ANSWER KEY

Citizenship in the Courts: Compare & Contrast

Ozawa v. United States	*Similarities*	*Thind v. United States*
Argument for citizenship was based on appearance (i.e., having white skin).	The rulings meant to define whiteness in a way that excludes people of color.	Caucasian. (At the time, people from India were sometimes considered Caucasian by anthropologists.)
Decision cited "scientific" understanding of race, which influenced the ruling.	The rulings were meant to exclude those deemed "other"(or "foreign") by the vast public from citizenship.	A white person was defined as someone who the "common, unscientific" person would consider and recognize as white; this was different from defining whiteness as someone from Caucasus.
A white person was defined as Caucasian or someone from Caucasus.	Race is constructed; whiteness is what people decide it is - it is not a fixed category or designation.	Race is a social category, not scientific category.
The ruling affirmed anti-Japanese sentiments.	The rulings re-affirmed racist racial policies that informed U.S. immigration/ naturalization and that perpetuated Asian exclusion.	The ruling led to the revocation of citizenship from Indian immigrants who had been able to naturalize prior to 1923.
	Neither case challenged the legality of racial restrictions to citizenship.	
	Argument for citizenship was based on being	

© The Asian American Education Project. All rights reserved.