

200 Left History 15.1

this is a sadly missed opportunity.

In relation to the latter goal, Soja rightly shows that much spatial theoretical development must be understood as rooted in the insights Henri Lefebvre developed over his long career (leavened with more than a few dashes of Foucault). He explains that a robust theory of spatial justice requires an “ontological restructuring” (69) that allows the aspatial, liberal, Rawlsian theories of justice that are dominant in much political philosophy to be transcended by a spatialized theory of justice that understands uneven development to be a root fact of life and that gives rise to and supports both the theorizing of, and political struggle for, what Lefebvre called the “right to the city.” But then things turn weird. Instead of examining in any depth the work of those theorists who have toiled away on this project of ontological restructuring (Harvey, Castells, Young, and a raft of lesser theorists, myself included), critiquing them where necessary and out of that developing a more robust theory of spatial justice, Soja instead dismisses them not because their work is lacking (he is in fact frequently generous in his appreciation of aspects of this work), but because they possess “little inclination to use either of the specific terms of spatial or territorial justice.” (91) This complaint – a dismissal, really – is repeated over and over again (e.g. 82 [twice], 87, 91, 107), even as those couple of geographers who have used the terms explicitly are praised. In neither case, however, does Soja really examine the *substance* of the arguments he is examining to see whether or not the arguments at stake in fact contribute to the project of theorizing spatial justice, even if the explicit term is not used. The result, intended or not, reads like a blacklist rather than an engaged critique. This too is a sadly missed opportunity.

Nonetheless *Seeking Social Justice* possesses much of value. As a chronicle of Soja’s long and productive career, it is enlightening. The vignettes about organizing in LA of which the BRU is just one example whet the appetite. The bibliographic essay that concludes the book is an excellent resource for anyone seeking the richness of theories of spatial justice (as long as they are not too worried about whether the specific term is used or not). And the encomium for the Right to the City movement that appears off and on throughout the book is particularly welcome at a moment when signs of progressive organizing around critical urban issues are all too few and far between.

Don Mitchell
Syracuse University

Moon-Kie Jung, *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii’s Interracial Labor Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006).

In the United States and other multiracial nations, how do workers from different races and ethnic groups become a unified class? According to most labour histo-

rians, workers develop awareness of their common interests by replacing their older racial consciousness with new class consciousness. In contrast, Moon-Kie Jung argues that this widely accepted viewpoint of “deracialization” is misleading. Instead, Jung proposes that workers’ pre-existing consciousness becomes “stretched and remolded” to reinterpret and rework race (7). In other words, rather than class consciousness replacing race consciousness, workers transform their notions of race to encompass class.

Jung develops this analysis of the relationship between race and class through a detailed study of Hawaii from the mid-1800s to 1946. From the mid-nineteenth century to the early 1940s in colonial Hawaii, an immigrant workforce was divided racially and ethnically in the islands’ main industries of sugar, pineapple, and longshoring. Although immigrant workers waged militant strikes against the white oligarchy controlling Hawaii, especially on sugar plantations, they were unable to unite across racial and ethnic lines. Hawaii’s three main groups of immigrant workers – Japanese, Filipino, and Portuguese – formed ethnic-specific labour associations, and despite efforts to form strategic alliances to counter employers’ divide-and-conquer tactics, the workers remained divided until 1946. Thus, according to a U.S. Department of Labor report, until 1944 Hawaii was one of the least organized areas in the U.S. and its territories. However, by 1946 it had become one of the most highly organized areas (107). What happened to dramatically change this situation?

Labour historians identify the 1946 strike in the sugar industry lasting 79 days as the transformative moment. Led by the International Longshore and Warehousemen Union (ILWU), the workers organized interracially, with Japanese and Filipino Americans especially modeling the new class consciousness. Jung agrees with labour historians on the impact of the 1946 strike for changing the political landscape of Hawaii. However, in contrast to standard interpretations of the strike, Jung contends that for workers a new class consciousness did not replace their older racial consciousness. Instead, new ideas of class combined with pre-existing notions of race. To explain this development, Jung examines earlier racial ideas of workers and how they shifted.

In nineteenth century Hawaii, the white elite that controlled the sugar and pineapple industries constructed a rigid racial hierarchy to govern an immigrant workforce. They regarded Portuguese as nonwhites but different from Asian “cheap labor.” Portuguese became foremen on the sugar plantations and were seen as a “model minority.” (73) In contrast, Japanese and Filipinos were initially defined as “cheap labor,” replacing earlier Chinese “coolies.” The status of Japanese in Hawaii, however, changed by the 1930s due to two developments: the coming of age of second-generation Japanese American “citizens,” and the suspicion over their “national loyalty” due to the emergence of Japan as a powerful nation state threatening the hegemony of the U.S. in the Pacific (82). Meanwhile, the white elite regarded Filipinos as an “inferior race” due to coming from the col-

onized nation of the Philippines (84). The racial classifications of the white oligarchy impacted how workers saw each other and themselves, influencing the kinds of struggles they waged (i.e., ethnic-specific labour associations) and their strategic thinking about how to unite against a common enemy. Thus, from the mid-1800s to the early 1940s, workers struggled among themselves over racial classifications like coolie, cheap labor, citizen, *haole*, and American, “defining what these categories meant and who belonged to them” (188). To unite together, workers of different ethnic groups needed to confront and overcome qualitatively different racial inequalities.

According to Jung, during World War II and the immediate years preceding it, new “mobilizing structures” and “political opportunities” enabled workers to transform their thinking about race and class (107). In this period, workers took advantage of New Deal legislation and the coming of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to Hawaii. Longshoremen in the islands gained resources and new approaches to organizing from their contact with West Coast counterparts. Japanese Americans fought valiantly in World War II, shifting perception in the islands of their loyalty.

The impact of these developments culminated in the 1946 strike. For Jung, the strike represented for workers a new understanding of racial justice as encompassing united worker power. In other words, workers defined the strike as not simply an economic struggle – i.e., a campaign for better wages and working conditions and union power – but as part of the historical struggle of workers in the islands against racial discrimination and for the rights of immigrants against a common oppressor.

Can Jung’s insights about the relationship of race and class be applied to other multiracial settings, beyond colonial Hawaii? Most definitely. However, the crucial starting point is for labour historians and social scientists – as well as labour and community organizers – to discard the predominant framework of “deracialization” and to understand that the making of a working class integrally involves racial justice.

Glenn Omatsu
California State University, Northridge

Neil Foley, *Quest for Equality: The Failed Promise of Black-Brown Solidarity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

Race relations between African Americans and Mexican Americans are commanding greater attention from scholars. Both racial groups have comprised key constituencies of the American left during the twentieth century. A contributor to the Du Bois Institute of African and African American Research Nathan Huggins’ Lecture Series, Neil Foley’s *Quest for Equality* explains the historical failure of Black-