are Massacred in Wyoming Territory, supra note 55; Rea, supra note 55; The Rock Springs Massacre, supra note 55.
Chinamen, killed by rifle shots while fleeing from their pursuers. All were placed in pine coffins and buried yesterday afternoon. Some six or eight others were found seriously wounded, and were cared for by the railroad officers. The Coroner’s jury has rendered a verdict to the effect that the men came to their death at the hands of parties unknown. Reports from along the line of the railroad are to the effect that Chinamen have been arriving at small stations east and west of here, and they say that a large number of the fugitives were wounded by Wednesday’s attack, and that many have perished in the hills. It is feared that it will be found that no less than 50 lost their lives when all the returns are in. This trouble has been brewing for months. The contractors who run the mines have been importing Chinamen in large numbers and discharging white men, until over 600 Celestials were in their employ. It is said that the mine bosses have favored the Chinamen to the detriment of white miners, and it needed only a spark to kindle the flames. This was furnished by a quarrel between a party of Celestials and whites in Mine No. 6 . . . .

Federal troops were summoned, and the troops eventually escorted many of the Chinese who had fled back to Rock Springs.69 Not all stayed, but some had little choice but to return to work.70 Some 559 of the Chinese signed a “memorial” that they sent to the Chinese Consul in New York describing their perspective on the massacre and imploring the authorities “to endeavor to secure the punishment of the murderers.”71

The railroad fired forty-five white miners for their role in the rioting.72 Sixteen of the rioters were arrested. The grand jury, however, refused to indict them.73 The foreman of the grand jury explained:

We have diligently inquired into the occurrence at Rock Springs . . . and though we have examined a large number of witnesses, no one has been able to testify to a single criminal act committed by any known white person that day . . . . We have also inquired into the causes . . . . While we find no excuse for the crimes committed, there appears to be no doubt of abuses existing that should have been promptly adjusted by the railroad company and its officers. If this had been done, the fair name of our Territory would not have been stained by the terrible events of the 2d of September.74

The sixteen men were released on October 7, 1885, after just a few weeks in prison, and they were “met . . . by several hundred men, women, and

69. See Chinese Miners Are Massacred in Wyoming Territory, supra note 55; Rea, supra note 55; The Rock Springs Massacre, supra note 53.
70. See Rea, supra note 55.
71. “To This We Dissented,” supra note 59.
72. See Chinese Miners Are Massacred in Wyoming Territory, supra note 55.
73. See Rea, supra note 55.
children, and treated to a regular ovation.”

No one was ever charged for the murder of the twenty-eight Chinese miners and the wounding of many others.

3. Hells Canyon Massacre of 1887

On May 27 and 28, 1887, in Hells Canyon, Oregon, the hostility toward Chinese gold miners resulted in the deadliest attack against Chinese immigrants in U.S. history. A group of Chinese gold miners had set up camp on the banks of Deep Creek on the Oregon side of the Snake River, with the hope of finding “flour gold—tiny flakes and nuggets washed by river current into the gravel bars and riverbanks.” A gang of seven horse thieves—including a fifteen-year-old—concocted a plan to murder miners and steal their gold. The first day, several gang members took a position on a hillside above the miners’ camp and saw ten to thirteen Chinese working the river below. With high-powered rifles, they shot them, one by one. They killed all but one instantly, and when he tried to escape, they finished him off with rocks.

The next day, the gang killed eight more Chinese miners who had arrived in the camp by boat, and then the horse thieves proceeded to a second camp nearby, where they killed thirteen more Chinese miners. In total, at least thirty-one and as many as thirty-four Chinese miners were murdered, their gold stolen and their camps burned, and their bodies thrown into the Snake River.

The murders were discovered after some of the bodies washed ashore at Lewiston in the Idaho territory, sixty-five miles from the massacre site.

---
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In March 1888, one of the horse thieves confessed and agreed to cooperate with the authorities. The other six were indicted for murder, but three fled and were never caught. In a two-day trial that concluded on September 1, 1888, the other three were found not guilty.

George Craig was a rancher who attended the trial. He and his son had discovered some of the bodies in Hells Canyon. Some years later he told an interviewer:

"I guess if they had killed thirty-one white men something would have been done about it, but none of the jury knew the Chinamen or cared much about it, so they turned the men loose."

In 2005, the site was renamed Chinese Massacre Cove, and in 2012, a memorial was installed. The memorial is inscribed with the following, in three languages, English, Chinese, and Nez Perce:

Chinese Massacre Cove
Site of the 1887 massacre of as many as 34 Chinese gold miners.
No one was held accountable.

4. Watsonville Riots of 1930

For five days, beginning on January 19, 1930, hundreds of white men armed with pistols and clubs rioted in Watsonville, California, attacking Filipino men. The rioting was motivated in part by fears that Filipino
laborers were driving down wages, transmitting disease, and mixing with white women.91 A few days earlier, on January 10, 1930, D.W. Rohrbach, a justice of the peace and a leader of the Northern Monterey County Chamber of Commerce, had issued a resolution condemning the Filipinos:

For a wage that a white man cannot exist on, the Filipinos will take the job and, through the clannish, low standard mode of housing and feeding, practiced among them, will soon be well clothed, and strutting about like a peacock and endeavoring to attract the eyes of the young American and Mexican girls. Fifteen Filipinos will live in a room or two, sleeping on the floor and contenting themselves with squatting on the floors and eating fish and rice. The same group will form a club and buy a partnership in a classy automobile and attired like Solomon in all his glory, will roll along the highways. Marriages among white and Filipinos soon will be common, and if the present state of affairs continues there will be 40,000 half-breeds in the State of California before 10 years have passed. We do not advocate violence but we do feel that the United States should give the Filipinos their liberty and then send those unwelcome inhabitants from our shores that the whites who have inherited this country for themselves and their offspring, might live.92

The next day, January 11, 1930, a Filipino club leased a dance hall in nearby Palm Beach and brought in nine white women to dance with its Filipino members.93 The rioting began on January 19, when a mob of young white men attempted to “rescue” the women at the dance hall.94 One local was quoted as saying:

Taxi dance halls where white girls dance with Orientals may be all right in San Francisco or Los Angeles but not in our community. We are a small
city and have had nothing of the kind before. We won’t stand for anything of the kind.95

The rioting lasted five days, as groups of white men formed “Filipino hunting parties”96 and “700 trouble-seekers, armed with clubs and some firearms, attacked Filipino dwellings, destroyed property, and jeopardized lives.”97 Filipinos were pulled from their homes and beaten in the streets.98 Some were thrown off the Pajaro Bridge.99 On January 23, armed rioters injured fifty Filipino laborers at nearby farms. They shot up a bunkhouse at a ranch, killing twenty-two-year-old Fermin Tobera as he lay in his bunk.100

Eight men, ranging from eighteen to twenty-eight years in age, were charged with rioting for the raids on the farms, but no one was charged with Tobera’s murder and the authorities did not pursue the matter with much vigor.101 The preliminary hearing for the men was presided over by the same Judge Rohrbach who had issued the anti-Filipino resolution a couple of weeks earlier. While he ruled that there was cause to hold the matter over for the Superior Court, he remarked that if they were found guilty, “the court should be very lenient” in sentencing them.102 The eight men pleaded guilty in Monterey Superior Court before a different judge on February 25, 1930; they were sentenced to thirty days in jail and two years’ probation and told to “refrain from agitation against the darker races.”103

B. Expulsions

We turn to the next category of anti-Asian hostility and violence: expulsions, that is, efforts literally to drive Asians out of town. These occurred repeatedly—in 1885 and 1886, at least 168 communities in the West drove out their Chinese residents.104 We highlight three episodes: Eureka,
California, in 1885; Seattle, Washington, in 1886; and Bellingham, Washington, in 1907.

1. Eureka, California—1885

On February 6, 1885, in Eureka, California, a white man was crossing the street when he was caught in a cross fire between two Chinese men and was shot and killed. Within minutes, an angry mob formed, shouting “burn Chinatown, burn Chinatown.” Some six hundred men gathered at the town hall to consider the appropriate course of action; they determined that the Chinese had to be driven out of town. The mob appointed a committee—including “pillars of the community”—to go into Chinatown to order all the Chinese residents to leave Eureka. Makeshift gallows were constructed with signs posted threatening to hang any Chinese who remained. Within forty-eight hours, the entire Chinese population of Eureka—estimates range from three hundred to as many as eight hundred Chinese men and women—was expelled from the City of Eureka. The Chinese were put on two steamships in Humboldt Bay and taken to San Francisco.

Some fifty-six Chinatown businesses and residents who had been forced to leave Eureka sued the city for damages. The plaintiffs brought what
was essentially a forerunner of a class action, seeking to hold a municipality liable for the actions of a mob. According to the complaint, one claimant, Chung Sing & Co., transacted business and owned and operated a store in Eureka when “a mob of disorderly and riotous persons assembled together in said City of Eureka and created a riot,” and broke into its premises and “carried away therefrom and totally destroyed their goods, merchandise, furniture, fixtures, clothing, personal effects, money and provisions, and drove the members of said firm, and their clerks and agents, and servants, from their said store and from said city.”

The complaint alleged that the City of Eureka was responsible because it “had due notice of the assembling of the mob and of the riot aforesaid,” but “failed and neglected to quell said riot or to disperse said mob, or to protect the property of said firm.”

In March 1886, the court dismissed the claims seeking to hold the City of Eureka responsible for the damage caused by the mob action, apparently on the theory that because Chinese immigrants could not legally own land, they did not have standing to assert claims for damages for the loss of property. Although some limited claims survived, little progress was made in the case over the next three years, and the case was dismissed on March 2, 1889, for failure to prosecute. The court ruled that the “plaintiff take nothing by this action,” and assessed the Chinese fifteen dollars in court costs. Although the Chinese did not prevail, the case was still significant as a group of Chinese merchants and laborers banded together to take on the City of Eureka, asserting novel theories of liability and sending a message that the Chinese—who were being expelled in countless communities in the West—were willing to fight back.

---

Hing v. City of Eureka, No. 3948 (9th Cir. Jan. 20, 1886). The complaint sought a total of $132,820 in damages. Id. at 60–61.
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120. See id. at 198–202, 209. As Professor Pfaelzer has observed:

The Chinese immigrants turned to American courts to fight roundups, assert their rights to nationhood and community, and demand reparations for being driven out of town. They brought criminal actions against elected officials—mayors, police chiefs, members of boards of supervisors. They forged unprecedented lawsuits for police harassment and intimidation. They created early forms of class actions. They demanded public education for their children. They fought the queue, the shoulder-pole, the laundry, and the cubic-air ordinances. Throughout the 1880s and 1890s, the Chinese in the West used the American judicial system as a site of contact and conflict with white Americans, seeking to establish their rights by putting them within established legal systems of contractual, property, tort, and civil rights. These cases challenge enduring stereotypes of the docile Chinese immigrant.

Id. at 246.
2. Seattle, Washington Territory—1886

On February 7, 1886, “Seattle’s Chinese community awoke to a white mob marching through Chinatown . . . . Armed vigilantes knocked on each door, telling the Chinese that they had to vacate Seattle by 1 P.M. No one was exempted.” A movement to remove the Chinese, led by organized labor and others, had been building in Seattle for months, as the Chinese had accepted jobs on terms that white workers were unwilling to accept. Such anti-Chinese sentiment was emboldened by the growing hostility against the Chinese nationally, as exemplified by the passage of the Chinese Exclusion

---


Act in 1882, the Rock Springs massacre of 1885, and the recent expulsions of Chinese from Eureka and Tacoma, Washington. The King County sheriff, John McGraw, described the scene:

On Sunday morning, February 7th, about 9 o’clock, a messenger came to me and informed me that the Chinese were being forced from their homes and driven to the steamship Queen of the Pacific, to be transported to San Francisco. I immediately went to the Chinese quarter of town, and there I saw groups of men in and about different Chinese houses assisting in packing up the goods and effects of the Chinese and loading them on to express wagons, and met squads of Chinamen going towards the wharf, each squad being under the escort of three or four white men, followed by a rabble. The mob, which I found in possession of the streets at this time, numbered 1,500, composed of the discontented element in Seattle, reinforced by delegations from Tacoma, Portland and other places.

Sheriff McGraw tried to intervene, but more than three hundred Chinese were rounded up and led to the port. The plan was to put them on the steamer, the Queen of the Pacific, to ship them to San Francisco. The captain of the Queen refused to allow them onboard until their fares were paid. But the rioters took up a collection and raised enough money to pay for almost one hundred fares. By the next day, enough funds were collected to pay for another one hundred or so fares. In the meantime, a court granted temporary relief, but most of the Chinese had decided they could not stay. Filled to capacity, the Queen departed. A week later, a second steamship took away another 110 Chinese. Federal troops were called in, but by the
time order was restored, only a few dozen Chinese merchants and domestic servants remained in Seattle.131

Illustration 5: Seattle Riots of 1886132

3. Bellingham, Washington—1907

On September 4, 1907, in Bellingham, Washington, a mob of five hundred white men launched a full-scale attack against South Asian migrant workers, many of whom worked at local lumber mills.133 The mob “raided the mills

131. See id.; Chin, supra note 123.
where the foreigners were working, battered down doors of lodging houses, and, dragging the Asiatics from their beds, escorted them to the city limits with orders to keep going.” The cry “Drive out the Hindus” was heard throughout the city. The mob included members of the Japanese-Korean Exclusion League, a predecessor to the Asiatic Exclusion League. Within days, “the entire South Asian population departed town.” Five men were arrested for rioting, but they were later released and no one was prosecuted.

The local newspapers weighed in on the riots. While they did not approve of the violence, they were pleased with the end result. There were editorials in the Bellingham Herald, the Reveille, and the Seattle Morning Times:

**BELLINGHAM HERALD:** The Hindu is not a good citizen... It would require centuries to assimilate him, and this country need not take the trouble. Our racial burdens are already heavy enough to bear.

**REVEILLE:** While any good citizen must be opposed to the means employed, the result of the crusade against the Hindus cannot but cause a general and intense satisfaction, and the departure of the Hindus will leave no regrets.

**MORNING TIMES:** [T]he matter [is] “not a question of race, but of wages; not a question of men, but modes of life; not a matter of nations, but of habits of life. . . When men who require meat to eat and real beds to sleep in are ousted from their employment to make room for vegetarians who can find the bliss of sleep in some filthy corner, it is rather difficult to say at what limit indignation ceases to be righteous.”

**C. Governmental Discrimination**

We turn to our third category: governmental discrimination. There are innumerable examples of state and federal laws targeting AAPIs, including discriminatory taxes; laws restricting immigration, including the Chinese

---
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Exclusion Acts;\textsuperscript{144} city ordinances purporting to regulate laundries;\textsuperscript{145} and anti-miscegenation laws.\textsuperscript{146} We highlight the Pigtail Ordinance case and a pair of pandemic cases.

1. The Pigtail Ordinance Case

In 1876, the California State Legislature passed the “Cubic Air Law,” which required at least 500 cubic feet of space for each adult living in a residence.\textsuperscript{147} The law targeted the Chinese, many of whom lived in cramped quarters in San Francisco’s Chinatown.\textsuperscript{148} The law was enforced by police officers who raided lodging houses in the Chinese quarter “invariably . . . in the dead of night.”\textsuperscript{149} In one raid, “a posse of officers made a descent . . . on a Chinese lodging house” and “[f]ifty six lodgers were captured.”\textsuperscript{150}

Violators were guilty of a misdemeanor and were subject to a fine or imprisonment or both.\textsuperscript{151} An unintended consequence of the Cubic Air Law was that the jails became overcrowded, as many Chinese were arrested and would not or could not pay the fine.\textsuperscript{152} As the jails filled, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed another law—the Pigtail Ordinance.\textsuperscript{153} It
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required all male prisoners in city jails to have “the hair of their head cut or clipped to a uniform length of one inch from the scalp thereof.” Most of the Chinese men in San Francisco kept their hair in a queue, and its loss was a mark of disgrace and resulted in, many Chinese believed, misfortune and suffering after death. The ordinance was enforced only against the Chinese.

Illustration 6: Ho Ah Kow and the Pigtail Ordinance

California state legislature passed the Cubic Air Law in 1876, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors again passed a queue ordinance. This time the mayor approved it. Id. at 65 & n.102 (providing text of law and quoting from Joint Special Committee Report, app. D, at 1166).
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156. See Ho Ah Kow, 12 F. Cas. at 255; see also The Tale of a Chinaman, N.Y. TIMES, July 16, 1879, at 4 (“It is nowhere denied that the so-called ‘cubic air ordinance’ was enacted for the sole purpose of harrying and disconcerting the gregarious Chinese.”).

Ho Ah Kow, a Chinese laborer in San Francisco,\footnote{See Chionsini, supra note 152.} was convicted in April 1878 of violating the Cubic Air Law and sentenced to a ten-dollar fine or five days in prison.\footnote{See Ho Ah Kow, 12 F. Cas. at 253.} He failed to pay the fine and was imprisoned.\footnote{Id.} The sheriff in charge of the jail cut off his queue.\footnote{Id.}

Ho Ah Kow sued the sheriff for $10,000 in damages—and won.\footnote{Id. at 253, 257.} U.S. Supreme Court Justice Stephen Field, sitting in his capacity as circuit justice,\footnote{McCLAIN, supra note 9, at 74.} wrote as follows:

[The ordinance] is special legislation on the part of the supervisors against a class of persons who, under the constitution and laws of the United States, are entitled to the equal protection of the laws. The ordinance was intended only for the Chinese in San Francisco. . . . The reason advanced for its adoption, and now urged for its continuance, is, that only the dread of the loss of his queue will induce a Chinaman to pay his fine. That is to say, in order to enforce the payment of a fine imposed upon him, it is necessary that torture should be superadded to imprisonment. Then, it is said, the Chinaman will not accept the alternative, which the law allows, of working out his fine by his imprisonment, and the state or county will be saved the expense of keeping him during the imprisonment. Probably the bastinado, or the knout, or the thumbscrew, or the rack, would accomplish the same end; and no doubt the Chinaman would prefer either of these modes of torture to that which entails upon him disgrace among his countrymen and carries with it the constant dread of misfortune and suffering after death. It is not creditable to the humanity and civilization of our people, much less to their Christianity, that an ordinance of this character was possible.\footnote{Ho Ah Kow, 12 F. Cas. at 255. A “bastinado” is a form of torture that involves beating the soles of a person’s feet with a stick. See Bastinado, MERRIAM-WEBSTER, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/bastinado (last visited Mar. 4, 2022). A “knout” is a whip with a lash of leather thongs twisted with wire used to flog someone; as a verb, it means to punish by whipping with a knout. See Knout, MERRIAM-WEBSTER, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/knout [https://perma.cc/DMX2-SMVE] (last visited Mar. 4, 2022).}

“Ho Ah Kow’s significance for the future struggles of the Chinese can hardly be exaggerated.”\footnote{McCLAIN, supra note 9, at 76.} Long before civil rights suits for damages became popular, a Chinese laborer had the audacity to sue a government official—the sheriff—for money damages. Moreover, his efforts led to a ruling, some seven years before the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in \textit{Yick Wo v. Hopkins},\footnote{118 U.S. 356 (1886).} that the Equal Protection Clause applied not just to citizens but
also to noncitizens, including the Chinese. And, significantly, the Court held also that even a facially neutral ordinance, if unfairly applied, could violate the Constitution:

> [W]e cannot shut our eyes to matters of public notoriety and general cognizance. When we take our seats on the bench we are not struck with blindness, and forbidden to know as judges what we see as men; and where an ordinance, though general in its terms, only operates upon a special race, sect or class, it being universally understood that it is to be enforced only against that race, sect or class, we may justly conclude that it was the intention of the body adopting it that it should only have such operation, and treat it accordingly.

2. The Bubonic Plague Cases

At the turn of the twentieth century, there was worldwide fear of a pandemic—the bubonic plague. On March 6, 1900, San Francisco officials gathered at a Chinatown “coffin shop” to examine the body of a Chinese man. They suspected the plague.

Within hours, San Francisco’s Board of Health ordered a quarantine of Chinatown. Police officers spread out around twelve city blocks, stringing ropes across key intersections, and blocking pedestrians and wagons from entering or leaving. Before doing so, they made sure that all white persons who could be found were escorted out of the area. The quarantine was an
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extraordinary reaction to the discovery of a single suspected case of the plague; while the practice of quarantining had been applied to ships arriving in a port or individual homes, it was “highly unusual” to cordon off “a whole district of a great city.” At the time, some 25,000 to 35,000 Chinese residents in the area.176

The plague quickly became a political issue, as newspapers referred to “the plague fake” and teamed up with California politicians and business leaders to oppose the health officials, believing fears of the plague would impact “travel, tourism, free-flowing trade and their unfettered wealth.”177 Others complained that the quarantine of Chinatown had an impact on the greater community. The San Francisco Chronicle observed that “[t]he Chinese were not the only people who had to suffer,” as “[t]he white employers of the Chinese awoke to find that there was nobody on hand to prepare breakfast.”178 The quarantine was lifted within a few days,179 but only temporarily, as at the end of May 1900, the Board of Health and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a series of resolutions and ordinances reimposing a quarantine on Chinatown.180

In the meantime, on May 18, 1900, the Board of Health passed a resolution requiring all Chinese or Asiatic residents, if they wished to travel out of the city, to be inoculated with a serum known as the “Haffkine Prophylactic,” an anti-plague vaccine made from the living bacteria of the bubonic plague that some feared caused severe side effects.181 The resolution applied only to the “Chinese and Asiatics.”182 Other residents of the city could depart from and return to the city without being inoculated.183

The Chinese quickly took action. Wong Wai, a resident of San Francisco, challenged the inoculation resolution,184 and Jew Ho, who operated a grocery store in Chinatown, challenged the quarantine.185 Both argued that the resolutions unfairly targeted the Chinese, and both prevailed.

---

175. McClain, supra note 9, at 236.
176. See Dowd, supra note 170.
178. Dowd, supra note 170 (quoting Criminal Idiocy of the Phelan Health Board, S.F. CHRON., Mar. 8, 1900, at 7).
179. See Kalisch, supra note 177, at 118.
180. See Jew Ho v. Williamson, 103 F. 10, 12 (C.C.N.D. Cal. 1900); McClain, supra note 9, at 259.
181. See Wong Wai v. Williamson, 103 F. 1, 3 (C.C.N.D. Cal. 1900); see also Siler, supra note 171 (noting that a San Francisco Examiner reporter “even went so far as to get himself injected with the plague vaccine to catalog its side effects”); McClain, supra note 9, at 245 (“The vaccine was highly toxic, and its administration was frequently accompanied by localized pain and swelling, headache, and high fever. Reactions were occasionally quite severe and could render an individual prostrate for many days. There were occasionally even reports of death.”).
182. See Wong Wai, 103 F. at 6.
183. Id.
184. See id. at 2.
185. See Jew Ho, 103 F. at 12.
Judge William Morrow wrote for the Circuit Court for the Northern District of California in both cases. In the inoculation case, he concluded:

[The regulations] are not based upon any established distinction in the conditions that are supposed to attend this plague, or the persons exposed to its contagion, but they are boldly directed against the Asiatic or Mongolian race as a class, without regard to the previous condition, habits, exposure to disease, or residence of the individual; and the only justification offered for this discrimination was a suggestion made by counsel for the defendants in the course of the argument, that this particular race is more liable to the plague than any other. No evidence has, however, been offered to support this claim, and it is not known to be a fact. This explanation must therefore be dismissed as unsatisfactory. 186

....

[The regulations] are directed against the Asiatic race exclusively, and by name. There is no pretense that previous residence, habits, exposure to disease, method of living, or physical condition has anything to do with their classification as subject to the regulations. They are denied the privilege of traveling from one place to another, except upon conditions not enforced against any other class of people; and this privilege is denied, it appears, to Chinese persons born in the United States as well as to those born elsewhere. 187

The court issued an injunction enjoining enforcement of the regulations. 188

And in the quarantine case, Judge Morrow wrote:

Attention is called to the fact that, while the board of supervisors has quarantined a district bounded by streets, the operation of the quarantine is such as to run along in the rear of certain houses, and that certain houses are excluded, while others are included; that, for instance, upon Stockton street, in the block numbered from 900 to 1,000, there are two places belonging to persons of another race, and these persons and places are excluded from this quarantine, although the Chinese similarly situated are included, and although the quarantine, in terms, is imposed upon all the persons within the blocks bounded by such streets. The evidence here is clear that this is made to operate against the Chinese population only, and the reason given for it is that the Chinese may communicate the disease from one to the other. That explanation, in the judgment of the court, is not sufficient. It is, in effect, a discrimination, and it is the discrimination that has been frequently called to the attention of the federal courts where matters of this character have arisen with respect to Chinese. 189

The court concluded that because the quarantine was “unreasonable, unjust, and oppressive” and “contrary to the provisions of the fourteenth

186. Wong Wai, 103 F. at 7.
187. Id. at 9.
188. Id. at 10. Significantly, the court relied on Ho Ah Kow v. Nunan, 12 F. Cas. 252 (C.C.D. Cal. 1879) (No. 6,546), the Pigtail Ordinance case. See Wong Wai, 103 F. at 9.
189. Jew Ho, 103 F. at 23.
amendment to the constitution of the United States,” it could not be continued.\textsuperscript{190}

The 1900 San Francisco outbreak continued for several years. The final toll, as of February 1904, was “121 cases and 113 deaths, all but a handful Chinese.”\textsuperscript{191} Although the most effective way to fight the plague was to trap and kill rats, the authorities did not begin doing so in Chinatown until November 1902, and they did not pursue the matter systematically or vigorously.\textsuperscript{192} In 1907, there was a second outbreak of the plague in the Bay Area, this time among white residents in Oakland and San Francisco.\textsuperscript{193} For these communities, the authorities began trapping and exterminating rats quickly,\textsuperscript{194} and without consideration, apparently, for quarantining the areas in question or requiring the residents to be vaccinated.\textsuperscript{195}

\textbf{III. Modern-Day Discrimination}

As the country moved deeper into the twentieth century, the hostility and violence directed against Asian Americans persisted. The internment of 120,000 Japanese Americans during World War II amounted to both expulsion and government-sanctioned discrimination.\textsuperscript{196}

The postwar era did see a change in perception, as fears of the “Yellow Peril” began to mix with the image of the “model minority,”\textsuperscript{197} a concept that may have given some Asian Americans hope that their acceptance in this country had been achieved.\textsuperscript{198} It was seen by others, however, as merely

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{190}  Id. at 26.
\textsuperscript{191}  McClain, supra note 9, at 276; Bubonic Plague Hits San Francisco 1900–1909, PBS (1998), https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/aso/databank/entries/dm00bu.html [https://perma.cc/PLW6-762A] (reporting 122 deaths); cf. Dowd, supra note 170 (“The epidemic’s official death toll is 119, but it’s impossible to know if more cases were hidden, covered up or never discovered.”).
\textsuperscript{192}  See McClain, supra note 9, at 275–76.
\textsuperscript{193}  See Dowd, supra note 170; see also McClain, supra note 9, at 276.
\textsuperscript{194}  See Dowd, supra note 170; McClain, supra note 9, at 276.
\textsuperscript{195}  See McClain, supra note 9, at 276 (“No thought appears to have been given by anyone to quarantine or the use of the Haffkine prophylactic vaccine as anti-plague measures.”).
\textsuperscript{196}  See Korematsu v. United States, 323 U.S. 214, 215–16 (1944); Ex parte Endo, 323 U.S. 283, 285–90 (1944); Hirabayashi v. United States, 320 U.S. 81, 85–89 (1943).
\textsuperscript{197}  See Robert S. Chang, Toward an Asian American Legal Scholarship: Critical Race Theory, Post-Structuralism, and Narrative Space, 81 Calif. L. Rev. 1241, 1258 (1993) (“This history of discrimination and violence, as well as the contemporary problems of Asian Americans, are obscured by the portrayal of Asian Americans as a ‘model minority.’ Asian Americans are portrayed as ‘hardworking, intelligent, and successful.’ This description represents a sharp break from past stereotypes of Asians as ‘sneaky, obsequious, or inscrutable.’”).
\textsuperscript{198}  The Model Minority Myth, The Practice, Nov.–Dec. 2018, https://theppractice.law.harvard.edu/article/the-model-minority-myth/ [https://perma.cc/6MJG-MSH6] (“Since its introduction in popular media more than half a century ago, the term ‘model minority’ has often been used to refer to a minority group perceived as particularly successful, especially in a manner that contrasts with other minority groups. The term could, by its definition and logic, be applied to any number of groups defined by any number of criteria, but it is perhaps most commonly used to frame discussions of race. In particular, the model minority designation is often applied to Asian Americans, who, as a group, are often
another in a long line of wedges designed to discourage collaboration with other minority groups, hyped at a time when African Americans were pushing back against their experience of discrimination and violence in the 1950s and 1960s.\textsuperscript{199} And it obscures the challenges faced by many AAPIs.\textsuperscript{200}

The “Yellow Peril” concept has never faded away completely, and it returns at times of stress. We take a closer look at two more recent cases arising from anti-Asian violence, the murder of Vincent Chin and the Vietnamese Fishermen versus the Ku Klux Klan in the 1980s.\textsuperscript{201}

\textit{A. The Murder of Vincent Chin}

On June 19, 1982, in Highland Park, a suburb of Detroit, Vincent Chin—a twenty-seven-year-old immigrant from China who worked as a draftsman at an engineering firm and waited on tables at a Chinese restaurant on weekends—went out with three friends to celebrate, as he was to be married the following week.\textsuperscript{202} At the Fancy Pants Lounge, they encountered two men, Ronald Ebens and his stepson, Michael Nitz.\textsuperscript{203} praises for apparent success across academic, economic, and cultural domains—successes typically offered in contrast to the perceived achievements of other racial groups.”). As Frank Wu has noted, “You Asians are all doing well anyway” summarizes the model minority myth. Frank H. Wu, \textit{Yellow: Race in America Beyond Black and White} 40 (2002).


\textsuperscript{201} AABANY presented reenactments for the first time of the Vincent Chin case in 2008 (with Frank Wu) and the Vietnamese Fishermen case in 2015. \textit{See Trial Reenactments, AABANY}, https://reenactments.aabany.org/ [https://perma.cc/J26V-PXYN] (last visited Mar. 4, 2022). In our presentation on anti-Asian violence, we included excerpts from the two earlier reenactments.

\textsuperscript{202} \textit{See United States v. Ebens, 800 F.2d 1422, 1427 (6th Cir. 1986); see also Helen Zia, \textit{Asian American Dreams: The Emergence of an American People} 58–59 (2000); Paula Yoo, \textit{From A Whisper to A Rallying Cry: The Killing of Vincent Chin and the Trial That Galvanized the Asian American Movement} 7–8 (2021).}

\textsuperscript{203} \textit{See Ebens, 800 F.2d at 1427.}
As they were sitting across from each other, Ebens began directing racial and obscene remarks toward Chin, calling him a “Chink” and a “Nip,” referring to foreign car imports, and saying “it’s because of you little motherfuckers that we’re out of work.”

Chin confronted Ebens and blows were exchanged. The altercation moved outside. After Ebens took a baseball bat from Nitz’s car, Chin fled. Ebens and Nitz got into their car, drove off, and eventually found Chin near a McDonald’s a few blocks away. Nitz grabbed Chin and held him as Ebens swung the bat and hit Chin several times on his head and back. Chin lost consciousness as he was being taken to the hospital. He lapsed into a coma, his brain ceased functioning, and he died four days later.

Ebens and Nitz were charged in Wayne County Circuit Court with second-degree murder, but the prosecutors offered a plea bargain to manslaughter. Both men accepted. At sentencing on March 16, 1983, both men were represented by counsel, but no prosecutor appeared and the victim’s family and friends were not notified.

---

205. Id.; Zia, supra note 202, at 59–60; Yoo, supra note 202, at 9–14.
206. See Ebens, 800 F.2d at 1427–28.
207. See Yoo, supra note 202, at 57.
208. See id.
209. See id. at 58, 140; Harmeeet Kaur, Vincent Chin’s Family Never Got the Justice They Wanted. But His Case Changed Things for Those Who Came After Him, CNN (Oct. 10, 2021,
defendant to three years’ probation, a $3,000 fine, and court costs.210 The
judge later explained his reasoning: “These aren’t the kind of men you send
to jail . . . . You fit the punishment to the criminal, not the crime.”211

In the early 1980s, the subject of race was largely black and white.212 The
Asian American community, however, was galvanized by the notion that a
Chinese American could be beaten to death, with his killers sentenced only
to probation and a fine.213 The two men were white autoworkers in Detroit—
one was out of work—at a time when the U.S. auto industry was under
tremendous pressure from Japanese imports. There was much resentment
toward Japan, which spilled over to Asian Americans in general. There were
staged scenes of politicians and union leaders demolishing Japanese imports
with sledgehammers.214

Because of the efforts of the AAPI community, the U.S. Department of
Justice received thousands of letters and signatures on petitions urging
prosecution.215 The Reverend Jesse Jackson became the first national
political leader of any race to speak out against violence against Asians,
appearing with Lily Chin, Vincent’s mother, in San Francisco’s
Chinatown.216 In November 1983, a federal grand jury in Detroit indicted
Ebans and Nitz for interfering with Chin’s right to use and enjoy a place of
public accommodation—the Fancy Pants Lounge—on account of his race,
and conspiracy to do the same.217

---

210. Transcript of Proceedings at 7–8, People v. Ebens, No. 82-273374 (Wayne Co. Cir.
Ct. Mar. 16, 1983); accord Ebens, 800 F.2d at 1425 (noting Wayne County Circuit Court
sentenced Ebens, after pleading guilty to manslaughter, to probation and a fine of $3,720).
211. ZIA, supra note 202, at 60.
212. See Yoo, supra note 202, at 124 (“In 1982 the topic of race in the United States
centered on white and Black. Asian Americans and others were often not even considered
part of the conversation.”). This may still be the case today. See Frank H. Wu, Asian
Americans Recognizing Ourselves at a Crossroads, ASIAN AM./ASIAN RSC. INST.,
https://aaari.info/cuny-forum-8-wu/ [https://perma.cc/2YXA-TK7F] (last visited Mar. 4,
2022).
213. See ZIA, supra note 202, at 60–61, 64–77; Yoo, supra note 202, at 129–39.
214. See Ebens, 800 F.2d at 1439 (noting record contained “videocasts showing purported
auto workers or others in Detroit paying or making donations for the privileges of attacking
Japanese-made automobiles with sledgehammers as showing some of the uncontrolled spleen
directed at the competition from Japanese imports”); Wu, supra note 198, at 70–71 (“Driving
such an imported [Japanese] car meant taking a chance. Local car dealers held raffles for the
honor of taking a baseball bat to a Toyota to bash it to pieces. Owners of Hondas reported to
unsympathetic police departments that their vehicles had been ‘keyed’ in parking lots:
Vandals would take a key and run it along the length of the fender, gouging the steel so that
costly refinishing would be required. People who supported the ‘Buy America’ campaign
wore T-shirts with an atomic bomb mushroom cloud over the slogan, ‘Made with Pride in
America—Tested in Japan.’”).
216. See ZIA, supra note 202, at 76.
1983).
The case was assigned to Judge Anna Diggs Taylor, one of the first African American women to be appointed to any federal court in the country. Trial commenced on June 5, 1984. It was undisputed that Ebens and Nitz killed Vincent Chin. But there was sharp dispute over the issue of motivation—the government had to prove that Ebens and Nitz acted because of Chin’s race. One of the most important witnesses at the trial was Jimmy Choi, who was with Vincent at the Fancy Pants Lounge on the night in question. On direct examination, Choi testified about the encounter with Ebens and Nitz that ended with the fatal beating outside the McDonald’s.

Q. Then what happened?
A. Well, we were still sitting. Then all of a sudden, I heard Vince say, “Scram.” I turned around and I saw the two men right behind us, three to five steps.
Q. And what did you do?
A. Well, I scrambled. I ran towards north of McDonald’s right off the bat.
Q. And how far did you run?
A. Thirty yards, then I turned back.
Q. What did you see?
A. I saw Vincent running across, just about getting to the median of the cars; then, the younger man came up and tried to grab him from behind, pull him around . . . Then they were scuffling and the older man came with the bat.
Q. And what did you see when he approached Vincent with the bat?
A. He approached. Vincent was still trying to get away from him; and then, the older man—he could not run too fast, he kind of hobbled—he took a swing at Vincent’s knees.
Q. Then what happened.
A. At that point, on the knees, one swing; upper section on Vincent, and he blocked like this.
Q. And then what happened? What did you see Vincent doing?
A. Well, he was going down slowly like this; and the old man took a swing right at his head.
Q. What did you do?
A. I don’t know. I was like I couldn’t believe it. I was going, “I cannot believe it.”

220. See United States v. Ebens, 800 F.2d 1422, 1427–28 (6th Cir. 1986).
Q. And what else did you see?
A. It seemed like slow motion. Vincent was going down; then I saw another blow; then, he was kind of in a crawling position, like this; and then it was in a frenzy like, while he was swinging, he was saying something which I could not hear. He kept mumbling.

Q. How many times did you see him swing the bat?
A. The first blow, I saw it very vividly.

Q. And where did that blow land?
A. Right here. [indicating the side of the head]

Q. And after that?
A. One more blow to the head while Vincent was going down. He kept swinging, and I don’t know whether it was connecting or not, but I could not believe it.

Q. And what did you do?
A. Well, I ran back, I just ran toward the direction right to Vincent.

Q. And what did you see when you got there?
A. All of a sudden, I saw guns, service guns, and then, I stopped abruptly and I saw a black man holding the gun. . . . He pulled out a badge, like that, and told the older man to drop his bat.

Q. Now, when you went over to Vincent, was he conscious?
A. He was still conscious.

Q. Was he saying anything?
A. Yes, I cradled his head and I said, “Hey, Vincent, are you all right?” And he was saying, “Fight. Fight. It is not fair.”

Q. Was he speaking Chinese?
A. In Chinese. 221

Defendants put on a brief defense case. 222 Ebens testified, and he denied making any comments about Chin’s race or foreign cars or being out of work. 223 He claimed that he blacked out and could not remember beating Chin to death. 224 He denied that he did what he did because of Chin’s race. 225


223. See id. at 149, 164–65, 193, 196–97, 199.

224. See id. at 184, 206–08 (“When I seen him [Nitz] scuffling, it just flashed in my mind. He is going to get hurt again, and I started toward him, and it was almost audible to me, and something just snapped. I don’t remember from there on what happened.”). Ebens was shown the bat that had been used to kill Chin. When asked, “Is that the bat that you used to kill Vincent Chin?,” he responded: “I can’t tell that; I don’t know.” Id. at 206.

225. See id. at 189.
The lawyers summed up on June 26, 1984. The prosecutor focused on the issue of race as a motivating factor:

[T]here really is only one reasonable explanation for Vincent Chin’s brutal killing.

In the minds of Ronald Ebens and Michael Nitz, Vincent Chin was a Chink who dared to stand up to them.

Now, . . . this evidence must show that at least one of the motives of the defendants[’] actions of beating, hunting and killing Vincent Chin, was from racial animosity. And before you can convict these men for this brutal killing, you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that they acted in part because Vincent Chin was Chinese and because he was enjoying the Fancy Pants Lounge.

Now the defense has suggested all along that this was just a run-of-the-mill barroom fight between two individuals who happened to be of different races. Well ladies and gentlemen, let’s take a look at the evidence that simply makes that defense improbable and unacceptable.

Vincent Chin and his friends were having a good time, spending a lot of money, and that bothered Ronald Ebens; that Ronald Ebens began a barrage of racial insults, obscenities directed at Chin’s mother, that he was talking about foreign cars and, because of you mother fuckers, we in the auto industry are out of work. . . .

But ladies and gentlemen, you don’t have to decide that Ronald Ebens and Michael Nitz acted with any racial intent just on the basis of a few derogatory remarks. Rather examine what they did and you will be convinced why they did it.

When they walked into the Fancy Pants Lounge that night, they could only know two things about Vincent Chin, that he was an Oriental and that he was having a good time. They, of course, had never met him before. So all they could know was what they saw in front of them. They saw an Oriental acting flamboyant, spending a lot of money. How do you think Ronald Ebens reacted to that?

[T]he brutality and the ferocity of the attack on Vincent Chin himself tells you that this was no mere barroom brawl that got out of hand. After Michael Nitz got Mr. Chin in a bear hug, Ebens’ savage and repeated use of that bat, even after Chin lay motionless on the pavement, cannot be reasonably explained by mere anger or revenge.

And this was more than some barroom fight. This was violent hatred turned loose. This was years of pent-up racial hostilities and rage
unleashed. This was a modern-day lynching, but there was a bat instead of a rope.\textsuperscript{226}

On June 28, 1984, the jury returned its verdict. On the first count, conspiracy to violate civil rights on account of race and national origin in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 241,\textsuperscript{227} the jury found both Nitz and Ebens not guilty.\textsuperscript{228} On the second count, interference with civil rights on account of race and national origin in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 245,\textsuperscript{229} the jury found Nitz not guilty and Ebens guilty.\textsuperscript{230}

On September 18, 1984, Judge Taylor sentenced Ebens, as follows:

\begin{quote}
THE COURT: Mr. Ebens, is there anything you would like to say?

. . . MR. EBENS: Only, your Honor, I have expressed my regret and remorse on several occasions, and I would just like to reiterate that one more time. I am sorry for what happened. I can’t say anymore than that. At this point, I have no recourse but to depend on the American system of justice, and you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that all?

It is adjudged, Mr. Ebens, that you are committed to the custody of the Attorney General for a term of 25 years.\textsuperscript{231}
\end{quote}

Ebens was permitted to remain free on bail pending appeal.\textsuperscript{232}

The Sixth Circuit reversed.\textsuperscript{233} While the court rejected Ebens’s argument that the federal civil rights laws did not protect “Orientals”\textsuperscript{234} as well as the argument that the district court erred in failing to grant his motion for a change of venue,\textsuperscript{235} it held that “Ebens was denied a fair trial.”\textsuperscript{236} The court concluded that Judge Taylor had committed “reversible error” in allowing a witness to testify that Ebens had made a racist statement to a Black man in a bar some ten years earlier.\textsuperscript{237} The court also strongly disapproved of “inflammatory language” used by the prosecutor in his summation.\textsuperscript{238} The
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court was most troubled, however, by Judge Taylor’s refusal to allow the defense to introduce tape recordings of meetings several key witnesses had had with an attorney before the trial, which the defense argued showed that “the witnesses’ testimony concerning Ebens’s racist statements was false and that it was the result of improper coaching of them by [the lawyer] in preparation for the trial.”

On remand, Ebens renewed his motion for a change of venue. This time, Judge Taylor granted the motion. Ironically, the Asian American community’s success at publicizing the case was a factor in causing its transfer from Detroit—a city “with [a] black majority and civil rights history” and caught in the economic woes afflicting the automotive industry—to Cincinnati, “known as a conservative city with Southern sensibilities.”

In addition to the different demographics of the jury pool, the prosecution team faced several new challenges. With memories fading, its witnesses would have to testify to five-year-old events. More impeachment material existed in the form of testimony from the first trial. Evidentiary rulings that had gone the government’s way the first time were reversed. And Ebens—whose selective memory apparently had not impressed the jury when he testified in Detroit—did not take the stand in the second trial.

---

239. Id. at 1430. The meetings were recorded and then transcribed, and the court attached excerpts from one of the meetings as an appendix to its opinion. See id. at 1442–45. While the district court excluded recordings, with limited exceptions, as hearsay, the government conceded on appeal that these rulings were erroneous. See id. at 1430. As the Sixth Circuit held, because the tapes were not being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted but to show that the witnesses had been coached into lying, they were not hearsay. Id.

240. See United States v. Ebens, 654 F. Supp. 144, 146 (E.D. Mich. 1987). The court held: Factors such as the comment and castigation of public figures, the intensity and long duration of the publicity (since 1982), its inflammatory tone and content, and the continually repeated factual recitations, all militate toward the conclusion that a change of venue from the State of Michigan and the northern Ohio area must be granted.

Id.

241. See Ebens, 800 F.2d at 1438 (“[T]he case itself arose in an atmosphere of extraordinary publicity. The video tapes contained as part of the special record made with respect to the motion for a change of venue, demonstrate the deep sense of public outrage especially after it was perceived that the Chin incident was motivated by racial bias. Nearly every news telecast showed the pathetic figure of Chin’s weeping mother making pleas for justice. There are countless photographs of marches and demonstrations in front of both the county office buildings and the federal office buildings in Detroit, some, according to the accounts, attracting over 700 persons carrying large placards.”).


243. See id. at 57 (“In the years leading up to the summer of 1982, Detroit was a city in crisis. Long lines of despair snaked around unemployment offices, union halls, welfare offices, soup kitchens. Men and women lost homes, cars, recreational vehicles, summer cottages, and possessions accumulated from a lifetime of hard work in a once-thriving industry.”). The Sixth Circuit “recognize[d] fully that this was a public event and a matter of great and crucial importance to the Detroit metropolitan area.” Ebens, 800 F.2d at 1439.

244. Zia, supra note 202, at 79.
It was no surprise, then, when, on May 1, 1987, the jury returned a verdict finding Ebens not guilty. Ultimately, he never served a full day in jail. He entered into a $1.5 million settlement with Chin’s family but did not pay it. He currently owes the estate more than $8 million.

B. The Vietnamese Fishermen v. The Ku Klux Klan

We turn next to the Vietnamese Fishermen versus the Ku Klux Klan, where Vietnamese immigrants found an ally against white supremacy in the Southern Poverty Law Center.

Illustration 8: Knights of the Ku Klux Klan Torch the “USS Vietcong” on February 14, 1981

---

245. See id. at 80. As Zia concluded, “This jury, composed of people with so little contact with Asian Americans and knowledge of our concerns, couldn’t see how ‘It’s because of you motherfuckers’ might contain a racial connotation.” Id.

246. See id.


At dusk on February 14, 1981, several hundred people gathered in Santa Fe, Texas, a few miles from the town of Seabrook on Galveston Bay. The local fishermen there faced stiff competition from Vietnamese refugees who had resettled in the Gulf Coast in the late 1970s after the fall of Saigon, and they had asked the Klan for assistance. Louis Beam, the Grand Dragon of the Texas Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, addressed the crowd in his white Klan robe. He gave federal and state authorities what he called a “Grand Dragon’s Dispensation”—ninety days to resolve the issues in Galveston Bay. Ninety days coincided with the start of the shrimping season on May 15, 1981. Beam explained:

If [the] authorities . . . do [nothing] . . . , “this entire Gulf Coast is going to be a difficult place to live. . . . It’s going to be a hell of a lot more violent than it was in Korea or Vietnam . . . . If you want our country for the whites, you’re going to have to get it the way our founding fathers got it—with blood, blood, blood. . . . [You’ll have] to “fight, fight, fight.”

An old shrimp boat had been brought to the rally. On it were painted the words “USS Vietcong.” Someone poured diesel fuel on the boat. With the crowd chanting “[f]ight, fight, fight,” Beam set the boat on fire, shouting: “This is the right way to burn a shrimp boat . . . . This is in-service training.”

In the weeks that followed, there was more violence and threats of violence, directed not just against the Vietnamese but also against those who did business with them. And on March 15, 1981, a group of local

251. See Season for Justice, supra note 250, at 14–16.
252. See id. at 14, 16–18.
253. See id. at 18.
254. Id.; see also Vietnamese Fishermen I, 518 F. Supp. at 1001.
255. See Season for Justice, supra note 250, at 18.
256. Id. at 18–19; see also Vietnamese Fishermen II, 543 F. Supp. 198, 207 (S.D. Tex. 1982).
257. See Season for Justice, supra note 250, at 19.
258. Id.; see also Vietnamese Fishermen I, 518 F. Supp. at 1001.
259. See Season for Justice, supra note 250, at 19 (“Over the next month life became more and more dangerous for the Vietnamese fishermen and the Americans who were their friends or business associates or rented them space to dock their boats: Two crosses were burned, one in the yard of a Vietnamese shrimper, one near a marina in the town of Kemah where several refugees docked their boats; Fisher [the leader of the ‘American Fishermen’s Association’] told Emery Waite, another dock owner, that the only way to deal with refugees was to ‘drop a bomb in Saigon Harbor,’ the nickname given American Jim Craig’s Old Seafood Harbor; two men approached American fisherman Leon Bateman and offered to burn Vietnamese boats; the Anderwall family received phone threats, Klan cards in the mailbox, and two visits from American fishermen who threatened to burn their house and the Vietnamese boat docked at their wharf unless they forced the owner . . . to move his boat; David Collins brandished an AR-15 semiautomatic rifle for the press and announced he’d have armed members of the Klan on shrimping boats when the season began; a Vietnamese boat was burned.”).
fishermen and Klansmen, some wearing robes and hoods, some carrying shotguns and assault weapons, steered a shrimp boat up to the dock of the leader of the Vietnamese fishermen, Colonel Nguyen Van Nam.\footnote{See id. at 19–20; see also Vietnamese Fishermen I, 518 F. Supp. at 1001. Colonel Nam had led a unit of ten thousand troops in Vietnam; he had fled to the United States when Saigon fell in 1975 and eventually took up shrimping on the Texas Gulf Coast. He quickly became a leader in the Vietnamese refugee community in Galveston Bay. See \textit{Season for Justice, supra} note 250, at 14–15.} They had on board a cannon and a human figure hanged in effigy on the rigging of the boat’s stern.\footnote{See \textit{Season for Justice, supra} note 250, at 19.}

\textit{Illustration 9: Another Threat of Violence from Klansmen on March 15, 1981}\footnote{John Van Beekum/Southern Poverty Law Center.}

The story of the conflict was covered in \textit{The New York Times}, and when the chief trial counsel and cofounder of the Southern Poverty Law Center, Morris Dees, learned that the Ku Klux Klan had been invited to help the American fishermen, he dialed information for Seabrook, and soon reached Colonel Nam.\footnote{See id. at 20–22.} Just a few weeks later, on April 16, 1981, the Vietnamese Fishermen’s Association filed suit in federal court in Houston, seeking a preliminary injunction to prevent Beam and the Klan from carrying out their
threats of violence. The complaint alleged not only civil rights violations but antitrust, racketeering, and common law tort claims as well.

Judge Gabrielle Kirk McDonald was the first African American appointed to the federal bench in Texas, and only the third African American female federal judge in the country. She had been a judge for less than two years when the suit brought by the Vietnamese fishermen was randomly assigned to her. She promptly granted plaintiffs’ request for expedited discovery and scheduled a hearing on their motion for preliminary injunctive relief for May 11, four days before the start of the shrimping season.

Louis Beam arrived for his deposition on April 30 wearing his white Klan robe and, as Colonel Nam noticed, concealing a gun beneath his robe. The following exchange occurred:

MR. DEES: . . . We’d like counsel [for Mr. Beam] to determine whether this witness came into the deposition armed.

Mr. Adamo, would you determine whether your witness is armed?

THE WITNESS [Mr. Beam]: You don’t have permission to search my body unless you’ve got a permit.

MR. DEES: Let the record show that this witness has a weapon under his Klan robe. He’s in here in full regalia Klan robe, and obviously he has a shoulder holster with a weapon sticking out under it. I want the record to show it, unless his counsel refutes it, and he says he refuses to admit it.

MR. COBB [co-counsel with Mr. Adamo for Mr. Beam]: It’s not up to counsel to admit or deny what’s under somebody’s clothing. I’m not clairvoyant, nor do I have X-ray vision, and am certainly not in a position


265. See Vietnamese Fishermen I, 518 F. Supp. at 999–1000 (alleging that “the defendants have violated their rights under . . . 42 U.S.C §§ 1981, 1982, 1985(c), 1986; the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2, 15, and 26; the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), 18 U.S.C. §§ 1962 and 1964; and common law torts of assault, trespass to property, the intentional infliction of emotional distress, and intentional interference with contractual relations”).


267. Judge McDonald received her commission on May 11, 1979. See History of the Federal Judiciary: Gabrielle Anne Kirk McDonald, FED. JUD. CTR., https://www.fjc.gov/history/judges/mcdonald-gabrielle-anne-kirk [https://perma.cc/K2RT-EAQC] (last visited Mar. 4, 2022); see also SEASON FOR JUSTICE, supra note 250, at 26 (“A dozen judges sat in the district court where we filed the suit. When the court’s lottery system assigned Judge Gabrielle McDonald to our case, we couldn’t have been happier: Judge McDonald was a black woman in her late thirties who had tried civil rights cases as an attorney before her appointment to the bench by Jimmy Carter.”).


269. See SEASON FOR JUSTICE, supra note 250, at 8.
to grant anybody permission to search someone else’s body. And I see no weapon.

MR. DEES: Okay. Let the record show it is obviously clear and goes without dispute in my mind, and that’s the end of the deposition.270

Because Beam had also refused to answer any questions, plaintiffs applied to Judge McDonald for relief.271 Judge McDonald ordered all further depositions to be taken at the office of the U.S. Attorney, with a U.S. Marshal in attendance, and further ruled that no witnesses could carry weapons into depositions.272

A few days later, plaintiffs presented another application to Judge McDonald, this time because of Beam’s bizarre and threatening behavior.273 Their counsel described Beam’s conduct:

On May 5, 1981, the defendants took the depositions of the four named plaintiffs in the Jury Room of Judge McDonald’s court. Mr. Louis Beam, along with defendant Joseph Collins, attended portions of the depositions. While in the room, Mr. Beam sat in a chair against the wall opposite plaintiffs’ counsel, Morris Dees, and held in front of him a book with the word “EXORCISM” printed in very large type on the front cover. Mr. Beam chanted something from the book or from memory while staring at Mr. Dees. He did this for a period of approximately one hour. Occasionally Mr. Beam pointed his finger at Mr. Dees. After nearly an hour of this activity, Mr. Beam’s eyes became transfixed upon Mr. Dees and it appeared that he was in a semi-conscious state. He began to mouth in a clear and distinct manner but in an inaudible voice the following words in the direction of Mr. Dees:

You die, you die, you die, you die, you die,
You die, you die, you die, you die, you die . . . .274

Judge McDonald denied plaintiffs’ requests for protection by U.S. Marshals, but she enjoined Beam and the other defendants from contacting plaintiffs and their counsel and from “making threatening and vile remarks, unsolicited hand gestures, and other distracting actions toward the plaintiff[s’] counsel.”275 She warned Beam that if he failed to comply, “I will find you in contempt.”276

271. Id. at 3–4; Dist. Ct. Docket, supra note 268, at no. 14.
275. SEASON FOR JUSTICE, supra note 250, at 36; see Dist. Ct. Docket, supra note 268, at no. 53.
276. SEASON FOR JUSTICE, supra note 250, at 35; see Dist. Ct. Docket, supra note 268, at no. 53.
In the meantime, Beam had moved to disqualify Judge McDonald on the grounds of “personal bias or prejudice.” At the hearing on the motion, Beam referred to the judge as a “negress,” and stated as follows:

I no more have the opportunity and confidence that I could get any fairer trial here in front of you than you would feel were you to go before a Ku Klux Klansman who was a judge as a defendant. [I know the prejudice of] your people against the Klansmen.

Judge McDonald denied the motion, ruling from the bench. She told the Klan leaders:

You are not entitled to a judge of your choice . . . . But you are entitled to a judge who will give you a fair trial. I am deeply committed to equal justice under the law and you will get it. You are entitled to nothing more and nothing less.

The preliminary injunction hearing began on Monday, May 11. Plaintiffs’ witnesses included American dock owners who testified about the threats they had received for doing business with the Vietnamese and the Vietnamese fishermen, who testified to the acts of intimidation and their own fear. One Vietnamese fisherman’s testimony was translated by his

---


278. SEASON FOR JUSTICE, supra note 250, at 26.

279. Vietnamese Fishermen’s Ass’n v. Knights of Ku Klux Klan, 518 F. Supp. 1017, 1019 (S.D. Tex. 1981). Beam apparently was concerned because “[t]he Court has evidenced at the very least sympathy and sensitivity toward the Plaintiffs’ personal feelings about my mode of dress at Court proceedings,” referring to Beam’s wearing of his Klan robe during the proceedings. See Defendants’ Motion for Disqualification of Judge, supra note 277, at 3.


283. SEASON FOR JUSTICE, supra note 250, at 38, 39. For example, Margaret Anderwall, a dock owner who had rented a spot to a Vietnamese fisherman, asked him to move his boat because of threatening phone calls from individuals claiming to be in the Klan. Id. at 42–43. She testified: “We didn’t want to make Khang move, but we had no choice—. . . . His boat has been parked here for two years, and he’d never given us any trouble. But no one wants to have their house burned down or receive threats against their life.” Id. at 43.

284. Id. at 39–40. Phuong Pham, a thirteen-year-old who was babysitting, testified at a deposition at the courthouse with Judge McDonald present; she described being threatened by the Klansmen on their March 15, 1981, boat ride. See id. at 39; Transcript of Deposition of
ten-year-old son, who wanted to be a lawyer and was allowed to sit in the empty jury box for the remainder of the proceedings.\textsuperscript{285}

On May 14, the day before the fishing season was scheduled to begin, the court ruled from the bench, temporarily enjoining defendants from engaging in acts of violence against the Vietnamese.\textsuperscript{286} The court thereafter converted the preliminary injunction into a permanent injunction, and on June 3, 1982, enjoined the military operations of Beam’s so-called Texas Emergency Reserve.\textsuperscript{287}

The Klan did not appeal any of Judge McDonald’s decisions.\textsuperscript{288} She later revealed that while she presided over the case, she and her family received death threats and one-way tickets to Africa.\textsuperscript{289}

IV. CONCLUSION

We return to the present, as the country deals with a new plague and a nationwide wave of anti-Asian violence.\textsuperscript{290} AABANY, working with the law firm Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, issued a report in February 2021 entitled \textit{A Rising Tide of Hate and Violence Against Asian Americans}

\begin{itemize}
\item 285. \textit{Season for Justice}, supra note 250, at 40. The ten-year-old boy, Truc Dang, was permitted to interpret for his father, with the official court interpreter monitoring, because the father felt more comfortable with his son interpreting. \textit{Id.} Dees explained why he asked the judge to let the boy remain:
\begin{itemize}
\item It seemed important that he stay and that he sit in that particular spot; the jury box was on a raised platform and looked down on the tables at which the plaintiffs and defendants and lawyers sat. Truc Dang was the symbol of the hopes and dreams of the generation of refugees that had come to America and taken jobs in car washes, in boat yards, and on shrimp boats so the next generation could be lawyers or whatever they wanted to be.
\end{itemize}
\textit{Id.} at 40–41.
\item 286. \textit{Id.} at 47; Dist. Ct. Docket, supra note 268, at no. 77; see also \textit{Vietnamese Fishermen II}, 543 F. Supp. 198, 202 (S.D. Tex. 1982).
\end{itemize}
in New York During COVID-19: Impact, Causes, Solutions.\textsuperscript{291} The report noted that, although Asian hate incidents and hate crimes are notoriously underreported, “[s]ince the onset of the pandemic, . . . anti-Asian hate incidents . . . have skyrocketed according to both official and unofficial reports.”\textsuperscript{292} Two years into the pandemic, the attacks continue.\textsuperscript{293}

We have seen that there is nothing new about these attacks, or about the politicians who weaponize words to encourage racism and xenophobia and the kind of tribalism that is comforting to some in times of stress. But the questions we must ask are, first, why has this happened? And, second, what can we do to end the hostility and violence once and for all?

\textit{A. Why Has This Happened?}

Based on what we have seen across history, anti-Asian American violence has multiple causes.

\textit{Economic Competition.} From the Chinese gold miners in California to the South Asian lumber mill workers in Bellingham to the Vietnamese fishermen in Galveston Bay, we saw resentment build and violence erupt because of fears that Asian Americans were bringing down wages and taking away jobs.


The Weaponizing of Racism for Political Gain. Starting with Governor Bigler in 1852 and continuing to today, too often politicians seek to rally their base by playing on racist tropes. Former President Donald Trump first tweeted out the phrase “Chinese virus” on March 16, 2020. A study of 1.2 million tweets in the week before and the week after his tweet showed a sharp rise in coronavirus-related tweets with anti-Asian hashtags. In the following weeks and months, he used the phrases “Kung flu,” “Wuhan virus,” and “China plague.” When Asian Americans and allies spoke out against those phrases, the White House closed ranks and defended the former President’s statements. Numerous other politicians and public officials also publicly blamed the Chinese for the spread of coronavirus. Words matter.

The Pressures of National Crisis. Hostility intensifies at times of national crisis. The incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II, the rash of violence against South Asians after 9/11, and the recent spike in anti-Asian attacks during the pandemic are prime examples. Today’s tensions with China and North Korea only increase the hostility.

The Use of AAPIs as Scapegoats and a Wedge. From Yellow Peril to the model minority and now back to the Yellow Peril, AAPIs are too often blamed for society’s problems, from the bubonic plague in San Francisco in 1900 to the economic woes of the auto industry in Detroit in 1982 to the coronavirus in 2020. Vincent Chin was beaten to death by two autoworkers during a recession blamed in part on competition from Japanese auto

---


298. See generally AABANY REPORT, supra note 291, at 8–10.

299. See id. at 11.
companies. And too often AAPIs have been used by the majority as a wedge against other minority groups, generating resentment.

**Pure Racism.** Finally, of course, there is the continuing prevalence of stereotypes and the notion that AAPIs must be forever foreigners in this country. Asian Americans are seen as passive, docile, and weak—to some, vulnerable targets; to others, not worthy citizens. Just as racist notions drove the authorities in San Francisco in 1900 to quarantine and inoculate only the Chinese, “[t]he term ‘Chinese virus’ racializes the disease so that it’s not simply biological but Chinese in nature.”

---


301. See Chang, supra note 197, at 1260, 1264; see also Erin Blakemore, *The Asian American “Model Minority” Myth Masks a History of Discrimination*, NAT’L GEOGRAPHIC (May 27, 2021), https://www.nationalgeographic.com/culture/article/asian-american-model-minority-myth-masks-history-discrimination [https://perma.cc/3Y6C-6VF] ("Asians were lauded as a desirable, hardworking minority—and upheld as a contrast to other groups, such as Latino and Black Americans, who were characterized as a threat to white supremacy."). Even the internment of Japanese Americans was “weaponized” by politicians, as their “success stories” after World War II were used to “weaken[] the civil rights movement.” Kimmy Yam, *Officer Who Stood by as George Floyd Died Highlights Complex Asian American, Black Relations*, NBC NEWS (June 4, 2020, 12:56 AM), https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/officer-whostood-george-floyd-died-asian-american-we-need-n1221311 [https://perma.cc/UPC5-BF57]; see also id. ("In the 1960s, white liberals wielded the model minority stereotype to stifle black social movements, using Asian Americans as ‘proof’ of meritocracy and equal opportunity for people of color.").

302. This was the feeling in 1879. See Ho Ah Kow v. Nunan, 12 F. Cas. 252, 256 (C.C.D. Cal. 1879) (No. 6,546) (“We are aware of the general feeling—amounting to positive hostility—prevailing in California against the Chinese, which would prevent their further immigration hither and expel from the state those already here. Their dissimilarity in physical characteristics, in language, manners and religion, would seem, from past experience, to prevent the possibility of their assimilation with our people."). And unfortunately it is still too often the feeling today. See, e.g., Robin Kawakami, *I’m Asian American. When Will People Stop Seeing Me as a Forever Foreigner?*, TODAY (Mar. 24, 2021, 12:22 PM), https://www.today.com/trnd/i-m-asian-american-when-will-people-stop-seeing-me-1216664 [https://perma.cc/I2Q3-JP6D] ("Where are you really from? I loooovve Chinese food. Go back to your country. They are derogatory remarks I thought I had left behind in adolescence, and yet I’m hearing them again—on the New York subway, walking through the city—in 2021."); see also Frank H. Wu, *Foreword to Asian American BAR ASS’N of N.Y. & PAUL WEISS, A RISING TIDE OF HATE AND VIOLENCE AGAINST ASIAN AMERICANS IN NEW YORK DURING COVID-19: IMPACT, CAUSES, SOLUTIONS* 5 (2021), https://www.aabany.org/resource/resmgr/press_releases/2021/A_Rising_Tide_of_Hate_and_Vi.pdf [https://perma.cc/FY4P-GTAC] (“There are many reasons for the omission of Asian Americans from discussions of race and civil rights whether deliberate or negligent. We are regarded as perpetual foreigners who have no standing within the community to hint at an injustice over which others if it were them would be outraged.").

303. See Wu, supra note 302, at 6 (“Thus Asian Americans become easy targets. We are reputed to be tourists carrying cash who won’t fight back or even report wrongdoing.").

304. Salcedo, supra note 294 (quoting Professor Russell Jeung of San Francisco State University).
B. What Can Be Done?

As for what we can do, there is no easy answer, but some recommendations have been offered. We summarize a few.

Collect the Data. There must be clear and simple ways for victims to report incidents, and a consistent way to classify and report them. As AABANY has pointed out in its report, both incident reporting and distribution of information are being supported by nonprofit organizations—government and law enforcement need to play a bigger role.

Prosecute Hate Crimes. Historically, the violence against Asians resulted in few if any convictions, and too often the authorities looked the other way. We saw that repeatedly in the examples discussed above, from Los Angeles to Hells Canyon, from Watsonville to Bellingham. More recently, we saw how difficult it is to prosecute a hate crime in the case of Vincent Chin. Although six of the eight victims in the Atlanta shootings in March 2021 were Asian American women and the shootings took place during an upsurge in anti-Asian violence, still the defendant—a twenty-one-year-old white male who blamed a sex addiction for his actions—was not initially charged with hate crimes. Despite the challenges, hate crimes must be prosecuted.

---

305. As the AABANY Report notes, “Hate crimes and incidents often go unreported because, for many victims, filing an official report can be time consuming, too personal, and burdensome… There may be language barriers, as well as fear of backlash from the community or retaliation from the perpetrator.” AABANY REPORT, supra note 291, at 27.

306. See id. The U.S. Department of Justice has a website devoted to hate crimes. See Learn About Hate Crimes, U.S. DEP’T OF JUST., https://www.justice.gov/hatecrimes/learn-about-hate-crimes [https://perma.cc/NGS5-THEG] (last visited Mar. 4, 2022) (“It is critical to report hate crimes not only to show support and get help for victims, but also to send a clear message that the community will not tolerate these kinds of crimes. Reporting hate crimes allows communities and law enforcement to fully understand the scope of the problem in a community and put resources toward preventing and addressing attacks based on bias and hate.”).


As long as attacks against AAPIs carry no legal consequences, they will continue.

United Action from Within the AAPI Community. In the late 1960s, a group that called itself the Asian American Political Alliance broke with previous norms by promoting the term “Asian” rather than “oriental” and by advocating for Asian pride and unity.309 That movement was amplified by the prosecutions of Chol Soo Lee in the 1970s310 and by the murder of Vincent Chin in 1982. The recent and continuing wave of anti-Asian violence must be met with similarly strong advocacy by a united AAPI community.

Stronger Collaboration Among Groups. There is a long history of tension as well as solidarity between Black and Asian American communities.311 In 1991, a Korean American convenience store owner shot and killed a fifteen-year-old African American girl suspected of shoplifting a container of orange juice;312 and over the years there have been other conflicts involving Asian-owned businesses in Black communities.313


312. See Darsha Philips, Before George Floyd and Breonna Taylor, There Was Latash Heilin, NBC L.A. (Feb. 28, 2021, 6:05 AM), https://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/national-international/latash-heilin-mental-los-angeles-riots/2537429 [https://perma.cc/6Q4T-J9XX]. The store owner shot the girl in the back of the head. She was convicted of manslaughter and sentenced to five years’ probation. Id.

hand, there are many examples of the two communities working together. As early as 1948, for example, the NAACP submitted an amicus brief in *Takahashi v. Fish & Game Commission*[^314] and helped Japanese Americans obtain a significant victory in their fight against discriminatory state laws.[^315] In *Loving v. Virginia*,[^316] the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) submitted an amicus brief in support of the Lovings.[^317] Many AAPIs marched in support of Black Lives Matter.[^318] But it is also true that many of the assailants in anti-Asian incidents have been other people of color, and it escaped no one’s notice that an Asian American police officer stood by as George Floyd died.[^319] It is time to resist the wedges driven between minority groups and work together, and to have a broader conversation about race.[^320]

[^315]: See id. at 418–20 (striking down California law barring “Japanese aliens” from receiving state fishing licenses on ground that protections of Fourteenth Amendment extended to aliens as well as citizens); see also Greg Robinson, Takahashi v. Fish & Game Commission, DENSHO ENCYCLOPEDIA (May 9, 2014, 6:13 AM), https://encyclopedia.densho.org/Takahashi_v._Fish_and_Game_Commission/ [https://perma.cc/7PVA-DLTF].
[^316]: 388 U.S. 1 (1967).
[^318]: See Lang, supra note 311; see also *Intersections of Black and Japanese American History: From Bronzeville to Black Lives Matter*, DENSHO (Feb. 17, 2016), https://densho.org/catalyst/japaneseamericanandblackhistory/ [https://perma.cc/QZX8-NTEE]. During World War II, after the Japanese were forced to evacuate, many African Americans moved into vacated Japanese neighborhoods. What had been Little Tokyo became Bronzeville, and Black-owned businesses replaced what had been Japanese American establishments. See generally *Kurashige*, supra note 311, at 158–85 (discussing Bronzeville and Little Tokyo). Still, there were numerous examples of the two groups supporting each other. See id.
[^319]: See Yam, supra note 301; Deanna Pan, *Asian-Americans, Long Used as a Racial Wedge, Are Confronting Anti-Black Racism in Their Own Communities*, BOS. GLOBE (July 21, 2020, 10:24 AM), https://www.bostonglobe.com/2020/07/21/metro/asian-americans-long-used-racial-wedge-are-confronting-anti-black-racism-their-own-communities/ [https://perma.cc/B52C-7H4Z] (“In George Floyd’s final moments, captured on video, Tou Thao, a Hmong-American police officer in Minneapolis, argued with bystanders while his white colleague pressed his knee against Floyd’s neck. As Floyd gasped for air, the crowd pleaded for the dying man’s life. Thao responded, ‘He’s talking, so he can breathe.’”).
[^320]: See, e.g., Mineo, supra note 300.

Ultimately, the pandemic has exposed the cracks in America’s society, bringing forth the layers of systemic racism and legacies of injustice that many Americans have chosen not to pay attention to until now. And it’s not only up to Black and Asian American communities to do the work of building solidarity—it’s the
Strong Leadership and Action from Washington and State Capitals. Our leaders at the federal and state levels need to be encouraged not only to speak out in condemnation of anti-Asian rhetoric and violence, but to develop a game plan to stop the violence and then take action in accordance with that plan. It was helpful that the White House recognized that “during the pandemic, inflammatory and xenophobic rhetoric has put Asian American and Pacific Islander persons, families, communities, and businesses at risk.”

Likewise, in March 2021, two days after the Atlanta shootings, the U.S. House of Representatives held a “rare congressional hearing” to address the issue of anti-Asian discrimination and violence. And credit must be given to Senator Mazie Hirono and Congresswoman Grace Meng for their leadership not only in securing the enactment of the COVID-19 Hate Crimes Act last year, but for pressing the Department of Justice to implement it.

Public Education. Too many people know too little about the Asian American experience. As Helen Zia has said, we are not so much “missing in action” as “missing in history.” We can fix that by sharing stories like the ones discussed in this Essay. We need more AAPIs in politics, the media, sports, and popular culture, and we need them to spread the word.
need more public art campaigns like the series that honored AAPI and Black New Yorkers, originally displayed in a subway station in Brooklyn in 2020. It included portraits of Black people as a sign of solidarity with the Black Lives Matter movement and as a call to end all institutional racism. As the artist, Amanda Phingbodhipakkiya, whose parents are Thai and Indonesian, stated, “you can’t help but see us and you can’t help but feel that we are reclaiming space.” Together, we can beat back not only COVID-19, but the discrimination and bias that Asian Americans and other people of color have faced for centuries.

Illustration 10: “I Still Believe in Our City” Public Art Campaign


328. Messman, supra note 327.

329. Works from public art campaign “I Still Believe in Our City” (2020) created by multidisciplinary artist Amanda Phingbodhipakkiya while artist-in-residence with the NYC Commission on Human Rights. The series was first placed by the artist in over 200 locations around New York City where anti-Asian bias incidents have occurred. Since 2020, the works have reclaimed space for the AAPI community with defiance and pride around the world in subway stations and community centers, on billboards and buildings and the cover of Time magazine.
We close with this excerpt from the conclusion of our Vietnamese Fishermen reenactment:

Once Judge McDonald issued the preliminary injunction, the Vietnamese were ready to launch their boats at the start of the shrimping season on May 15, 1981. But first, there was a custom of their country they wished to observe, the blessing of the fleet. They invited their lawyer to attend. In a speech Dees gave in 2013, he described the event:

I got there about 5:00 in the morning, and I was standing there in the fog. The sun hadn’t come out. On the dock there were 50 or 100, or so, family members waiting for the boats to come out.

There was a priest there to bless the boats. After about half an hour, the sun still hadn’t come out, the fog was hanging heavy on the bay. We heard a diesel engine, and a boat popped out through the fog and came by the reviewing stand. The priest blessed that boat and another and another, until 15 or 20 boats had gone out into the open waters.

As I stood there that morning and the sun began to burn through the fog, I could see the sun glistening off the badges of the United States Marshals sent there to protect these American immigrants. As I looked at those officers, I thought about the majesty of our justice system at work.

As I looked into the faces of these immigrants, I saw pride. Pride as they took a place at America’s table. Not just finding a place at America’s table, but building that table, so to speak, to make this nation great like other immigrants who’ve come into this country time and time again in the past and made this nation a great nation.

I not only felt proud to be a lawyer for these people, I felt proud to be an American. For the first time, I understood that our nation is great because of our diversity and not in spite of it.

---

331. Id. at 110.
Detroit, Michigan

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

At about 8:26 A.M.

* * * *

THE CLERK: Docket number 62-273374, People versus Ronald Elenes and Michael Ritz.

THE COURT: Mr. Khoury, do you wish to say anything on behalf of your client before the Court imposes sentence?

Mr. KHOURY: Yes, Your honor. I represent Michael Ritz, who stands to my left. As we have had furnished to us, the report, we have no quarrel with the factual recital, except I would want to call to the Court's attention very briefly, that the Defendant Michael Ritz, who is 24 years old, and as the report indicates, Your Honor, has had no previous contact whatsoever with the law.

He's presently not only working, but is a part-time student. He has completed two years of college, he's making a contribution to the community here, he's never -- he has a niche in society which he's determined to fulfill, and was seen until this incident arose.

I view the entire matter, Your Honor, not so much as an act that was willful or with any specific intent to commit any crime, but one a tragedy of major proportion, in which
Mr. Nitz first round himself attacked, unprovoked not hours before the baseball bat incident, but within a matter of 15 to 20 minutes at the most, Your Honor, at the bar, where apparently the deceased — and there is no recital of those facts in the report that I saw — the deceased apparently had had some exchange of words, not with the Defendant Michael Nitz, but with his co-defendant or someone in that area, which resulted in the deceased having struck Michael Nitz, and split his head open with a chair. And that led to the ejection of the deceased together with his three friends.

And the tending of Michael Nitz for his wounds in the top of his head — in fact, may it please the Court, the Defendant Michael Nitz was going in the general direction, going in the general direction of the hospital in Highland Park, when they passed this McDonald's and saw the deceased and his friends. I think, if only they hadn't seen the Defendant, this incident —

THE COURT: — He wouldn't be here today?

MR. MONROE: Exactly, exactly. But I say it was one tragic sequence of events following the next, and it culminates in our presence here today. And I see what the recommendation is, but I think it is unreal, nor should it apply to this situation for this reason, Your Honor. This is akin to a situational crime. It is one
that arose in the heat of passion, that was generated by
that unprovoked attack, as far as Defendant Michael Hitz
is concerned, by the deceased on him. And the thing
carried on in that sequence that I just recited, and I can't
won't be repeated to the Court, and I do want the Court to
know that Michael Hitz did not wield any weapon. There
was none.

It was his misfortune to have, perhaps, to have
counted upon the deceased out there on Woodward Avenue,
and then to have simply not participated in the attack,
but perhaps, not to have prevented it. Because had he
been able, or had he done so, instead of just being there
standing a matter of a few feet as the preliminary -- as
the testimony at the preliminary examination, and said, there
was no active participation of actually wielding any
weapon, nor of holding the deceased.

He was standing while the fight was going on, and I don't want the tragedy to be compounded by the
recommendation followed by the Probation Department. I
know the guidelines that are followed by the Probation
Department. I simply urge this Court not to consider
them to be applicable in this particular situation given
the circumstances that I have just related to the Court.

There is a place for this boy to function in society
without being a threat to it. I think he would go through
his entire life without any further incident. And if the Court feels, would take into consideration, what contribution Michael Nitz can make, if he were to engage in even community services, because he has both the mental capacity and the willingness to participate, because the testimony -- the letters that were submitted both to this Court and to the Probation Department, tells us on a very personal and business basis, what kind of a person Michael Nitz is, and how he can function in that interpersonal relationship, and in a business sense.

And if the Court would deem it appropriate to have him rather than be incarcerated to participate in a community program that he's qualified to do, because he's continuing his education now, I think that that would be the more appropriate disposition.

THE COURT: He's not working now?

MR. KNOX: Oh, yes, he's working and going to school, town.

THE COURT: Mr. Sazerstein, did you wish to say anything on behalf of your client before the Court imposes sentence?

MR. SAZERSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor, it's not my intention to indicate that there has not been a crime committed here, but rather mitigation of the offense, Your Honor. I would like to indicate to the Court, that but
for the physical assault by the victim in this case, the
victim initiating the physical assault, this crime would
never ever have been committed in the instant case.

Your Honor, Mr. Bonta and Mr. Ritz were seated, and
the victim woke up and punched Mr. Bonta in the mouth
initiating the physical assault. During the scuffle Mr.
Ritz had his head cut open, was bleeding profusely and in
fact, required stitches with respect to that incident.
Either side, Your Honor, could have been the victim in
this case. They could have changed places in this
particular case.

I think Your Honor would agree in looking at the
background, and the background of Mr. Bonta is
impeccable, that Mr. Bonta is not a hardened criminal. I
don't believe that rehabilitation is even in order in this
case. I'm confident that this would never happen again.
but normal people get strange when loved ones appear to be
seriously injured, and that is what happened here,
resulting in this tragedy.

And God knows that these gentlemen would like to see
this man back, but we can't change what happened over
here.

With respect to punishment, Your Honor, Mr. Bonta is
being punished every day of his life over this incident.
He can't change that, he has to live with this. His work
background is excellent, 17 years at Chrysler and he has
been suspended as a result of this waiting for the outcome
of this.

And these are one of the more difficult cases to
handle, Your Honor. It's not a manslaughter plea out of
some recovery or something of that nature. There are good
people resulting in the tragedy, and I ask the Court to
consider something less than incarceration in this matter.

Mr. Ebens do you wish to say something?

DEFENDANT EBENS: Only that I'm deeply sorry
about what happened. If there is anyway I could change
it, I sure would.

THE COURT: Mr. Hitz, do you want to say
anything before I pronounce sentence?

DEFENDANT HITS: Basically the same thing, if
there was anyway that we would change what happened if we
could. We are very sorry it happened.

THE COURT: I was looking to see any background
on the victim. Do you have any background on him, Mr.
Saperstein or Mr. Krouny?

MR. KROUNY: No, I don't.

THE COURT: Did the victim have a criminal
record?

MR. SAPERSTEIN: I don't have any background on
him either way, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And I looked and looked and I didn't see anything in the pre-sentence report about the victim. Who was the officer in charge, Roberts?

MR. KNOWY: Correct.

MR. SAPERNSTIN: Yes, Your Honor, correct.

THE COURT: Let's just take a short recess. I want to check it out for a minute. Some information. We will take a short recess.

(At about 9:40 a.m. recess)

(At about 9:45 a.m. proceedings reconvened, all parties present)

COURT OFFICER: Back on the record.

THE COURT: Okay, do you want the step up here again? Okay, did anybody have anything further to say before the Court imposes sentence?

MR. KNOWY: No, Your Honor.

MR. SAPERNSTIN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, will counsel stipulate that I can just impose one sentence addressed to both Defendants, because it is going to be exactly the same?

MR. SAPERNSTIN: Yes, so stipulated.

MR. KNOWY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's the judgment of this Court that each of the Defendants be placed on probation for a period of three years. In addition to the usual terms and
conditions of probation that will require you to report as
directed and keep the Probation Department advised as to
your employment and whereabouts. I will require that each
of you pay two hundred sixty dollars a year costs at the
rate of twenty-five dollars per month. That each of you
pay an additional cost and fine in the amount of three
thousand dollars, payable at the rate of one hundred
collars per month. I will leave the question of
restitution to civil proceedings. I will require that you
report as directed, and that you continue to keep the
Probation Department advised as to your employment and
whereabouts, and that any violation of your probation that
you will be brought back and sentenced according to the
law.

Finally, I'll advise each of you that under the
constitution and the laws of the State of Michigan, each
of you has the right to make a motion for a new trial, or
to take any other proceedings allowed by law to set aside
your conviction or to appeal your conviction to a higher
court, provided such action is taken within 60 days from
today.

If you haven't the money to hire a lawyer, the Court
will appoint one for you, and the Court will furnish your
lawyer with all or such portions of the transcript as he
needs to set aside your conviction or to take such appeal.
I'm going to give you forms inquiring into your financial background, and also some forms inquiring whether you want a Court appointed attorney. If you wish to avail yourself of any of these rights you must fill out these forms, and sign them under oath and serve them on the Wayne County Prosecutor's Office, and file them with the clerk of this Court within 60 days from today. Sign these forms that you have received them, and that they have been given to you.

(At about 9:48 a.m., proceedings concluded)
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THE COURT: Are Counsel ready?

MR. LAWSON: Good morning, your Honor. If the Court please, David M. Lawson on behalf of the Defendant.

MR. EAMAN: Good morning, your Honor. Frank Eaman on behalf of Mr. Ebens, also.

MR. MERRITT: Theodore Merritt on behalf of The United States.

THE COURT: Defense Counsel, is Defendant prepared to be sentenced?

MR. LAWSON: There is one outstanding matter, and that is our motion filed to correct the presentense report, and for resubmission to sentencing Counsel. I don't believe the Court has ruled on that motion.

THE COURT: The Court has granted your motion to Resubmit, but the motion to Correct the Presentence Report is denied. The Court has set aside from its consideration the matters which you cite -- in paragraph 4, I believe, of your motion. These matters are
not part of the Court's consideration. And the Court in submitting it to colleagues, as the colleagues also consider those matters is not part of the Court's consideration. So you essentially have a deliberation on the basis which you requested.

MR. EAMAN: Frank Eaman -- the memorandum we submitted to sentence to the Court containing the corrections and additions was, also, submitted to the sentencing Counsel. The first memorandum.

THE COURT: Counsel, I have submitted -- it is the Court that is responsible for the sentence, not the Counsel.

MR. EAMAN: Very well. Did the Court also -- ?

THE COURT: The Court does have the full advice of its colleagues of the Counsel.

MR. EAMAN: Thank you, your Honor. Did the Court also receive the social history, and background done by the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives in Washington?

THE COURT: Yesterday.

MR. EAMAN: Has the Court had an opportunity review that matter prior to sentencing?

Very well. We would have no additional corrections or additions to make in the
presentence report, other than what we have already reduced to writing in our motion and memorandum. And the addition of the information from the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives. And, therefore, are prepared for sentencing then at this time.

THE COURT: Mr. Ebens, are you prepared to be sentenced at this time?

THE WITNESS, MR. EBENS: Yes.

I am, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything you would like to say?

MR. EAMAN: Your Honor, if the Government has any remarks, I request the Government to go first in this matter.

MR. MERRITT: Theodore Merritt -- the Government has submitted a sentencing memorandum in this case, and took the somewhat infrequent step of making a specific recommendation. The Government has recommended a sentence of incarceration of 30 years. We have done this for a number of reasons. First, of course, is that the crime that was committed in this case has to be judged as the most serious on any legal or moral scale. The Defendant as a result of his intentional interference with Mr. Chin's civil rights caused Mr. Chin's death. That crime in the Congressional view in 1968, they amended the
statute to add a maximum penalty of life imprisonment. The Government has not asked the maximum in this case in part because of Mr. Ebens' lack of a prior criminal record. In other cases under Section 245 where death has resulted, the sentences have always been life.

Most of my comments now are directed to some of the Defense Counsel's statements, and the Defendant's statements that were submitted in writing. In large part the contents of their arguments appear to be wanting to retry this case again. They have still not accepted the verdict of the jury that Ronald Ebens intentionally interfered, intimidated Vincent Chin because he was a Chinese-American, and because he had been enjoying a public bar with the result that he died. That is what the jury found. This Court found that that verdict was supported by the evidence, and that no longer should be an issue. We shouldn't be here arguing about whether, or whether or not there was sufficient evidence for the jury to find the verdict that they did. And that evidence showed that there was an escalation that started with taunting in a bar, with racial epithets, and other profanity. That later led to a search in the vicinity of Mr. Chin, and, finally, the brutal attack that ended in his death.

Now, as Counsel have argued that there may not have been enough evidence to show that Mr.
Ebens intentionally killed Mr. Chin. But I don't think it can be hardly said that at least he acted with a wanton disregard for Mr. Chin's life -- another human being.

And we are troubled somewhat by the consistent theme in Mr. Ebens' statement, and in the Defense Counsel's statement which show a failure to acknowledge responsibility for these acts. That first that failure was first detected in the presentence report done after the State matter was first adjudicated. And the Court is aware of what the doctor found in that, that there was still a denial by Mr. Ebens in regard to responsibility for the offense. And that same denial of responsibility is rampant throughout his whole statement of fact in this case.

Mr. Ebens still wishes to blame Mr. Chin for his own death. He asserts that Mr. Chin was outside waiting for him to come out of the bar, when, in fact, the evidence showed they were waiting for their friend who is inside still in the men's room. Mr. Ebens asserts that he never provoked anybody in the bar itself. That Mr. Chin just came around and threw a first punch at him. Mr. Ebens claims that he took the bat away from Michael Nitz because he didn't want someone from the other group to use the bat on him, and his son-in-law, or his stepson. Mr. Ebens' explanation as to Jimmy Perry, again, defies the
testimony of Jimmy Perry himself, and the facts. Again, failing to acknowledge what the true purpose of enlisting Mr. Perry's aid was.

And then Mr. Ebens' statement that the reason he attacks Mr. Chin with the bat was because he was trying to protect his stepson. Again, shows a distinct failure to acknowledge his responsibility for the death of Mr. Chin.

And the sentence recommended by the Defense Counsel, a year-and-a-day, of course, is designed to minimize the amount of time he would have to spend in prison. Rather than a year -- year-and-a-day, of course, having the ramifications for parole.

And in terms of remorse, Mr. Ebens claimed he had tried to contact Mrs. Chin, and offered to pay her 20 percent of his salary. Well, that left out one other fact that was contingent on Mrs. Chin helping him get his job back.

The other matter, your Honor, which we believe the Court should take into consideration -- and we cited a long string of cases including Supreme Court cases. His own material false testimony from the witness stand. Of course, as the Supreme Court said, there is no intent to chill the Defendant from taking the stand. But, on the other hand, the Court does not have to sit and listen
as do the rest of us, to a Defendant make statements which are patently untrue. His denial, of course, of all the racial remarks was contradicted by the other testimony. But more specifically his denial that he had spoken to the social worker, and admitted at that point that he had been talking about foreign cars and Japs. Well, that was the whole point of that rehearing because as the Court will recall the Defendant sought a rehearing on that issue on whether that testimony would be admitted in rebuttal.

MR. EAMAN: I want to interpose an objection to the Prosecutor's remarks. He is commenting on matters which the Court held a closed hearing on. And I don't think it is appropriate that the matter be commented on at this time.

MR. MERRITT: Your Honor, these are all matters now that are in public papers.

THE COURT: The hearing was closed, Counsel, because of the fact that the jury was to be sworn in the case. The Court will hear what the Plaintiff has to say.

MR. MERRITT: Very well. I was just reminding the Court in their papers for rehearing, on that issue the Defendant stated his decision on whether or not to take the stand would, in fact, be predicated at least in part -- predicated on whether the testimony of
that social worker would be allowed in rebuttal. And having prevailed on that motion, the Defendant then took the stand.

Lastly, your Honor, we agree with Defense Counsel that a Defendant's background is important in sentencing. But we also believe that the victim's background, and the victim's family's background, and the impact on that family is equally as important. That is why Congress passed the Victim Witness Protection Act, and required that a victim impact statement be included in any presentence report. And it is clear that the Defendant's action in this case is the ultimate action against a family. He destroyed two lives. Mr. Chin's, and, of course, his mother's.

And, lastly, we think that a 30 year sentence would appropriately reflect society's intolerance of this type of violent, and antisocial behavior.

Thank you, your Honor.

MR. EAMAN: Your Honor, first of all, I would dispute the Government's remark that a sentence in 245 has always been life. I don't think that's correct.

Second of all, I know, again, that the Government's primary motive seeking a harsh and heavy sentence in this case is to attack Mr. Ebens'
explanation of what happened that night. And I would
remind the Court that unlike the Government's theory of
this case, Mr. Ebens' explanation of what happened that
night has been consistent, truthful, and, we believe,
consistent with the facts as they were proven in the court.

As to the allegation that we wish
to retry this case -- what we wish to do is to bring to the
Court, and to Sentencing Counsel, the entire circumstances
of this event as they were related from the witness stand.

And not merely that this was a Section 245 conviction. And
in doing so, we relayed in our memoranda various circum-
stances relayed by certain witnesses, and certain medical
facts, and other information which we believe were important
in sentencing.

And I would comment only briefly
on the social worker, of course, the inclusion of any
Recorder's Court information -- social worker information,
otherwise. Based on what we perceived to be a 15 minute
interview. Was one of the things we objected to in our
memorandum. It was objected to partly because of incompetence,
we believe, of the person making the observation. We
dispute the allegation; made that any statements were made
particularly since they are not supported by any written
document, or report, or even the notes of the person who
claims the statement was made. And we would ask that any
sentence of the Court -- not be based whatever on that
information from any Recorder's Court, psychiatrist, or
social worker.

We regret that the Court denied
our motion to have a competent psychologist or psychiatrist
who is an expert in the area of alcohol abuse to review
Mr. Ebens, and present to this Court competent and accurate
information about Mr. Ebens, and his background. Had that
been the case, we believe, that the information before the
Court now would have been different than it is before the
Court. I believe that the Court's task in their job is
made difficult today. It is made difficult in part by
arguments by the Government that they just interposed in
part by the great deal of public opinion, pressure, and
comment on this case. And in part by Mr. Ebens. And I
say it is made difficult by Mr. Ebens because when one
looks at Mr. Ebens and his background, one sees a person
who one would not expect to be a Defendant in a Section 245
case.

Mr. Ebens had a typical, normal
life of a midwesterner who grew up on a farm. Went into
the Service, and worked in the auto plants, and then in
30 minutes of his life he went berserk, and acted out of
character. And I say out of character, and I believe the
information we present to the Court supports that his action
on June 19th, 1982, were out of character.

There were reasons for his actions that night. The reasons were pent up anger, and frustration from his employment, and the role of alcohol. I think that someone has to be around men who drink to understand the behavior of June 19th, 1982. It is difficult for anyone to understand how alcohol can do this to a man -- to cause him to act in the manner that Mr. Ebens acted unless one has been around men who have been drinking too much, and have seen this happen before -- sudden violent explosion of a man who drinks too much. An explosion which can turn into random violence; an explosion which can last for minutes or hours. But a phenomenon which, I believe, is recognized. And, again, I regret that we don't have the expert assistance of presenting that phenomenon to the Court.

Of course, the sentence in this case is a difficult sentence because the jury -- because of racial words used, and the character of the event have deemed this a racial crime. That is a verdict which for sentence we accept, and we would always accept the verdict of the jury for sentence. The questions of appeal for a new trial are to be taken up at another time, and we are not here today to dispute the jury's verdict.

And we are sure the Court like all
right thinking Americans like myself is deeply concerned with racial violence. And, in fact, if there is to be a country safe for all races, racial crimes cannot be permitted. And if our streets are to be safe, homicides and crimes of violence cannot be allowed to become commonplace.

But Ron Ebens is not a member of the Ku Klux Klan, or a person who travels around the country shooting interracial couples. Ron Ebens is not an armed robber who preys on the elderly in our streets. Ron Ebens is a man who grew up not causing his parents or his neighbors any problems. Who graduated from high school, Served in the Armed Services of this country. Married his high school girlfriend because she was pregnant, so she wouldn't have to give up her baby. Worked for the same company for 17 years, and had an exemplary employment record. Was a good father to his stepchildren in one marriage, and has become a good father to his first daughter from whom he was estranged for a period of time. He is a good father to his 12 year old daughter of his present marriage. And although children at her school have said to her that your father is a killer, she knows that's not true. And in spite of this behavior which occurred in school, she achieved the top academic award at her grade level in her school.
Ron Ebens as we have presented to the Court from letters from friends and acquaintances is a good neighbor and generous friend. He has always treated people of all races fairly. This is attested to by his friends; by the black bartender, Ira Colleys (ph) who when interviewed by the FBI stated that Ron Ebens drank in his bar, and he drank in Ron Ebens' bar. And stated that Ron Ebens was a racially fair person. The black foreman, who when interviewed by the FBI stated that he never had a racial incident with Ron Ebens, and did not believe that Ron Ebens was a violent person, or a racist. By the black men and women at the plant who worked on the line with Ron Ebens who sent letters to this Court attesting to Mr. Ebens' racial fairness.

There is not indeed one incident in Mr. Ebens' past or background when he caused injury or misery to another human being until June 19, 1982. And looking at his behaviors since June 19, 1982, we see a life that has been shattered. We see someone who despite what the Government insists feels so bad about what happened -- the fact that he is responsible for the death of another human being, that Ron Ebens has to seek psychiatric counseling in order to go on living. In a sense, to Ron Ebens today it will be a relief to sentenced. Because there is nothing more that anyone in the community can do to him. And the
irony is Ron Ebens offered 20 percent of his future lifetime earnings to Mrs. Chin. Not if Mrs. Chin got his job back. But if he were working, he offered his earnings to Mrs. Chin. And that offer, of course, was rejected. And if he serves a lengthy prison sentence, Mrs. Chin will not receive any support or assistance from Ron Ebens in the lawsuit against him that she has filed.

Mr. Ebens is not a person who has been violent. He is not a person who has been a racist. His past life should count for something today. At the age of 44 with a daughter of 12, if he receives a 30 year sentence as the Government requested, he would be released when he is 74 years old, and when his daughter is 42.

At sentencing when the Court has an opportunity to act in an independent fashion, the question before the Court is always justice for the Defendant. In fact, the meaning of justice in our courts is not revenge or vengeance, but it is justice for the litigants who appear in the court. Mr. Ebens has not denied responsibility for Mr. Chin's death. He has only denied the racism which has been claimed to rest in his heart. He has denied that racism had any role to play in this, and he will continue to deny that. And even if I felt otherwise which I do not, I could not advise Mr. Ebens to say to the Court that he does believe that racism played a
role when he does not.

We ask the Court today to turn away from the mean spirited and grim attitudes of vengeance, and revenge which have infected the hearts of our citizens and our Courts. If we live for an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, the whole world would be blind. Mr. Ebens based on his past, what he has been through recently, and his alcohol problems deserves not a harsh, cruel sentence, but the compassion, understanding, and assistance of a Court of Law.

Thank you. I believe Mr. Lawson also has some remarks to make.

MR. LAWSON: Your Honor, I don't believe I can add to that.

THE COURT: Mr. Ebens, is there anything you would like to say?

THE WITNESS: MR. EBENS: Only, your Honor, I have expressed my regret and remorse on several occasions, and I would just like to reiterate that one more time. I am sorry for what happened. I can't say anymore than that. At this point, I have no recourse but to depend on the American system of justice, and you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that all?

It is adjudged, Mr. Ebens, that
you are committed to the custody of the Attorney General for a term of 25 years. It will be recommended that you be committed to an institution where you may receive treatment for alcohol abuse.

You have a motion?

MR. LAWSON: Your Honor, we have filed a written motion for appeal bond, and we ask the Court to continue the bond that Mr. Ebens has been placed under, and has honored throughout the course of these proceedings. The Court continue the bond after his conviction.

I would indicate to the Court, in addition to the allegations that we have stated in our motion that we have already filed a notice of appeal this morning. That the voluntary surrender statement in the probation report has been favorable. That Mr. Ebens has been aware all along of the 30 year recommendation by the Government, and has appeared voluntarily. And the pretrial services agency has been given a very favorable report about Mr. Ebens' faithfulness to the orders and dictates of the Court. And he would continue to be faithful to that pronouncement, and requirement in the future pending appeal.

THE COURT: Anything from the Government?
MR. MERRITT: We believe there are -- this case is not going to be reversed on appeal. And under that standard, we believe the Court would be within its power to order Mr. Ebens to report.

THE COURT: Well, assuming that bond will be ordered, what is the Government's position on bond?

MR. MERRITT: If bond was ordered, we would not object to the continuation of the personal secured bond.

THE COURT: Circumstances are substantially changed. The Court will order a cash or surety bond $20,000. You have filed your notice of appeal this morning?

MR. LAWSON: Yes.

MR. EAMAN: Yes, we did.

THE COURT: Mr. Ebens, you are aware, and I must advise you at this time if you cannot afford Counsel to represent you on appeal, this Court will appoint Counsel.

MR. LAWSON: Your Honor, under the circumstances there is a change in the bond, we would ask the Court to allow a report date nonetheless between now, and the -- generally the report date we would request is 30 days, and in the interim allow Mr. Ebens to assemble
his resources, and post the appeal bond. And at least continue the present bond for a 30 day period to allow us to furnish the increased appeal bond.

MR. EAMAN: We would note that probation department recommended that he be allowed to report date in this case.

THE COURT: What is the 30 days? No later than noon on Thursday, October 18th.

MR. LAWSON: Would that be to the designated institution, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LAWSON: That's October 18th.

THE COURT: We'll take a recess.
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