

The Chinese As Sojourners: A Study In
The Sociology of Migration

by

C. Livingston Daley

A Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty
in Sociology in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy, the City University of New York.

1977

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

25 January 1978
date

Dorothy H. Larson
Chairman of Examining Committee

25 January 1978
date

Richard Cecutti
Executive Officer

Michael Brown
(Dr. Michael Brown)

Benjamin Ringer
(Dr. Benjamin Ringer)

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ABSTRACT

THE CHINESE AS SOJOURNERS: A STUDY IN
THE SOCIOLOGY OF MIGRATION

by

C. Livingston Daley

Adviser: Professor Sidney Aronson

Because European immigration has been unparalleled in its scope, it has influenced demographic theories in America. The consequence has been that the majority of theories and generalizations found in demography have assumed permanence and have regarded all migrants as intending to establish permanent settlement. These formulations have been unable to adequately account for those who migrate with the intention of returning home. Thus, demographic theory provides few useful generalizations that would enable us to describe temporary migration.

In order to provide a theoretical frame work for temporary migration, we have modified Paul C.P. Siu's conception of the sojourner. Such a modification underscores migration as a resultant of economic pressures in the native ecological complex and argues that migration is used as an economic outlet. Further, the motive for migrating is to earn enough money to return to the homeland or

while migrants are sojourning, they remitt wages home in order to support their families. The critical issue is the intention to return home and this is what distinguishes the immigrant from the sojourner.

Also,sojourners tend to leave their families behind because of the cultural restrictions placed on the migration of women in the homeland. This issue is mainly a feature of non-western societies, (China, Africa, India). Other reasons for leaving behind families include the inability to pay the passage of their wives and children, political restrictions placed on the migration of families in the host country, and the unwillingness to bring a family along while adjusting to a new environment. With the lack of women, sojourner settlements differ from those of immigrants because they are mainly composed of males, with an almost total absence of females, and are usually segregated from the host society. Thus, the intention to return home, the restrictions placed on females migrating and the use of migration as an economic outlet, influence the demographic characteristics of the migratory group. In addition, the characteristics of the migrants will influence the types of settlement structured in the host society.

Finally, having provided the theoretical formulations of temporary migration, we will empirically test them by an analysis of Chinese migration to the United States during the period of 1850-1870.

PREFACE

This study was an outgrowth of the dissatisfaction with the way many demographers have handled the issue of remigration, which is the process of leaving one's country for a period and returning to it. There are three explanations given for this. One, improved communication between the two areas facilitates movement in both directions. Two, attractions at the destination area may lessen or disappear. And three, some of those who moved in may always have intended to leave.¹ The general consensus among demographers is that remigrants are different from immigrants who settle permanently, however, they do not differ in any consistent pattern.

We decided to start with the premise that remigrants do differ from immigrants, especially those who intend to return. Thus, remigrants are motivated differently in comparison to immigrants. For example, let us assume, for the time being, that remigrants may only be interested in accumulating enough money in order to return home and invest it in some type of commercial activity. Then, if this were the case, migrants who intend to return to the homeland maybe very different from immigrants because "they would be less able or willing to acculturate to their new environment than immigrants are."² The interesting issue is that some demographers tend to accept this point

1. William Petersen, Population, (New York: Macmillian, 1969), page 260.

2. Ibid., page 267.

but they feel that few generalizations maybe added to it. We tend to disagree because any analysis of migration must begin with the motives that explain why and how migrants leave, while others stay. Further, the decision to settle permanently and the decision to return to the homeland are both motivated differently. Given the differences in motives there will be differences in the demographic characteristics of immigrants and remigrants. In addition, these characteristics will influence the types of settlement established by both groups.

It is our contention that when migration to the United States is considered, some groups migrate with the intention of settling permanently and others migrate with the intention of returning to the homeland. Thus, the purpose of the following study is to use Chinese migration to the United States as a way of examining some of the differences between immigrants and remigrants. Although we will use historical data for our examination, the subject matter is sociological because our primary interest is not to historically account for Chinese migration to America, but to shed some light on migration to the United States in general.

The study begins with a discussion of sociological theory and moves from there to an empirical analysis of the theory. Chapter one locates the inability of demography to theoretically account for temporary migration and it introduces the reader to the issue of motivation, which is crucial to both the permanent and temporary types of migration. Chapter two locates the sociological concept of the

sojourner, which has been used to describe temporary migration in general and Chinese migration in particular. The salient feature of the concept reflects the issue of remigration. The rest of the study is concerned with the empirical examination of the concept sojourner. Chapter three looks at the reasons (motives) why the Chinese emigrated, the ties to the area of migration, and it tries to account for the intention to return to the homeland. In chapter four we are interested in measuring the intention to return to the homeland. This is accomplished by using the demographic characteristics of the Chinese as an index of the intention to return. Chapter five examines some of the implications of the demographic characteristics, especially those that influence community settlement. Chapter six explores the relationship between the legislative acts that were enacted for the Chinese and their effects in confining the group to their sojourner status.

A subject as complex as ours requires a wide variety of sources. Thus, we have placed equal weight on both primary and secondary sources. In addition, secondary sources were used as a guide in the formulation of our generalizations. We were able to do this because of the great abundance of studies that have been done on immigration to the United States in general, and on the Chinese in particular. Although we have relied heavily on census data, we have also included testimony and secondary sources in order to establish our empirical evidence. In the cases where the data were unavailable to us, we constructed our own from primary sources. For example, in order to

provide an idea of wages in China during the period of our investigation, we examined the California Senate Report on Chinese Immigration and constructed a wage table for the southeastern part of China from the testimony contained in it. The same may be said of the marital status of the Chinese migrants. Here we examined the contemporary sources and established an idea of the percentage of those married. Having done so, we examined the census data in order to find out the numbers of those who left their wives in China. As a side point, the reader should be cautioned that the figures on Chinese migration vary depending on the source. Further, the census figures are not totally accurate, census data never are. However, we have found Mary Roberts Coolidge's figures to be the most reliable by far because she has taken into account those who have died, arrived and departed in establishing the numbers of Chinese in the United States. Overall, the figures cited should be considered as rough estimates rather than exact statistical representations. As such, they do not alter our findings nor our generalizations.

Now a word or two about how we proceeded to measure the motives of the migrants. It is our contention that sojourners are those who migrate from one area to another with the intention to return to the homeland once they have acquired what they consider enough money. The problem is however, such a motivation cannot be established directly because it is not directly available to the senses. We must infer this motive from the behavior which is produced. First, we must assume that those who leave the homeland are not a random sample of

the population. If this were the case then the social characteristics of the migrants will provide for us the knowledge of who migrates and why? From the demographic characteristics of the migrants (age, sex, family status and remigration rate) we will be able to locate the motive for the migration. Second, the demographic characteristics will influence the type of community that sojourners will establish and another empirical measure of motivation will be whether or not the community is able to reproduce its population. If it is not able to do so, then it must rely on migration in order to maintain itself. And third, if the host government enacts legislation prohibiting the migration of sojourners, then eventually the group must either marry outside of it, or if unable to do so, they will age and die.

Chinese migration became intensified because of the favorable reports to make money in California. Exaggerated tales of fabulous wealth, high wages and the possibility of making quick fortunes were advertised on placards, maps and pamphlets. Ship captains, recognizing the profits to be made in transporting the human cargo of Chinese were quick to advertise the virtues of California. Early Chinese goldseekers who returned to their native land after years of toil were walking advertisements for the riches of California. All of this served to influence others, who hoped that they too could go to California and earn enough in order to enjoy their accumulation in the land of their birth. Descriptively, this was the motivating factor in the Chinese migration to the United States.

At first the early Chinese migrants were welcomed because the ever

expanding economy of golden California needed their labor. However, due to end of gold strike and the shrinkage in the economic opportunities of California, the Chinese were regarded as competitors and an anti-Chinese resentment resulted. By 1871, this resentment was organized around the interest of the white working class. Eventually, the anti-Chinese movement took on a national perspective which resulted in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. Due to the hostility directed towards the Chinese after 1870, many of the migrants returned to China and the others who stayed made the decision to become immigrants. Thus, when we characterized Chinese migration as a sojourner type, we are mainly concerned with the period 1850-1870.

.....

It is often very difficult to acknowledge the debts owed to all of the people who has assisted me in the development of my ideas during the years of my graduate training. To all of my Professors and colleagues who have helped along the way, many thanks.

The following individuals are owed a debt I can never repay: Stanford Lyman of the New School, who has influenced my ideas in this study, Professors Aronson, Brown and Ringer, all of whom have provided a guiding hand in the shaping of this study, and Ms. Jo-Ann Terry who has provided here excellent typing skills.

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation to the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, a place which has had a positive impact on my life and I pray that it continues to serve its students.

C. Livingston Daley
July, 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I	Page 16.
Introducing the Problem.	
CHAPTER II	Page 33.
On the Sociology of Migration.	
CHAPTER III	Page 56.
The Push and Pull Factors: Causes of Emigration.	
CHAPTER IV	Page 105.
Demographic Characteristics of the Migration.	
CHAPTER V	Page 143.
Demographic Characteristics and community structure.	
CHAPTER VI	Page 169.
Conclusions and Implications: Sojourner Migration and its relationship to enacted legislation.	
APPENDIX	Page 189.
BIBLIOGRAPHY	Page 194.

LIST OF TABLES

Table I	Page 21	Percentage of Remigration for Various Nationalities.
Table II	Page 66	Origins of Chinese Immigrants to New York City.
Table III	Page 79	Eight Clans of Lo-Chuan (Shensi).
Table IV	Page 102	Estimates of the Growth of the Five District Companies.
Table V	Page 111	Occupations of the Chinese in San Francisco.
Table VI	Page 112	Testimony of Wages Paid in China.
Table VII	Page 113	Wages of Chinese Laborers in California, 1883-1884.
Table VIII	Page 114	Growth of California's Population 1850-1870.
Table IX	Page 117	Chinese in Mining Counties of California, including San Francisco.
Table X	Page 121	Population of California by Age and Sex, 1860.
Table XI	Page 124	Chinese in the United States, 1820-1900.
Table XII	Page 125	Sex of Chinese Immigrants to the United States, 1854-1864.
Table XIII	Page 126	Comparison of Permanent Immigrants and Sojourners by Place of Origin and Sex, 1853-1855.
Table XIV	Page 127	Age and Sex of Chinese Immigrants admitted to the United States, 1950-1960.
Table XV	Page 128	Percentage of the Chinese Population Reported for each Age Period by Sex, 1900.

Table XVI	Page 129	Chinese Population in the United States by Sex, 1860-1900.
Table XVII	Page 132	Marital Status of the Chinese in the United States, 1890-1910.
Table XVIII	Page 133	Marital Status of Chinese Laborers in Selected Industries, 1910.
Table XIX	Page 134	Native Born and Foreign Born of the Chinese Population, 1870.
Table XX	Page 137	Chinese Passengers Arrived and Departed at the Port of San Francisco, 1852-1876.
TABLE XXI	Page 138	Increase and Decrease of the Chinese Population in the United States, 1850-1920.
Table XXII	Page 149	Testimony of the Presidents of the Six Companies, 1876.
Table XXIII	Page 159	Chinese Males and Females, Native and Foreign Born: 1850-1950.
Table XXIV	Page 160	Japanese Males and Females, Native and Foreign Born: 1850-1950.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCING THE PROBLEM

In 1885, E.G. Ravenstein presented his theory of migration to the members of the Royal Statistical Society in London and it may be considered the first theory of migration.³ Many of his generalizations are still considered valid in demography. For example, the idea that females predominate among short distance migrants and that each main current of migration produces a counter stream. The reason why many of these generalizations are still valid is because demographers have been unwilling to theorize about migration⁴ or if demographers do establish theories, the major concern has been with permanent immigration. Remigration, the migration of those who leave their country for a period, and then return to it, has not been theoretically developed by demographers, even though there have been studies done in that area.⁵

The mass movement from Europe in the nineteenth century was

3. E.G. Ravenstein, "The Laws of Migration," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, XLVIII, (June, 1885), pages 167-227.

4. Rupert B. Vance, "Is theory for Demographers?," Social Forces, XXXI, (October, 1952), pages 9-13.

5. See the following: Rowland T. Berthoff, British Immigrants in Industrial America, 1790-1950, (Mass: Harvard University Press, 1953), R.T. Appleyard, "The Return Movement of the United Kingdom, Migrants from Australia," Population Studies 15, 1962, pages 214-255, A.H. Richmond, "Demographic and Family Characteristics of British Immigrants Returning from Canada," International Migration 4, 1966 pages 21-26 and Theodore Sacoutos, They Remember America: The Story of the Repatriated Greek American, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956).

unparalleled in its scope and numbers. Theorists, in trying to explain this phenomenon, formulated concepts and typologies, many of which did not fit other kinds of migration. Further, embedded in the constructs used to explain European migration was the assumption of permanent settlement and this assumption was applied to all types of migration. This assumption is usually found in the definition of immigration. For example, Henry Fairchild defines immigration as:

A movement of people, individually or in families, acting on their own personal initiative and responsibility, without official support or compulsion passing from one well developed country (usually old and thickly settled to another well developed country, usually new and sparsely populated) with the intention of residing there permanently.⁶

Maurice Davie, in adopting Henry Fairchild's definition retained the assumption of permanence. Unlike Fairchild, however, he allows for temporary migration when there exists the international exchange of labor. He states:

The term immigration covers two distinct phenomena. There is migration for the purpose of settlement, consisting in settlement in another country for a long period, generally permanent and there is the international exchange of labor, a temporary and fluctuating phenomenon which follows the oscillations in international labor market.⁷

For some curious reason, Davie accepts the definition of immigration by the United States Bureau of Immigration and also argues

6. Henry Pratt Fairchild, Immigration: A World Movement and its American Significance, (New York: Macmillian, 1920), page 26.

7. Maurice Davie, World Immigration, (New York: Macmillian, 1947), page 8.

that is contains the essential characteristics of immigration. He states:

...An immigrant is an alien whose last permanent residence was in some foreign country and who comes with the declared intention of residing here permanently. Residence of twelve months or more is considered permanent.⁸

The problem is that the Bureau's definition of immigration reflects an administrative way of categorizing immigrants, however, it does not take into account the immigrant's motives nor the consequence of motives and settlement. In any event, for Davie, "true emigration involves a permanent change of residence" and this locates the assumption of permanence in migration.⁹ Further, implicit in this assumption about immigration is the motive for migration, that is, the immigrants migrate in order to establish a new life in the new country and eventually assimilates. Thus, Davie writes:

Assimilation is a social and cultural process involving on one hand, the fusion of cultural heritages and, on the other, modification of sentiments and attitudes and the gradual incorporation of the strangers into the culture group. It goes on wherever contact and communication exists between groups. Much of it takes place automatically without formal or official interference. It is as inevitable as it is desirable. The process may be hastened or delayed; it cannot be stopped.¹⁰

Because Fairchild assumes that "migration involves an actual and"¹¹

8. Ibid., page 8.

9. Ibid., page 7.

10. Ibid., pages 498-499.

11. Fairchild, op. cit., page 3.

permanent change of residence," he must assume assimilation as an outcome. However, for him, "real assimilation means adopting American standards, customs, ideals, institutions and mores and the only way this can be brought about is through close, intimate and constant association with those in whom it is embodied."¹² The issue is, that even though Fairchild discusses the "increase in temporary or seasonal immigration,"¹³ it is not picked up in his discussion of assimilation. It would seem obvious that any discussion of assimilation, that is grounded in the necessity for close and intimate contact, would have to address itself to temporary migration because this type would minimize contact and intimacy. Rather, it is regarded as an after thought, or at best, it is not considered real migration. Fairchild, is not alone in this because Davie also discusses the issue of seasonal migration¹⁴ and in his chapter on assimilation¹⁵ he adopted Park and Miller's typology of personality types that are favorable or unfavorable to assimilation.¹⁶ What is interesting is that Davie lists the type of "the caffone," an immigrant who is isolated both from American life and from that of his

12. Ibid., pages 408-409.

13. Ibid., pages 379-380.

14. Davie, op. cit., pages 449-450.

15. Ibid., pages 547-563.

16. See Robert E. Park and Herbert A. Miller, Old World Traits Transplanted, (New York: Arno Press, 1969), pages 81-118.

national group, whose only thought is to make money and return home."¹⁷ However, he never developed it in its relation to immigration or assimilation. Thus, temporary migration is again viewed as an after thought or a residual item. The main theoretical problem is that if immigration was not permanent then it was treated as a residual item, but not as meaningful as migration. There can be no doubt that the assumption of permanency and the theoretical constructs used in relation to that assumption were influenced by European migration.

William Petersen states the issue well when he writes:

The age of discovery and colonization merged into the great migration. The mass movement from Europe in the nineteenth century was on a scale new in human history. Of the sixty-seven million persons who crossed an ocean from 1800 to 1950, some sixty million were Europeans, and of these, two out of every three went to the United States. That analysts of migration,¹⁸ and particularly the Americans among them, should derive their precepts entirely from this prototype, is perhaps understandable for the strong tendency in all of us toward ethnocentrism, is here, reinforced by the universal significance of this element of American civilization. Here we shall try to avoid that trap.¹⁹

What is interesting is Petersen also fell into the same trap, even though he tried to avoid it. For example, he deals with remigration in two different places, however, in both places

17. Davie, op. cit., page 408-409.

18. Besides Fairchild and Davie, see also: Marcus L. Hansen, The Atlantic Migration, 1607-1860, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), John R. Commons, Races and Immigrants to America, (New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1962) and Oscar Handlin, Immigration as a Factor in American History, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1969).

19. Ibid., pages 252-253.

remigration was never theoretically structured. In the section "total vs. net migration" he states that "with respect to both internal and international movement that for every major migration stream, a counterstream develops."²⁰ In explaining this phenomenon,

TABLE I. PERCENTAGE OF REMIGRATION
FOR VARIOUS NATIONALITIES, 1908-1923.
(The average remigration rate was 35.2 percent of the immigration)

<u>Nationality</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Nationality</u>	<u>Rate</u>
Chinese	130	Lithuanian	25
Bulgaria, Serbian, and Montanegrin	89	Syrian	24
Turkish	86	Scandinavian	22
Korean	73	African	22
Rumanian	66	French	21
Hungarian	66	English	21
Southern Italian	60	Mexican	19
Cuban	58	Dutch and Flemish	18
Slovak	57	Armenian	15
Russian	52	Scotch and Welsh	13
Finnish	29	Irish	11
		Jewish	5

Source: William Petersen, op. cit., page 260.

Petersen postulates three reasons: "improved communication between two areas facilitates movement in both directions; the original attractions at the first destination may lessen or disappear, in part, even as a consequence of the increased numbers; and some of those who moved in may always have intended to leave."²¹ He goes on to argue that "remigrants, those who leave their country (or area)

20. Ibid., page 260.

21. Ibid., page 260.

for a period, and then return to it, typically makes up a large portion of any movement and that they ordinarily differ from the migrants who remain abroad, but not necessarily according to any consistent pattern."²² For him, one main difference is that "remigrants were less able to acculturate to their new environment than the immigrants who remained" but beyond this, few generalizations may be added.²³ What is of interest is that he cites the average rate of remigration in the United States as 35.2 percent for the years 1908 to 1923 and then lists Ferenczi's table of rates for the different nationalities.²⁴ (See Table I.) In explaining the two extremities, the Chinese and the Jews, he felt that "special factors influenced the remigration rate" of the Chinese, and that is why more departed than arrived, and so far as the Jews were concerned he felt that "many of them were classified elsewhere. For example, they could have been classified as Russian, Rumanian or French."²⁵ The point to be made is that when one considers Chinese immigration from the standpoint of special factors without ever locating what those factors may be or even trying to develop some reasons for such a high remigration rate, one is reducing the issue of remigration to a peculiarity. As an area, it is not real

22. Ibid., page 260.

23. Ibid., page 261.

24. Imre Ferenczi, International Migrations: I Statistics, (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1929), publication number 14, pages 206-207.

25. Petersen, op. cit., pages 260-261.

migration as the permanent kind is, and thereby, not worthy of attention. Even the case of Jewish remigration may be explained other than the fact that they were classified elsewhere. Rather, the migration of Jews prior to World War I, contained a large proportion of females and children, more so than other nationalities.²⁶ No doubt, they had intended to stay, because, the more permanent the migration, the larger the number of women and children.²⁷ Thus, the motives of immigrants are important in locating permanent migration or temporary migration. Further, migration consists of many types, such as forced migration, migratory labor, etc., and as such, European migration cannot be used as a guide for all migrations mainly because it contains many distinct types of population movements.²⁸ What accounts for the difference between one type of migration and another is the cause of the migration and the motives of the migrants. We will now ask two questions. First what causes temporary migration, and what are the motives of the immigrants who migrate temporarily? It is obvious that the two questions are related, however, let us try to analytically separate them.

In trying to answer what causes temporary migration, we must

26. See Liebman Herch, "International Migration of the Jews" in Walter Willcox, International Migration 2: Interpretations, (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1931), page 471-520, and Isaac Hourwich, Immigration and Labor, (New York: Arno Press, 1969), page 497.

27. Davie, op. cit., page 223.

28. Petersen, op. cit., page 253.

assume that it is free migration rather than forced migration we are explaining.²⁹ This is so because in forced migration, migrants do not decide whether or not to leave, the state or some other powerful body makes the decision, whereas in free migration, the migrants make the decision. If the migration is free, the will or wish of the migrant is of crucial importance in any discussion of migratory causes. Another important concern is whether or not the immigrants come from a population that is sedentary or one that is migratory. For example, the causes of migration are different if the group is nomadic. Then, the usual typology of "push, those conditions at home that repel, and pull, those conditions abroad that attract,"³⁰ factors cannot be used. Such a typology assumes a sedentary population and not a nomadic one. In our case, we are assuming a sedentary population. "Once a people have a permanent place of residence, the relevance of push and pull factors are presumable greater."³¹

For our purposes, the "push" factors in temporary migration will take into account the problematic aspects of the region of migration and the propensity to leave. Problematic aspects usually involve economic hardships at home, where subsistence is a problem. In this context, migration is viewed as an economic outlet and the immigrant's

29. Forced migration may also be temporary. For example, the importation of laborers by the Nazis in order to maintain their industry during World War II.

30. Petersen, op. cit., page 289.

31. Ibid., page 290.

motive for leaving is an economic one. Thus, the migrant who goes abroad temporarily because of the lack of economic opportunities at home, is using migration as a means of achieving a new level of economic opportunity. Obviously, the pull factors or conditions in the host country are crucial in determining both the cause of the migration and the motive of the migrants.

At this point, a few words of clarification are in order. When we use the term "cause of migration," we are postulating, in effect, a theory of migration. That is, we are logically relating factors in the homeland (push) to factors abroad (pull) in such a way as to account for the movement between the two places. Further, this is a way of rationally organizing the movement, in such a way as to produce a theory. The same may be said of "motives for migrating." The concept motive is not to be thought of simply as the private state of the individual, as is often the case, but rather as a way of rationally organizing the actions of the immigrants in such a way as to see the "causes of migration" as an intelligible link.³² Or to put the matter in Weberian terms, "a motive is a complex of subjective meaning which seems to the actor himself or to the observer, an adequate ground for the conduct in question."³³ Taken together, causes and motives provide

32. For a complete discussion of the perspective on motives see Peter McHugh, et. al., On the Beginning of Social Inquiry, (London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), pages 21-46.

33. Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, (New York: Free Press, 1947), page 98.

our theory with logical consistency. Petersen states the issue clearly, although he confuses the analytical and concrete parameters of the relationship between motives and causes:

In particular, if we fail to distinguish between personal motives and social causes - that is, if we do not take the emigrant's level of aspiration into account - our analysis must lack logical clarity.³⁴

Since the "causes" of immigration (push and pull factors) are important in our analysis of temporary migration, some further clarifications are in order. In the area of demography, there has been considerable confusion in regards to whether or not the push factors are of primary importance.³⁵ Petersen seems to feel that the pull factors are of more importance. He states:

Everything that we know about selectivity by more easily defined characteristics, such as sex, indicates the greater importance of pull factors: the dominance of males or of females is generally determined less by the conditions at home than by the opportunities for one or the other at the destination.³⁶

This may be. However, if a group is using migration as an economic outlet and has a history of migration to different technological environments, then; it is not the pull factor that is of importance, rather, it is the push factor. Thus, it is difficult to determine which factor is of more importance by only examining the demographic

34. Petersen, op. cit., page 290.

35. For a brief discussion of this confusion, see Ibid, page 272.

36. Ibid., page 272.

characteristics of migrants. This is not to say, however, that the pull factor is not important, on the contrary, it is important in terms of understanding the movement to a particular place and the structuring of the motive for migration.

Once the "causes" of migration have been accounted for, implicit in the theory are the motives for the migration. Since migrants may not be a random sample of a population, one has to account for why in "any situation some leave and others stay."³⁷ However, since motives are logical constructs of any observer, "they cannot be established directly, rather, they must be inferred"³⁸ from the social characteristics of the migrants (age, sex, family status, occupation, etc.,). In demography, the social characteristics that are reflected in the migration are called "migratory selection, the process of migrants reflecting various social characteristics, such as age, sex, occupation and marital status."³⁹ These characteristics are useful as a source of empirically testing "causes" and motives, as well as providing generalizations about the migration. The objective characteristics that are used in this process are: age, sex, family status, occupation and psychological factors.⁴⁰ Motives for migration are considered important in the early stages of the migration. Once mass migration exists, motives no

37. Ibid., page 262.

38. Ibid., page 262

39. Ibid., page 262.

40. Ibid., page 262-275.

longer become reliable guides. Petersen states:

The most significant attribute of pioneers, as in other areas of life, is that they blaze trails that others follow, and sometimes the number who do so grows into a broad stream. Migration becomes a style, an established pattern, an example of collective behavior...When emigration has been set as a social pattern, it is no longer relevant to inquire concerning individual motivations. For the individual is...in an unstable state of equilibrium, in which only a small impulse in either direction decides his course; thus, the motives he ascribes to his emigration are either trivial or perhaps more likely to be generalizations that he thinks are expected.⁴¹

So far, we have sketched some of the problems involved in the area of migration. The area has been dominated by generalizations derived from European migration, most of which imply the assumption of permanency in migration. We agree with Petersen that European migration is only one type among many. However, another type, temporary, has not been theoretically examined by demographers. In this section, we have tried to lay some basic foundations on which we may be able to theorize about temporary migration. The crucial issue is the role of motives because they locate the reasons for the migration and, in this regard, the distinction between permanent migration and temporary migration may be provided for by the immigrant's intentions (reasons) for migrating. Thus, if immigrants migrate in order to earn money, so that they are able to live more adequately in their homeland, then it is logical to conclude that once they have acquired the money, they will return home. Thus, motive for

⁴¹. Ibid., page 297.

migration not only will determine who migrates (the social characteristics of the migrants) and why, but also how they migrate as well as from where they migrate. The final implication of motive for migration takes into account how do the emigrants establish themselves in the new country.

We are now in a position to introduce the purpose of this study. Our main concern is to theorize about temporary migration by locating the motives for migration and show how these motives influenced the demographic characteristics of the migratory group and how, in turn, those characteristics influenced the types of settlement that the group structured. We will use Chinese migration in order to do this. This study then is one that deals with the history of Chinese migration and is not to be considered as just simply a history of the Chinese in the United States.

At this point, let us explore the issue of motive. For us motives exists in a specific context of meaning, one which is influenced by environmental and social processes. Actors attach subjective meanings to their everyday negotiation of the environment and social structure, and this results in specific forms of behavior. If we are to understand the behavior, we must understand the intentions of the actors as well as the context within which the behavior takes place. Motive then, "is a complex of subjective meaning which seems to the actor himself or to the observer an adequate ground for conduct " in a specific context. In other words, motive

locates why and how human conduct takes a specific direction. Thus, if we were to ask the question why does a group migrate from one ecological complex to another, we are asking for a theory or a motive. Of primary importance to our question are the intentions of the actors who in responding to social stimuli, establish a pattern for the migration. Further, the motive will provide for us an understanding as to how the group will settle in the new environment.⁴²

Like attitudes, motives are not directly available to the senses, we must infer them from behavior or from the statements of actors.⁴³ There are several problems here. First, "any analysis of migration must deal with the motives of migrants, especially motives which determine why in any situation some leave and others stay."⁴⁴ Given this, demographers infer motives from the differential migration rates. Petersen's rationale for this is:

Given a sedentary population and an inducement to leave, migrants become differentiated from nonmigrants by the fact that neither category is a random sample of the whole population. This process of migrant's self selection according to various social characteristics is called migratory selection (or selective migration). Whether the decision is made by the migrants themselves is not a crucial distinction in a demographic context.⁴⁵

The problem is, however, when differential migration rates are used

42. Weber, op. cit., page 98, and H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Character and Social Structure, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964), page 113.

43. Roger Brown, Social Psychology, (New York: Free Press, 1965), page 113.

44. Petersen, op. cit., page 261.

45. Ibid., page 262.

to infer motives we are not really locating what the migrants feel are their motives. In this view, it is assumed that case studies would provide a more adequate guide to motivation. Such a discussion assumes "true" motivation and we would do well to remember Max Weber's words when he argued that meaning attributed to actors cannot be assumed to be correct or "true" in some metaphysical sense, this is what distinguishes sociology from ethics.⁴⁶

Second, actors themselves may not know their own motives or they may disguise them, given a situation where expression of motive may create a negative conception. For example, some immigrants do not admit readily to the motive of economic migration, because to do so would indicate direct competition with the native work force. Thus, they may cite political freedom, religious toleration or the despotism of the Old World as reasons. In short, immigrants may be reluctant to admit that they could not make it in the old country.⁴⁷ In the case of temporary migrants, this problem is even more acute⁴⁸ because of the hostility directed towards them by the native work force. Temporary workers who are usually regarded as aliens may find it difficult to express the view that they are actually competing with the native work force for jobs.

46. Weber, op. cit., pages 89-91.

47. Hansen, op. cit., pages 78-79, and Petersen, op. cit., page 274.

48. For example, it would have been extremely difficult for a Chinese to indicate to others that they migrated for economic reasons once the anti-Chinese movement had started.

In sum, we have indicated that there are differences between the intentions of migrants to settle permanently and the intention of migrants to settle temporarily. The state in desiring a temporary work force, may deny citizenship to some migratory groups in order to provide a cheap form of labor. Both intentions are a reflection of different motivating forces. Further, there exist a political definition as to which group may settle permanently and which group may settle only temporarily. (This point will be addressed in the last chapter of this study.) However, before such a political definition is made, migrants must decide to emigrate and it will be this decision that we will be mainly concerned with. The central thesis then is to explain why temporary migration in general and Chinese migration to the United States in particular takes the specific form it does? We intend to measure the motive of the migration by inferring it from the demographic characteristics of the migrants. Having posed the question, we are now ready to consider a concept that would describe the motivational aspect of temporary migration. Although the concept has been used extensively, it has not had the theoretical development that it deserves. The concept is sojourner, the amplification of which is the focus of the next chapter.

CHAPTER II
ON THE SOCIOLOGY OF MIGRATION

Most American writers in describing Chinese immigration, use the term sojourner without any adequate empirical investigation of the term. Most often, the only reason given for using the term is the citation of its initial usage by Paul C.P. Siu.⁴⁹ The problem is that the term was postulated as a type of attitude that some immigrants possess, or in our case, a set of motives for migration, without any elaborate empirical investigation of them. Nevertheless, sociologists do use the term to describe Chinese migration and such a usage has become standard. For example, the following writers have used the term or its meaning. Stanford Lyman uses the term in one place and it is implied in two other places in three of his works. In one place he states:

Chinese emigrants regarded their journey as temporary and their return as certain. Abroad the Chinese, as homeless men, never fully accepted any permanence to their sojourn.⁵⁰

In another place he states:

The first Chinese immigrants to the United States intended to remain for only a short time, and in

49. See Paul C.P. Siu, "The Sojourner," American Journal of Sociology 8, (July, 1952), pages 34-44.

50. Stanford Lyman, "Contrast in the Community Organizing of Chinese and Japanese in North America," The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 5:2, (1968). A Bobbs-Merrill reprint, number S-728, page 60.

accordance with the Cantonese tradition, they left their wives in the homes of their parents.⁵¹

In still another work, he states the following after which he cites Siu's article:

Chinese immigrants who journeyed to America and other foreign shores in the last century were wanderers to be -sure, but they were not without fixed places to go. Their course took them where opportunity beckoned, but never without the hope of one day returning to the homeland which would call them back from their despair and invite them once more to the warmth of heart and domesticity.⁵²

James Lowen, writing about the Chinese in Mississippi, uses the term sojourner when he states:

The early Chinese...were not true immigrants intending to become permanent settlers in a new homeland, but were sojourners, temporary residents in a strange country; planning to return to their homeland when their task was accomplished.⁵³

Gunther Barth has an entire chapter where he argues the transition from the Chinese as sojourners to immigrants.⁵⁴ And one race and ethnic relations textbook has an entire section devoted to the Chinese as sojourners.⁵⁵

51. Stanford Lyman, Chinese Americans, (New York: Random House, 1974), page 87.

52. Stanford Lyman, The Asian in the West, (Nevada: Social Science and Humanities Publication No. 4, 1920), page 9.

53. James Lowen, The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), pages 26-27.

54. Gunther Barth, Bitter Strength, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), pages 183-213.

55. C. Marden and G. Meyer, Minorities in American Society, (New York: Van Nostrand Co., 1973), pages 363-365.

If writers do not use the term explicitly, it is implied implicitly in their conceptions of Chinese immigration, all that have been examined address themselves to the fact that the Chinese would return home. Pyan Ling states:

With Europeans, no matter, male or female, young or old, they all come; with the Chinese only the young men emigrate. Europeans intend to settle permanently, the Chinese intend to go back.⁵⁶

Coolidge's study on Chinese immigration, which is one of the most quoted works in the area, also stresses the temporary nature of Chinese immigration. She writes:

Before 1852, no record was kept of the Chinese passengers returning from San Francisco to China, but that many did soon return, having made their stake, and spread the news of the Golden Hills among their countrymen, is the testimony of Englishmen and American residents in China at that period.⁵⁷

Betty Sung described one such immigrant in her story of Fatt Hing.

She states:

...Finally Fatt Hing decides that he would take his gold and return to China, before he set sail, he cleared his account with the Six Companies and was delegated by Chairman Wong to see that the bones of several of his compatriots, who had met death in this foregin land, were returned to their ancestral homes for proper burial.⁵⁸

56. Pyan Ling. "Causes of Chinese Emigration," The Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, (39), January, 1912, page 74.

57. Mary Roberts Coolidge, Chinese Immigration, (New York: Arno Press, 1969), page 18.

58. Betty Sung, The Story of the Chinese in America, (New York: MacMillian, 1967), page 28.

In brief, it would seem that many writers, in describing Chinese immigration, either used the term to describe the intention of the Chinese to return to China or described the migration as a temporary one. Having grounded the term in the sociological literature, we are now ready to locate it theoretically.

Intellectually the term sojourner is anchored in Simmel's essay, "The Stranger," where Simmel describes the sociological form of the stranger,⁵⁹ one which reflects an individual's spatial and social separation from the group. He states:

The stranger is thus being discussed here, not in the sense often touched upon in the past, as the wanderer who comes today and goes tomorrow, but rather as the person who comes today and stays tomorrow. He is so to speak, the potential wanderer. Although, he has not moved on, he has not quite overcome the freedom of coming and going. He is fixed within a particular spatial group or within a group whose boundaries are similar to spatial boundaries. But his position in the group is determined essentially by the fact that he has not belonged to it from the beginning, that he imports qualities into it, which do not and cannot stem from the group itself.⁶⁰

Robert E. Park, being influenced intellectually by Simmel's essay on "The Stranger," formulated in 1928, the term "marginal man." Park states:

...In the case of the marginal man, the period of crisis is relatively permanent. The result is that he tends to become a personality type. Ordinarily, the marginal man is a mixed blood, like the mulatto in the United States

59. Kurt Wolff, The Sociology of George Simmel, (Glencoe, III: Free Press, 1950), pages 402-408.

60. Ibid., page 402.

or the Eurasian in Asia, but that is apparently because the man of mixed blood is one who lives in two worlds, in both of which he is more or less of a stranger.⁶¹

Elsewhere, Park in his attempt to characterize the types of attitudes immigrants brought to America, formulated another conception of the marginal man called the "caffone." This term is applied to Italians in America, "to a man of their nationality who is only interested in saving enough money in order to return home."⁶²

In 1952, Paul C.P. Siu used Park's conception of the marginal man and Simmel's concept of the stranger and formulated a type of immigrant attitude, the "sojourner."⁶³ Siu, in describing this concept writes:

I am proposing to isolate another deviant type for which I employ the term "sojourner." The sojourner, to be sure, is characteristically not a marginal man; he is different from the marginal man in many aspects. The essential characteristics of the sojourner is that he clings to the culture of his own ethnic group as in contrast to the bicultural complex of the marginal man. Psychologically he is unwilling to organize himself as a permanent resident in the country of his sojourn. When he does he becomes a marginal man. Both the marginal man and the sojourner are types of stranger-in Simmel's sense, products of the cultural frontier. No doubt, in many instances, the sojourner has something in common with the marginal man. It is convenient, therefore, to define the sojourner as a stranger who spends many years of his lifetime in a foreign country without being assimilated by it.⁶⁴

61. Robert E. Park, On Social Control and Collective Behavior, ed., by Ralph H. Turner, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), page 206; or see Robert E. Park, "Human Migration and the Marginal Man", American Journal of Sociology, 32, (May, 1925), page 93.

62. Park and Miller, op. cit., pages 103-104.

63. Siu, op. cit., page.

64. Ibid., page 34.

For Siu, the main issue is that the sojourner, by definition, is an immigrant who has no interest in permanent settlement and assimilation. Rather, his stay in the country of his sojourn is temporary and in his mind, one day he will return home. Further, he is one who migrates for economic reasons, a job or for the economic opportunities available in the host country. Because the immigrant hopes to work and save enough money, so that he may return home, he usually leaves his family in the homeland. Thus, demographically, sojourners are almost all males, with an extremely small percentage of women, and an almost total absence of children.⁶⁵

There are several modifications we wish to make in regards to Siu's argument because of its broad interpretation of the term sojourner and because he focuses only on the motive aspect of the concept rather than the factors that produced the motive or goal directed behavior. First we will formulate a more specific meaning in regards to the concept by considering only migrant groups, rather than individuals who might reflect this motive, i.e., "the colonist, foreign trader, diplomat, student, missionary and research anthropologist."⁶⁶ Our restriction of the concept does not imply that

65. Although Siu includes diplomats who migrate with their families, or even more recently, Americans in the middle east, we are mainly concerned with migrants coming from mainly under-developed areas in large numbers.

66. Siu, op. cit., page 34.

the motive, to which the concept refers, does not fit these types, it just means that in these cases, the concept sojourner is not viewed as a motive for migration based on a sociological argument-environmental condition that produces this response-but on the motive possessed by individuals. Secondly, our starting point will be the factors that exist in the ecological context of the immigrant which produced the notion of sojourner. That is, sojourners migrate from populations that are unable to establish an equilibrium between its size and sustenance organization.⁶⁷ In using the term in such fashion, we will be able to describe large scale migration that is temporary because the environment of the migrants does not meet subsistence requirements adequately.⁶⁸ This is not to say, that the concept describes all cases in the population, rather, it is found in enough cases to warrant its usage. Thus, we are interested in the concept as it is found in migratory groups and not necessarily as it is found in individuals who migrate for their own particular reasons. Thirdly, we will re-define the concept sojourner from a "stranger who spends many years of his lifetime in a foreign country without being assimilated by it,"⁶⁹ to the idea that sojourners are individuals who

67. For a treatment of the ecological factors that stimulate migration, see David Sly, "Migration and the Ecological Complex," American Sociological Review, 37, (October, 1972), pages 615-628. This is an adequate account as to the conditions under which migration may occur.

68. Ibid., page 617.

69. Siu, op. cit., page 34.

migrate to foreign countries because for many of them, their ecological complex cannot sustain them and as a result, they migrate temporarily to work in order that they may be able to provide for themselves and their families. Added to this, we may say that it is possible that these individuals may spend many years in a foreign country without being assimilated by it. The migrants know why they migrate and their reasons is to earn income,⁷⁰ and this reason emerges out of the problem of sustenance. Examples of sojourner migration may be contract labor, migratory labor, seasonal labor or Chinese immigration to the United States where migration was used as an economic outlet.

It is assumed that these types of temporary migration will have different demographic characteristics in comparison to the permanent types of migration. This is due to the differences in intention to settle permanently or to return to the homeland. Further, permanent migration might reflect the same economic motive, that is better job prospects, certain skills in demand, the need or laborers, etc. However, in these types of migration, immigrants know that they are substituting one ecological complex for another. Whereas, sojourners know they will return to their ecological complex. It is because of this knowledge that immigrants try to make a home for themselves and their families. This is not to say that permanent immigrants may not remigrate, rather, many do return, due to a wide range of factors. In general, permanent immigrants intend to stay and although they may surround themselves with other members of the same group, in order to

70. Ibid., page 35.

maintain the traditions of the old world; to them, they know that the adopted land is their new home.⁷¹ Thus, they send for their families when they can afford it, or they establish families in the new country. In keeping with Davie's indicator of permanence, the larger the number of women and children or families, the more permanent the migration, we contend that this is an index of the motive of permanence and the lack of women and children is an index of temporary migration. For example, when one examines the demographic characteristics of Jewish migration to the United States, there exists a higher percentage of families than in any other group.⁷² The main reason for this is that Jews were substituting a more desirable ecological complex, as well as a less restricted political climate for an undesirable and highly restricted one. In the new country then, they intended to stay and this is seen in their low rate of remigration which was 5.0 (see Table I), as well as the large numbers of families in the migration.

An important outgrowth of the presence of families in ethnic communities is the existence of the public school as an important feature of the adopted society. The very presence of this institution

71. For some of the reasons why immigrants return to the homeland, see the following accounts: Charlotte Erickson, American Industry and the European Immigrant, 1860-1850, (New York: Russell and Russell, 1957), pages 5,49,56,60 and 142; Theodore Saloutos, They Remember America: The Story of Repatriated Greek Americans, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956), and Rowland Berthoff, British Immigrants in Industrial America, 1790-1950, (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1953), pages 72-74.

72. Hourwich, op. cit., page 497, Herch, op. cit., pages 471-520.

prevents permanent immigrants from being completely isolated from the newly adopted country. Whereas, sojourners who do not migrate with families have no need for a public school and as such, their communities are completely isolated. Davie describes the importance of the public school when he states:

The greatest agency of Americanization, so far as the foreign born children and the native born of foreign parents are concerned, is unquestionably the public school. Not only does the school children learn English and use American cultural materials, but they also acquire many American ways through association with native American children.⁷³

Not only is the presence of families used as an index of permanence in migration or to locate sojourner type migration, it is also used in locating the isolation of sojourner communities from the society as well as to locate the reasons for migration. That is, the family remains behind while the male works in the country of sojourn. In this way they are able to send remittances home in order that they may meet subsistence requirements in their ecological complex. Sometimes this results in the stimulation of the economy of the migrating area and at other times, it may result in the destruction of the economy of the area. For example, in those regions in Africa that utilize the "slash and burn technique of agriculture, the chilemen system," which require the pollarding of trees, the absence of males lead to a reduction in new farming plots, thereby creating a deterioration of the economy. In any event, the sojourner does

73. Davie, op. cit., page 551.

not substitute one ecological complex for another, rather, he is still tied to his native ecological complex, because he has left his family there.⁷⁴ This is why, in terms of migratory selection, sojourners are mainly male. There are some issues however, that must be explained in terms of sexual generalizations found in demography.

There exist in demography, the generalizations that males are more likely to predominate during the first stages of emigration,⁷⁵ and that internal migrants are predominantly female and international migrants are predominantly male.⁷⁶ These generalizations do not hold when we consider migration from non-western societies. The reason

74. For the destructive impact, this type of migration has on source area, see the following: Isaac Schapera, Migrant Labor and Tribal Life: A Study in the Bechuanaland Protectorate, (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), pages 162-163; Margaret Read, "Migrant Labor in Africa and its Effects on Tribal Life," International Labor Review, XLVI, No. 6, (June, 1942), and Elliot Skinner, "Labor Migration Among the Mossi of the Upper Volta," in Hilda Kuper, ed., Urbanization and Migration in West Africa, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965), pages 70-73. For how this type of migration may stimulate the economy see the following: J. Van Velsen, "Labor Migration as a Positive Factor in the Continuity of Tonga Tribal Society," Economic Development and Cultural Change, VIII, No. 3, (April, 1970), pages 265-278, or in, A. Southhall, ed., Social Change in Modern Africa, (London: Oxford University Press), pages 230-241, and P.H. Gulliver, "Incentives in Labor Migration," Human Organization, XIX, No. 3, (Fall, 1960), pages 159-163. It seems that this type of migration has received considerable attention in Africa and more recently, Europe.

75. Petersen, op. cit., page 263.

76. In fact, this is one of the oldest generalization in demography. See: Lee, op. cit., page 48, and Dudley Kirk, Europe's Population in the Interwar Years, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1946).

being that women are more tied to their villages by customs in non-western societies. Males therefore predominate in both internal and international migration.⁷⁷ Another reason that may be included in the predominance of males in both types of movement is that, sojourners are migrating because of the problem of subsistence at home. They usually cannot afford to bear the cost of transporting the family, not to mention, the idea that they would be gone temporarily.⁷⁸

It is mainly because the migration consists of males, that the sojourner is isolated from the institutions of the host country. This issue is even more acute when we consider sojourners who migrate from non-western societies. Given that social customs at home prevent the migration of females, there is then an almost total absence of women in the migration. In the ethnic enclave, there are no children, and if there are, they are too few to warrant public schools⁷⁹ and it is because of this that assimilation is restricted. Not only is the sojourner isolated in this sense, but at times, "political and legal

77. See Kingsley Davis, The Population of India, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951), page 135; William Hance, Population Migration and Urbanization in Africa, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), page 299-300; and Coolidge, op. cit., page 16.

78. For an interesting account of the women who are left behind and how they maintain the family, see: Ann Cornelisen, Women of the Shadows, (New York: Vintage, 1976).

79. Coolidge, op. cit., page 435.

constraints make permanent integration into the host country impossible."⁸⁰ Unlike the permanent migrant, the sojourner does not reflect "the issue of assimilation and acculturation, but of enforced segregation through such "total institutions" as the compound, labor camps, Chinatowns or the corresponding persistence of race and ethnic differentiation."⁸¹

Because subsistence is problematic at home, sojourners tend to migrate to those areas where their only asset-labor-is in demand. The basic issue here is the exchange of labor and wages, part of which is sent home in order to provide for the family.⁸² Thus, sojourner migration is mainly an economic migration and the destination usually is a place where labor is in demand or the prospect of earning a wage exists. There are several implications involved here.

The first implication is the assumption that the ecological complex cannot sustain its population and because of this, migration

80 Micahel Burawoy, "The Function and Reproduction of Migrant Labor: Comparative Material from South Africa and the United States," American Journal of Sociology, 81, (March, 1976), page 1051.

81. Ibid., page 1051. For a description of the segregation of sojourners, see the following: Lyman, The Asian in the West, pages 3-8; D.Y. Yuan, "Voluntary Segregation: A Study of New York Chinatown," Phylon, (Fall, 1963), pages 255-265. In Africa, the Bantustan Reserves may serve as examples, see Hance, op. cit., page 159; Burawoy, op. cit., page 1055.

82. Petersen writes: "The many generalizations concerning migratory selection based on the assumption that migrants are resultant (economic), can only be valid if family migration is insignificant," op. cit., page 270.

is considered an attempt to seek new avenues of economic opportunity. For the most part, the underlying reason for the movement is environmental. Soil exhaustion, lack of land, flooding and over-population are factors that place pressure on the ecological complex, thereby, causing subsistence problems. When this occurs, populations are forced to move. Permanent immigrants may be forced to move in this way just as sojourners are. The main difference between the migration of immigrants and that of sojourners is that social customs at home and the lack of money prevent women from migrating. Further, sojourners are usually prevented from establishing family households in the country of sojourn by legal restrictions which serve to prevent any social or economic problems from arising by their permanent settlement (with families). These legal restrictions make it easier for the sojourner to be a migratory worker rather than a permanent resident. For example, Orientals were excluded from naturalization because of the naturalization laws in the United States during the 1850's⁸³ and the residency requirements for naturalization required at least five years of continuous residence within the county in which the petition for naturalization is filed. These laws serve to restrict sojourners, especially those that are migratory laborers by denying them citizenship.⁸⁴ on the other hand, permanent residents migrating from Europe find the path to

83. Davie, op. cit., pages 328-329.

84. Ibid., pages 536-537, and Buraway, op. cit., pages 1061-1071.

naturalization a little easier and there seems to be few cultural restrictions in the way of the migration of females. Although both sojourners and permanent immigrants may migrate due to the same economic pressures, that is where the similarities in the two types of migration end because social customs at home which prevent the migration of females and the legal and political acts in the country of sojourn serve to perpetuate sojourner status. For both groups then, the decision to migrate may be grounded in an economic "need for cash and material wealth which cannot be gotten at home"⁸⁵ and in migrating, both groups are able to meet subsistence demands or attain a higher standard of living.

The second implication of this type of migration⁸⁶ involves the relationship between sojourners, employers and the native work force, a relationship which the permanent immigrant does not encounter to the same extent. Whenever there exists a higher standard of wage in the country of sojourn than in the homeland, sojourners may accept employment below the level of the native work force. This results in what Bonacich calls a "split labor market," that is, "the existence

85. Gulliver, op. cit., page 161; Clarke Brooke, "Types of Food Shortages in Tanzania," The Geographical Review, LVIII, No. 3, (July, 1967), page 350 and Bernard C. Rosen, "Social Change, Migration and Family Interaction in Brazil," American Sociological Review, 38, (April, 1973), page 299.

86. For a discussion as to the causes of labor migration, see Clyde Mitchell, "The Causes of Labor Migration," Commission for Technical Cooperation in Africa, Migrant Labor in Africa South of the Sahara, Publication, No. 79, (Abidjan, 1961), pages 259-280.

of a large differential in the price of labor for the same occupation."⁸⁷ The main criterion for this type of market is the presence of ethnic groups in the market who come from different "economic systems, either abroad or within a conquered territory."⁸⁸ If one group is in the market because of migration, it is mainly due to the poor economy of their ecological complex.⁸⁹ Further, the motives of the migratory group-reasons for the migration-affect the price of labor because "temporary workers are more willing to put up with undesirable work conditions since these need not be endured forever" and "often temporary workers are males who have left the comforts of home behind and whose employers need not bear the cost of housing and educating their families."⁹⁰ Thus:

sojourners have at least three features which affect the price of labor; lower wages, longer hours, and convenience to the employer.⁹¹

The reasons why the price of labor is affected this way is because sojourners "will be in the market a short while and their main concern is immediate employment, and they may be willing to undercut wage

87. Edna Bonacich, "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labor Market," American Sociological Review, 37, (October, 1972), pages 547-559.

88. Ibid., page 549.

89. Ibid., page 550.

90. Ibid., page 550.

91. Ibid., page 551. An added dimension to this is the use of sojourners in keeping the native work force in line. For an interesting account of this, see Lowen, op. cit.

standards"⁹² or, if they are not white, they are usually paid lower wages than whites. Further, they may be used to perform jobs that the native work force find too demeaning or even to keep domestic workers in line. For example, Chinese workmen were imported to North Adams, Massachusetts to prove to the Knights of St. Crispin, a union that was striking at the time in the 1870's, that they were no longer needed and no longer wanted by industrialist. In this context they were used as strike-breakers as well as paid a lower wage.⁹³

Because sojourners reflect temporary migration, they are often regarded as "aliens without rights of citizenship."⁹⁴ As such, they are "unable to influence the institutions that subordinate them to the other factions of the labor force as well as to the employer."⁹⁵ For example, in South Africa, blacks can only exercise rights of citizenship in the Bantustans and such an exercise, due to the "total institutional" nature of these places, does not affect their lives materially.⁹⁶ For the Chinese in the United States prior to 1868, citizenship was

92. Bonacich, op. cit., pages 550-557.

93. For a worthwhile discussion of the significance of this event, see Frederick Rudolph, "Chinamen in Yankeedom," American Historical Review, LII, (October, 1974), pages 1-29, and Charlotte Erickson, op. cit., page 126.

94. Burawoy, op. cit., page 1061.

95. Ibid., page 1061.

96. Ibid., page 1061.

conferred upon "free whites" only.⁹⁷ After blacks were granted citizenship, it was conferred upon "free whites as well as persons of African nativity or decendants of such persons." Thus, it was not conferred upon the Chinese. This fact was made evident by the Burlingame Treaty with China in 1868. Article VII stated: "But nothing herein contained shall be held to confer naturalization upon citizens of the United States in China, nor upon the subjects of⁹⁸ China in the United States." Employers were thus able to exploit the labor of sojourners because of their temporary status in the labor market and because they are unable to influence the institutions in the country of sojourn due to their lack of citizenship. George F. Seward, United States Minister to China in the 1870's, describes one aspect of this exploitation in regards to the Chinese:

Irrespective of the general effect produced by the presence of Chinese in the labor market, and the breakdown of the high wages which would naturally be demanded by white men if in undisputed control of it, the fact remains that the California farmer has been able, of late years, to employ Chinamen at about twenty dollars a month, besides his board, when he has been obliged to pay the native American or the foreigner of other nationality, not less than thirty dollars a month, besides his board.⁹⁹

97. William J. Bromwell, History of Immigration to the United States, (New York: Arno Press, reprint, 1969), page 29.

98. William Malloy, "Treaties, Conventions, Internation Acts, Protocols and Agreements between the United States and Other Powers, 1776-1909," Senate Document, No.357, 61st Congress, 2nd Session, 1910, Volume I, page 236.

99. George F. Seward, Chinese Immigration, (New York: Arno Press, 1970), page 58.

The sojourner, at times, does undercut the wage of the native worker and this undercutting is an outgrowth of the ease in which they may be exploited. This is due to the fact that they do not regard themselves as immigrants and are not politically treated as immigrants. Permanent immigrants on the other hand, were hired in accordance with the standard wage.¹⁰⁰ It is obvious that the difference in race was a factor in determining the lower wages for the Chinese in the 1860's. Further, the wages in many occupations before unionization were barely sufficient to provide for the necessities of life and that to a large extent, the standard of living determined the wage.¹⁰¹ In any event, the European immigrant's cost of living was higher than that of the Chinese because of his concentration in the urbanized East, as well as having to provide for a family, and it was due to family earnings that Europeans were able to sustain themselves.¹⁰² The Chinese on the other hand supported a family in China which had a lower cost of living than the country of sojourn, and it is this which makes sojourning feasible.

Out of the exploitation of sojourners, a class conflict usually develops between the native work force and exploited labor. The conflict occurs because the native work force usually accuses the sojourners of destroying the

100. Hourwich, op. cit., page 23.

101. Ibid., pages 284-285.

102. Ibid., page 266.

standard of wage, even when their presence in some industries in reality kept up the wage,¹⁰³ or of taking jobs away from Americans. Attacks by the native work force may be reduced when the exploitation of sojourners is rigidly structured along racial lines, as in the case of South Africa, or when sojourners are hired for those occupations the native work force refuses to enter.

In the United States the major argument of native workers was that the Chinese were destroying the standard of the wage. Thus, at the Anti-Chinese convention of 1886, native workers, in issuing a memorial to Congress, complained that "the Chinaman works industriously, consumes very little, imports from China what he eats and wears and underbids white labor."¹⁰⁴ The conflict between the native work force and Chinese sojourners was masked by racial ideology, where the racial and cultural characteristics of the Chinese were used by labor in an attempt to restrict their immigration. For example, Samuel Gompers argued that survival depended on racial purity and strength and that this could not be brought about by the importation of cheap labor because it cannot be Americanized and taught to render the same efficient service provided by American workers.¹⁰⁵

103. Coolidge, op. cit., pages 378-442.

104. Senate Miscellaneous Document, No. 107, 49th Congress, 1st Session, 1885-1886, (2346).

105. Samuel Gompers, Seventy Years of Life and Labor II, (New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1967), page 160; Burawoy, op. cit., page 1061 and Bonacich, op. cit., pages 553-554.

Thus according to Samuel Gompers, "the superior whites had to exclude the inferior Asiatics by law or, if necessary, by force of arms."¹⁰⁶

Attached to the racist ideology of the native work organizations is usually the idea that sojourners are imported by capitalists in order to provide cheap contract labor. In the United States for example, the idea of contract labor had a long history because it was a form of the old indenture system of colonial America and was later used to start the factory system in the United states by importing skilled industrial workers. This type of contract labor provided for the importation of skilled labor, which was far from cheap,¹⁰⁷ and "what the sponsors of the contract labor law had in mind in 1864 was the immigration of skilled industrial workers from Great Britain."¹⁰⁸

However, popular opinion associated contract labor with unskilled workers and mainly Orientals. This association, perhaps, was an outgrowth of Senator George Tingley's attempt to introduce in

106. Samuel Gompers and Herman Gutstadt, Meat vs. Rice: American Manhood against Asiatic Collieism-Which Shall Survive, (San Francisco: Asiatic Exclusion League, 1908). For two excellent discussions on the racial aspects of migration and labor, see Stuart Creighton Miller, The Unwelcome Immigrant, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1924), and Herbert Hill "The Racial Practices of Organized Labor-The Age of Gompers and After," in Arthur Ross and Herbert Hill, ed., Employment, Race and Poverty, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1974), pages 365-401.

107. For a discussion of this, see Erickson, op. cit., pages 4-5, 14,52,141-142.

108. Ibid., page 3.

1852 his Coolie Bill, the purpose of which was to enforce in the courts contracts made in China to perform work in California for a maximum term of five years.¹⁰⁹ Out of the heated debate and final defeat of the bill, Californians, henceforth, associated Chinese immigration with that of contract labor.¹¹⁰ Elmer Sandmeyer, who has analyzed the anti-Chinese movement in the United States wrote:

Californians were convinced that Chinese laborers came to this country under servile or "coolie" contracts. Senator Sargent had support of widespread public opinion when he insisted that in spite of laws forbidding the importation of coolies, the Chinese coming to California were not free,¹¹¹ but were bound to service for a term of years...These charges were not new to Californians. The attempt to pass the Tingley Bill in 1852 for the enforcement of contracts made in China had been defeated only after a bitter debate.¹¹²

The idea that the Chinese were imported as contract laborers, even though historically false, came in being because of the type of

109. California Senate Journal, 3rd Session, 1852, pages 67-68, 303-307, 667-675.

110. For an excellent discussion of contract labor, see Persia Crawford Campbell, Chinese Coolie Emigration to Countries Within the British Empire, (London: P. King and Son, 1923), also Coolidge, op. cit., pages 41-54 for reasons why this conception of Chinese immigration to the United States is incorrect.

111. Gunther Barth's, op. cit. (passim) main thesis is that the Chinese immigrants to the United States were controlled and exploited as if they were slaves. The problem is that his work relied heavily on newspaper sources for information and this distorted his analysis. Except for the limitations mentioned, it still remains an excellent work on the history of the Chinese in the United States.

112. Elmer Clarence Sandmeyer, The Anti-Chinese Movement in California, (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1973), page 36.

migration utilized, in that, they came without their families, they did not adapt to American customs readily, lived in complete isolation from the society, worked longer hours, for less wages and were recruited by Chinese headmen for unskilled labor.

Sojourners tend to live the life of homeless men, saving, toiling, being isolated in their ethnic communities where they may be able to relax by soliciting prostitutes and other recreational outlets, and there is just as many returning home as there are migrating to the country of sojourn. While sojourning, they remit wages home which provide sustenance for their families and when they have accumulated enough savings they may return home to live out their years or, failing that, they may remain sojourners for a lifetime.

Having outlined the general implications of the sojourner type of migration, we will now examine these formulations empirically by considering Chinese migration to the United States. The next chapter will examine why this type of migration was employed and its relationship between geography and subsistence.

CHAPTER III

PUSH AND PULL FACTORS: CAUSES OF CHINESE EMIGRATION

1. Geography and Economics

The most striking feature of Chinese emigration to the United States in 1850 is that the great majority of Chinese immigrants to the United States came from the southeastern part of China, more specifically, the provinces of Kwangtung and Fukien. Ling states:

Chinese emigration has peculiar territorial limits not only in its destination but, its source. It is chiefly composed of young peasants coming from only six prefectures of the two southeastern provinces, Fukien and Kwangtung lying between Foochow and Canton.¹¹³

The following testimony of Chinese migrants to the United States confirms this issue. Leung Cook testifies:

Question: From what part of China did you come?
Answer: From the state of Kwangtung (Canton) in the District of Sunning.

Question: Do the Chinese here come from there?
Answer: Most of the Chinese here come from Kwangtung (Canton).¹¹⁴

^{113.} Pyan Ling, *op. cit.*, pages 74-75. Also see the following sources for confirmation of this issue: William Speer, The Oldest and the Newest Empire: China and the United States, (Hartford, Connecticut: S.S. Scranton, 1870), page 472; S.W. Kung, Chinese in American Life, (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1973), page 30; Gunther Barth, Bitter Strength, (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964), pages 9-13; Mary Coolidge, Chinese Immigration (New York: Arno Press, 1969), and Betty Sung, The Story of the Chinese in America, (New York: Macmillian, 1967), pages 10-18.

^{114.} Report to the California State Senate of its Special Committee on Immigration, 1876, reprinted by R and E Associates, 1970, page 36.

Ah You testifies:

Question: From what part of China did you come?
Answer: Canton.115

Yung Ty testifies:

Question: From what part of China did you come?
Answer: Canton.116

Sin How testifies:

Question: From what part of China did you come?
Answer: Canton.117

Chin Fong Chow testifies:

Question: From what part of China did you come?
Answer: One day and a half travel from Canton.118

Wong Ben testifies:

Question: Where did you come from-what part of China?
Answer: Canton.119

Ah Dan testifies:

Question: From what part of China did you come?
Answer: Back of Canton.120

George Hing testifies:

Question: From what part of China did you come?
Answer: About two days travel from Canton.121

115. Ibid., page 73.

116. Ibid., page 94.

117. Ibid., page 95.

118. Ibid., page 98.

119. Ibid., page 99.

120. Ibid., page 120.

121. Ibid., page 133.

Lem Schaum testifies:

Question: From what part of China did you come?

Answer: One hundred and fifty miles from Canton.¹²²

It seems then, that it is more than coincidence that the vast majority of Chinese immigrants to America came from the southeastern part of China.¹²³ Rather, there are structural reasons as to why this region provided the stimulus for emigration and it becomes necessary to provide an analysis of this issue. Our analysis begins with the geographic conditions of the region because it is due to geography that migration was used as an economic outlet.

The first important geographic feature of the region is the elaborate waterway system created by the union of the West, North and East rivers, which has been called the Pearl River or Chu River and which flows out into the South China Sea. The region surrounding this waterway has been called the Pearl River Delta.¹²⁴ The second geographic feature of importance is the climatic conditions and soil formation of the region. To begin with, there seems to be "two Chinas," the North, with its cooler and drier temperature and

122. Ibid, page 135.

123. Betty Sung has argued that approximately sixty percent of the Chinese immigrants to the United States came from Toishan and the other forty percent from the surrounding areas, Sung, op. cit., pages 10-18.

124. Gunther Barth provides a vivid description of this region in his work, op. cit., page 20, and Betty Sung has constructed a map of the region in her work which depicts not only the waterway system but also the surrounding districts, op. cit., page 15.

the South with its warmer temperatures and high humidity. Consequently, anyone who studies China cannot escape the influence of geography in shaping the rural communities of the North and South into two distinguishable varieties.¹²⁵

Unlike the north, southeastern China is mainly a subtropical region. The summers are hot and wet and the coastal areas receive a maximum of rainfall in the early autumn, resulting in typhoons, many of which wreak havoc on the region by leaving thousands of people hungry and homeless. Lyman in locating the causal factors of Chinese emigration cites the typhoon in 1849 by stating:

...In 1849 a terrible flood wreaked havoc on the already wretched lives of southeastern China's peasants. "The rains have been falling for forty days," said a memorial to the emperor, "until the rivers, and the sea, and the lakes, and the streams, have joined in one sheet over the land for several hundred miles..."¹²⁶

Beyond the climatic conditions of the southeastern region is another important issue, that of soil formation. It is a widely known fact that it is the rocks of a region that are the original source of all soil, but in the long run, it is the climatic conditions that determines the nature of the soil. Because temperature and

125. For a discussion of this issue, see Kung-Chuan Hsiao's, Rural China, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1960), page 15.

126. Stanford Lyman, The Asian in the West, (Nevada: Social Sciences and Humanities Publication No. 4, 1970), page 11. This quote was taken from "The Celestials at Home and Abroad," Littlell's Living Age, 430, (August 14, 1852).

rainfall are important in soil formation there are marked differences in the soils of northern and southern China. For example, the north being colder and drier, tends to form its soils mainly by mechanical action, that is, by frost and exfoliation. The resultant is that the soils take a longer time to come to maturity, however, they retain their fertility longer. On the other hand, in the south where temperatures are much higher and rainfall much heavier, chemical decomposition of the rocks is much quicker and this results in the soils coming to maturity rapidly and losing their fertility just as rapidly. Because the formation of soils in this region is created mainly by natural and man-made erosion, one finds a scattering of alluvial deposits, which are easily farmed and rich in minerals. The problem is that these deposits tend to lose their fertility after intensive farming and without the skill of crop rotation, this cuts into the potential yield of the land. Nevertheless, highly populated settlements sprang from these deposits and usually the first individual to discover such a deposit often became the descendant from whom the residents may trace their lineage and which forms the basis of kinship, an issue which is addressed below.

A third and important geographic feature is the rugged topography of the southeastern part of China. The topography locates high rugged mountains, steep-sided valleys, cut deep into the mountains and level land is limited to small deltas, narrow flood plains and some river basins. Further, these mountain ranges provide a geographic

separation between north China and south China. The resultant is the isolation of the south from the north. This isolation will have an effect on the formation of dialect and kinship, a point which is addressed below. Another effect of the mountainous separation between north and south is the lack of extensive contacts between the "two Chinas." A famous geographer of China states the matter succinctly:

While the southeastern coast has had many overseas contacts, its relations with the rest of China have been limited by the rugged mountains along the interior border.¹²⁷

The lack of contact between north and south indicates the development of two Chinas. Further, this made it easier for the southeastern Chinese to migrate overseas than to the north.

The coastline of the region is indented, precipitous, scattered with islands, and in many parts there are excellent harbors. When this is combined with the elaborate waterway system of the Pearl River Delta as well as the availability of lumber for ship building it makes this region more sea conscious than other parts of China.

From an air-borne view, the rugged mountains rise, in sharp contrast to the sea and at a glance it becomes obvious that there is not enough level land in the region. Betty Sung dramatically describes the issue by stating:

In Toishan the climate is ideal for agricultural

127. Cressey, op. cit., page 212.

purposes were it not for its rocky terrain, which gives the district its name. A glance at a topographical map of Kwangtung shows that Toishan rises like a mountain island to a height of five hundred to a thousand feet while the surrounding regions drop like a cliff to sea level. The name Toishan itself is an accurate description of the place. Toi means mountain. Toishan together means pleatean mountain or elevated mountain. Whichever you choose, the place is mountainous, rocky, and almost barren. Her agricultural output can feed her population for only four months out of the year.¹²⁸

After considering the important geographic conditions in the region, the next step is to examine the effects of these issues on the economic and social life of the region. It will be our contention that the consequences of geography created the "push" factors of emigration from the region as well as the need for other economic outlets.

2. Economic Consequences of Geography: The Push Factors of Emigration

With such a rugged topography in this region agriculture is restricted to a small scale and has created the need on the part of the inhabitants of the region to establish other economic outlets.

Thomas Tregear, a geographer of China states:

Geography has influenced livelihood in the southeast to much the same extent and in much the same way as it has done in Norway. Topography is the ruling factor. The mountainous character of the area and the deep narrow

¹²⁸. Betty Sung, *op. cit.*, page 64.

valleys limit farm land to about eight percent of the whole.¹²⁹

Few regions in China have such a small percentage of usable land and the results are that the region was characterized by small farms and scattered fields. Tregear describes the former by stating:

There is a variation between north and south. (Manchuria) where the average was about one hundred and twenty mow or acres. In the south, the average farm was between twelve to eighteen mow which is less than the country as a whole. The farm land per head of population amounted to only two to three mow.¹³⁰

In addition to the restriction of agriculture, on a small scale in the southeastern region of China, the majority of "farms consisted of scattered strips and patches, often a mile or more apart between which the farmer had to divide his attention."¹³¹ A nineteenth century writer in his description of how farmers must watch their crops describes this issue:

Very few farmers have their land all in one plot. A farm of not more than eighty Chinese acres may consist of from five to fifteen pieces lying on different sides of the village.¹³²

When land scarcity and scattered fields are combined with lack of credit, the farmers in this region are driven even further into the

129. Thomas R. Tregear, A Geography of China, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965), page 260.

130. Ibid., page 112.

131. Ibid., page 113.

132. Arthur H. Smith, Village Life in China, (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1899), page 163.

the depths of poverty. Needing capital, farmers were often forced to sell cash crops as soon as they were harvested, and they were often sold way below the level of their value.¹³³ The irony is that often the farmer had to buy back these crops for his family at higher prices thereby being a victim of the sellers' market.¹³⁴ This is so because farmers, in lacking credit, must have money in order to provide for their families.

With limited agriculture, scattered fields and the lack of credit the people of the region had to create other economic outlets in order to survive and proximity to the sea provided one such outlet. Cressey states:

Few regions in China have a smaller arable percentage, so that all the available crop land is farmed intensively. This is a necessity, and agricultural products must be supplemented by the harvest of the sea. Even so, the region is normally a deficient area in food.¹³⁵

Thus, the region is more "sea conscious than any other part of China"¹³⁶ and this is mainly due to geographic conditions and economic need.

Tregear states:

Restricted agriculture has turned the faces of the people seaward to look for a living. The many good natural harbors and the plentiful timber supplies for ship building have combined to develop

133. Tregear, op. cit., page 113.

134. For a discussion of this issue, see R.H. Tawney's Land, Labor and Capital in China, (London: Allen and Unwin, 1932).

135. Cressey, op. cit., page 207.

136. Ibid., page 207.

here the fisher-folk of China...The region supplies a large proportion of junks which carries the very considerable coastal trade. Fukien also has been the region from which sailors have been recruited. This region supplies most of the crews which man many of the western steamship lines.¹³⁷

Although we characterize this region in a general sense, it should be noted that there were variations in the region, where earning a living off the land is even more problematic in some districts rather than others, as was the case of Fukien in relation to Kwangtung. One western writer characterizes this issue:

In spite of the intensive use of its limited agricultural land, and the full exploitation of its timber and fishing resources, Fukien has been unable to meet the pressure of its increasing population. It is not without reason that the people's government has provided special investment facilities in Fukien, free from restrictions, for remittances sent home from emigrants from this region.¹³⁸

Betty Sung describes the same issue when she states:

Hemmed in by mountain terrain, besieged by the ever present threat of starvation, and pressured by masses of swarming population all grasping at a food supply that could only sustain only a third of them, the Toishanese were forced to look for non-agricultural means of subsistence. But China was an agrarian society-sustenance came only from the land. There was little industry to speak of, and human labor was too plentiful and much too cheap to exchange for a decent livelihood.¹³⁹

Given the severity of economic survival in Fukien, this

137. Tregear, op. cit., page 264.

138. Ibid., page 264.

139. Sung, op. cit., page 14.

district accounted for a disproportionate number of migrants to the United States, in fact, Sung argues that the majority of Chinese immigrants to the United States came from Toishan, a place where economic survival was the most problematic.¹⁴⁰ There seems to be then, a correlation between economic conditions, influenced by geography and emigration. (See Table II.) For example, it seems

TABLE II. ORIGINS OF CHINESE IMMIGRANTS TO N.Y.C.

<u>PLACE OF ORIGIN</u>	<u>NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS</u>
<u>Sze Yup</u> (Four Districts)	
Hsin-hui	32
Toishan	216
Hoi-ping	26
Yan-ping	4
<u>Sam Yup</u> (Three Districts and Canton)	
Nan-hai	2
Pan-yu	4
Hsun-tak	1
Canton City	24
<u>Other Cantonese</u> (Province of Kwangtung)	
Hok-shan	11
Tung-kwan	4
Chung-shan	18
Chin-hoi	4
"Near Canton"	14
Hakka	4
Hong Kong	14
Pao-an	20
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>388</u>

Source: B. Sung, op. cit., page 13. See also Barth, op. cit., page 22.

140. Ibid., page 14.

that the majority of the Chinese migrants to New York City were from the district of Toishan. They accounted for two hundred and sixteen emigrants out of a sample of three hundred and eighty-eight.

Having grounded the problem of economic survival in the southeastern part of China in its geographic conditions, it is not difficult to understand how the inhabitants in the region would turn to other economic outlets in order to make ends meet. This results in the utilization of other geographic resources, namely the sea. From this, it is not an accident that this region would possess more overseas contacts than the north of China. These contacts resulted in a prosperous trade and commercial activity that was mainly confined to this part of China. One empirical indication of this trade was that governmental representatives in charge of the region developed added prestige and status due to the location of treaty ports in their provinces.¹⁴¹ Out of this trade, inhabitants of the region were able to earn a living by fishing or by ferrying goods and passengers on the Pearl River Delta. This was made possible because rivers, creeks and canals linked the cities, towns and villages. Further, large ships were unable to navigate the shallow waters of the Delta and only small boats-sanpans, junks, lorchas-could navigate the waterway in order to reach the only inland commercial center, Canton.¹⁴²

141. For an account of this issue, see Earl Swisher's, China's Management of the American Barbarians, (New York: Octagon Books, 1972), pages 2-10.

142. For a description of this waterway system, see Gunther Barth's work, op. cit., page 20, and Betty Sung's work, op. cit., page 15.

Other commercial centers that were involved with this waterway traffic were Hong-Kong and Macao, far away from these bustling centers the surrounding villages harbored the people. Those cities located at the mouths of these rivers, historically, "figured prominently in the 1870's when the China tea trade was in its heyday."¹⁴³

Given the open lines of communication due to the waterway system and the commercialization of the region, news of the 1848 gold discovery in America reached every part of the Delta by early 1849. Further due to the long contacts established with Europeans, the people of the region did not find the idea of sailing in an European vessel to a foreign country absurd. Sung states:

Proximity and contact made the Toishanese more receptive to the news about the discovery of gold in California in 1849. Having dealt with the white man in their transactions, the Toishanese did not find the idea of sailing in one of the ships to the white man's country so forbidding or preposterous.¹⁴⁴

Because of geographic circumstances, restricted agriculture, scattered fields and a lack of credit, which were mainly due to the rocky and barren nature of the southeastern region, the ecological complex could not maintain an equilibrium between sustenance and population. These aspects limited the ability to survive and in order to provide sustenance, the inhabitants had to develop new levels of economic opportunities. Migration, then, may be considered as a level

143. Tregear, op. cit., page 261.

144. Sung, op. cit., pages 15-16.

of economic opportunity and in this fashion, the inhabitants hoped to enhance their economic survival. Sung states:

Thus goaded by this circumstance, conditioned by this contact with white man, and lured by the prospect of getting rich quick, the first of the Toishanese bought passage and set sail for California shores.¹⁴⁵

Cressey shares the same view when he states:

This is a major area of emigration, population and geographic pressures within the region, the lure of economic gain abroad, and the availability of overseas transportation have led millions of Chinese to leave the southeastern coast.¹⁴⁶

The resultant of this economic outlet is the flowing of capital into the region from overseas emigrants. The consequence of this resulted in an economic uplifting of the region where wives did not have to work in the field, sons were able to receive instruction in order to pass examinations, and families were able to survive because of these remittances. Thus, "remittances sent home enabled families to live in ease and comfort."¹⁴⁷ News of the assets involved in having a relative overseas spread rapidly and "families worked, scraped and schemed to raise passage for one of their men to go to the United States."¹⁴⁸

The remittances sent home boosted the economy of the region by

145. Ibid., page 16.

146. Cressey, op. cit., page 208.

147. Sung, op. cit., page 16.

148. Ibid., page 16.

providing additional capital for spending, and it was obvious that having a relative overseas was an asset. Sung describes the resultant of remittances sent home when she states:

The remittances also sustained the economy of Toishan. So, in spite of her poor soil, made poorer by the natural calamities of floods and typhoons, and depleted after centuries of intensive cultivation, Toishan became one of the most prosperous districts in China. It was often referred to as "Little Canton" after the bustling commercial port of Southern China.¹⁴⁹

Cressey describes the same issue when he states:

Cash remittances from overseas colonists contribute to the income of many families, in normal years to the extent of millions of dollars.¹⁵⁰

Thus, out of the precarious economic conditions in the region another economic outlet was developed and that was the utilization of migration as a way of providing the necessities of life in the region. The emigrant thereby had no desire to settle permanently in the adopted land, rather, he viewed his stay as temporary. This was his interest and he would live a life of frugality, one without his family, take whatever job he could get, even if it meant longer hours and lower pay, and try to accumulate enough money so as to return home comfortably. In the meantime, his family responsibility had to be met, thereby, part of what he earned was sent home. He was able to do this because whatever the

149. Ibid., page 16.

150. Cressey, op. cit., page 207.

wage, it would be higher than what he could have earned at home. It is out of geographic and economic circumstances that his emigration was forced, and it was tied to his kinship relations, which also were forged out of geographic circumstances.

3. Geography and Kinship

Historically, the southeastern part of China has been an attractive area for migration because of mainly two reasons. The first is its tropical climate, and second, is its remoteness and underdevelopment.

It should be noted that Chinese civilization developed in the north, especially along the middle valley of the Hwang and flowered during the Han Dynasty (200 B.C.-A.D.9); this results in the Chinese of the north referring to themselves as the people of Han. The south during the development of the north, was underdeveloped and the native population was composed of a variety of tribes people who are assumed to be ancestors of the present Thai. During the Tang Dynasty (A.D. 618-906), famine and invasions forced the migration of many of the Han Chinese southward where in various places they absorbed many of the local people. Further, migration from north to south took place in the ninth and tenth centuries when the Mongols invaded the north and the largest group of migrants were the Hakka or guest folk. They migrated to and around the Pearl River Delta. The Hakka brought with them many different cultural traits which set

them apart from the natives in the area. Of particular importance were the following characteristics: an emphasis on group solidarity, a dialect that was closer to the Mandarin but different from the other local dialects, and the women did not practice the traditional custom of foot binding. On the other hand, the native of the twelve districts in the southeastern region, sometimes referred to as Punti, had different dialects and a more independent and rebellious spirit.¹⁵¹ This characteristic is described by one writer in locating the reasons for Chinese emigration.

A marked characteristic of the people of Kwangtung and Fookien is their independent, adventurous and unbending spirit. The independent spirit of the Cantonese for instance, has long been fostered by the independence of their province which despised submission to the son of heaven and which did not join the celestial empire till the Ming Dynasty (1368-1644) about three hundred years ago. This unruly spirit their northern neighbors designate as savageness.¹⁵²

This independent spirit, in part, was made possible by the geographic isolation of the south from the north. With the mountainous nature of the south, communication and social contact with the north was difficult, further, even within the southeastern region, isolation and the lack of social contact existed. This is why

151. Historically it may seem that this region supported the various revolts in the Chinese empire, especially the Taiping rebellion until it was severely crushed by Manchu forces. See Barth, op. cit., page 25, Ping-Ti Ho, op. cit., pages 236-247, and Hsiao, op. cit., pages 421-424.

152. Ling, op. cit., page 71.

different dialects are evident in the region, even though the written language is basically the same. Ethnic groups were divided in regards to dialect and district. For example, the districts of Nan-hoi (Nanhai), Pan-yu(Pwanyu), Hsun-tak (Shunte) and parts of Canton City formed the Sam Yup people, who spoke cantonese, a dialect which was hardly understood by the Sze Yup people of Hsin-hui (Sinhwai), Toishan (Sinning), Hoi-Ping (Haiping) and Yan-ping (Anping).¹⁵³ The latter were people of the mountain districts and were often regarded with contempt.¹⁵⁴ There were additional linkages that created the unity of five districts, and later six districts, an organizational division which was transplanted to the United States and was termed the Chinese Six Companies.

The imperial bureucracy did not take into consideration the ethnic differences of the region and was therefore ineffective in maintaining control of the region. Barth states:

The Mandarins faced the chaos in their districts helplessly. People paid their taxes, but did not allow the officials to tamper with local affairs. The walls surrounding yamens and district capitals symbolized the lack of communication which handicapped the officials, who in most cases did not speak the local dialect.¹⁵⁵

Howard Brett Melendy states the same issue by citing:

The Chinese bureaucracy had arbitrarily divided the land

153. Barth, op. cit., page 22, Sung, op. cit., page 13, and Table II.

154. Barth, op. cit., page 22.

155. Ibid., page 23, and Stanford Lyman, Chinese Americans, (New York: Random House, 1974), page 11.

into administrative units without regard to existing patterns of culture and language. The city of Canton, for example, was divided into two districts. These along with a third, were known collectively by the Delta Chinese as Sam Yup, the three districts. The three districts spoke a purer Cantonese dialect, hardly understood by residents from the two adjacent districts. These two culturally were more closely tied to the two districts of a neighboring prefecture. The Delta Chinese referred to these as Sze Yup, the Four districts. The urban Cantonese felt a contempt for those Chinese from the four districts which was reciprocated by the rural residents.¹⁵⁶

Out of the vast geographical conditions in China and its separation by mountain ranges, a separation of its people on the basis of dialect and ethnicity may be seen. It was therefore a problem for the imperial government to make its laws known, not to mention, enforcing them.¹⁵⁷ Thus, the government had to rely on kinship and the village as a means of providing social control.¹⁵⁸ For the individual then, his loyalty was defined in terms of kinship and he relied on the kinship group to provide not only economic assistance, but justice and social regulation as well. In this context, the kinship group settled disputes, administered punishment and provided protection from a harsh and unyielding environment. This institutional system molded a character that would rely on the long understood organization of kinship solidarity, rather than on the

156. Howard Brett Melendy, The Oriental Americans, (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972), page 9.

157. Hsiao, op. cit., page 5.

158. Hsiao's work, Ibid., is the best that I have encountered on the problem of social control in rural China.

unfamiliar bureaucracy of the state. Thus, when we examine their settlement pattern in the United States, it will be no accident that the Chinese immigrants will rely on their own organization for economic and judicial assistance. In order to understand how this is formulated, let us now examine kinship and its relation to social control.

4. Kinship and Social Control¹⁵⁹

In studying the Chinese family, many scholars confuse the term family with the term kinship, thereby arguing that the Chinese extended family was large. However, the matter is not quite as simple as that. Rather, there is a marked difference between family on the one hand and kinship on the other. Maurice Freedman places our discussion in perspective when he states:

Behind the confusion lies a failure, in the first place to distinguish between family as a specific social group on the one hand and kinship on the other. We can show without much difficulty that kinship bound together large numbers of people in Chinese society and exerted an important effect on their political, economic and religious conduct at large. Family is another matter, essentially its realm is that of domestic life, a realm of co-residence and the constant involvement in affairs of the heart, children, and marriage. Kinship is something different.¹⁶⁰

159. See Hsiao, Ibid., pages 323-370 for a more elaborate discussion of this issue.

160. Maurice Freedman, "The Family in China, Past and Present," Pacific Affairs, No. 34, Winter, 1961-1962, page 323.

Kinship maybe understood as a patrilineal system, involving specific sequential relationships, where a Chinese was bound to other individuals because of ties of descent. Some scholars refer to these relationships as clans¹⁶¹ or sibs,¹⁶², however, technically they should be thought of as lineages.¹⁶³

In order to understand the control of kinship over the individual, it is necessary to examine the moral precepts which provided for this relationship because they are at the very center of Chinese culture and they provide the rules for the existential conditions of day to day interaction. Tsao states:

The traditional Chinese law, by its very nature, is most customary. This legal history of the Chinese nation, like -that of any other ancient nation, convinces us that in the early stages of cultural development, customs as the natural growth from long practice and usage, were actually rules of conduct. Later, they fastened themselves upon existing institutions and became compulsory. With the emergence of government these rules were the very source of positive decrees and ordinances.¹⁶⁴

The traditional mores of China prescribed following rules of behavior; the worship of deceased ancestors, kinship as the ideal

161. Hsiao, op. cit., Lyman, op. cit., and Kung, op. cit.

162. Weber refers to this system of relations as sib, The Religion of China, (New York: The Free Press, 1951).

163. Maurice Freedman, Chinese Lineage and Society, Fukien and Kwangtung, (New York: Humanities Press, 1961).

164. Hen Yen Tsao, "The Chinese Family from Customary Law to Positive," Hastings Law Journal, (May, 1966), page 727.

unit of relation rather than individualism, the status and location of individuals in the kinship framework and that the head of the lineage system should be the oldest living male relation. In this system the individual must suppress his own individuality for the good of the group and his character is molded accordingly. Thus:

The nucleus of the traditional Chinese society is the family, not the individual person. Economically the family has been the unit of production and education ...socially the family is also the component unit, it represents a united front for all its members to the out-side world. Each individual is referred to merely as member of such and such family, and it is his duty to uplift its prestige and honor. Politically and legally the family is like a juristical person. Members of the family share a collective responsibility for the conduct of each, and usually the principal of the family bears the brunt.¹⁶⁵

Although the term "family" is used in this description, the author is actually describing the kinship system. In this context, it was the most important institutional system of traditional China because membership in the kinship group influenced one's economic or educational opportunities and political and religious institutions interacted within the kinship group. Thus, in southern China the kinship group was the totality of one's social environment and out of this one's loyalty was to this group and not to the state.

The religious aspect emerges out of kinship relations by the emphasis placed on filial piety, mourning duties and the customary power vested in the head of the lineage. Out of this, may be seen

165. Ibid., pages 735-736.

the importance of ancestor worship,¹⁶⁶ which must not be confused with religious obligation, but must be understood as a kinship obligation. Thus, kinship involves a complex organization of individual relationships, property, animals, reputation, traditions and gods.¹⁶⁷ Even ancestor worship has a geographic dimension because the main link in the lineage begins with the ancestor who settled in a certain locality, from which a village developed.¹⁶⁸ Individuals will thereby trace their relationships back to this common ancestor and who will also bear his surname. Hsiao states:

The Tsu or clan was primarily a kinship group...The Tsu is a group descended from one ancestor who settles in a certain locality or place...The locality in which a clan originally settled might be a city or town, but more often, it was a spot in the country from which a full fledged village might spring. In fact, it was in rural areas that the clan attained its fullest development.¹⁶⁹

The same argument is made by a nineteenth century author who lived in China:

At some remote and generally unascertainable time in the past, some families arrived from somewhere else,

166. Freedman, "The Family in China, Past and Present," op. cit., page 235.

167. Martin C. Yang. A Chinese Village, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), page 45.

168. Hsiao, op. cit., page 323.

169. It seems that clans attained more development in the south than in the north, Hsiao, Ibid., page 323, and also Yuan-Li Wu, China: A Handbook, (New York: Praeger, 1973), page 686.

camped down, made themselves a local habitation...And that was the village.¹⁷⁰

In the relation between clan and village, the clan dominated the life of its inhabitants. Table III indicates the extent of clan membership in the southeastern part of China. Thus, it is the lineage

TABLE III. Genealogical Records
Of Eight Clans of Lo-Chuan (Shensi)

<u>Clan</u>	<u>Number of Clansmen</u>	<u>Number of Scholars</u>	<u>Date of Compilation</u>	<u>Location of Ancestral Halls</u>
Li	4,838	37	1788	An-Shin Village
Chao	1,284	7	1811	Han Village
Wu	836	3	1825	Ching-Chao Village
Han	1,168	15	1867	Ching-Chao Village
Tung	302	21	1906	Chiao-Chang Village
Chu	1,391	46	?	City
Fan	334	3	?	Hwang-Chuang Village

Source: Kung-Chuan Hsiao, Rural China, op. cit., page 334.

system that provided the codes of behavior for all of its members and with the elder presiding in the chair, punishment and ostracism were often prescribed, the latter reflecting economic and civil death. Hsiao summarizes the general requirements and functions of the lineage system when he states:

The following clan activities were the most frequently undertaken: (1) compilation and revision of genealogical records; (2) ancestor worship and the institution of ancestral halls, ritual land, and ancestral graveyards; (3) material assistance to clan members; (4) education of young clansmen;

170. Smith, op. cit., page 21.

(5) punishment of misconduct and settlement of disputes;
and (6) self defense.¹⁷¹

Because of the relation to the native place of his lineage system, its ancestral land and temple, all of the individual's important relations with the native village were maintained. Weber in his classic study illustrates this point:

Socially the sib meant everything for its members—for those living far away from home and especially for those living in the city. This is apparent and important for the following reasons: First, there was the ceremonial unit necessary for those festive ties most important to the individual (especially the semi-annual ancestor festivals). It was also the topical unit for the family history which the housefathers had to write. Second, hitherto it was considered proper for the sib to lend capital at low interest rates to apprentices and to wage-earning artisans without reserves, thus enabling them to become "self employed" artisans. Third, as already noted, the sib elders elected young men who were qualified for study and provided for their expenses incurred by preparatory studies, examinations and purchase of office.¹⁷²

The effect then, of geography and social control is the predominance of clans in the South of China, whereas in the North, clans were not as extensive. The main reason being the rural and and isolated nature of the south compared to the north and the historical invasions of the north by Manchus and Mongolians and the forced migration of lineage systems southward. The predominance of clan organization in the southeastern part of China-Fukien and

171. Hsiao, op. cit., page 333.

172. Max Weber, The Religion of China, (New York: The Free Press, 1951), page 14.

Kwangtung-formulated control over villages and the lives of individuals. In migrating to the cities individuals in this region never recognized the city as home, rather, it was a place where work and business was transacted and no matter how long one stays, one's allegiance was to the lineage system located in native villages. As a side issue, Weber also argued in The City that one of the main reasons that a conception of the Chinese city cannot be developed is that the Chinese urban dweller owed too much of his loyalty to his family and native village, in which the temple of his ancestors stood and with which he conscientiously maintained affiliation.¹⁷³ The city then was never considered home, rather it was a place away from home. This point is reinforced by Weber's quotation from the Peking Gazette of October 12, 1899. "The police were enjoined not to treat as unknown strangers people who had a claim to their ancestral land but who had gone abroad."¹⁷⁴ Consequently, stay in the city was always regarded as temporary. Within China then, one found the utilization of "migration" to the city as an economic outlet which, for the most part, reflected aspects of the sojourner status because of the intention to return to the village. Another outgrowth of this rural form of social organization was the independence of villages, dominated by lineage systems and independent from imperial administration. Lineage

173. Max Weber, The City, (New York: Free Press, 1955), page 81-82.

174. Max Weber, The Religion of China, page 277.

systems undertook the responsibility for "village repairs, flood control, irrigation, crop protection and tax control"¹⁷⁵ and representatives of the imperial government had little to say in these matters. This aspect leads one writer to conclude:

...Kwangtung preferred independence to servile, submission to the despotic rule of the central government and homage which their northern neighbors take pride in as a sign of civilization.¹⁷⁶

Another aspect of lineage control is the submission of the Chinese from this part of China to their lineage organization. As an outgrowth of this, one may see the acquiescence on the part of the Chinese to this type of organizational structure.

The final item to be considered in terms of the lineage system is the role of women. As mentioned above, membership in clans was established in terms of blood ties to a common ancestor. This resulted in a patriarchal, patrilocal and patrilineal family system in the southeastern part of China.¹⁷⁷ Genealogical records, in terms of clan membership, that were kept indicated to a large extent, the status of the female in China. In a patrilocal context, the female was considered lost to the groom's family and this influenced the treatment she received. Further, it also helped to establish the custom of the wife residing at the husband's father's house where she

175. Stanford Lyman, The Chinese Americans, page 11, and Hsiao, op. cit., pages 281-290.

176. Ling, op. cit., page 77.

177. Hen Yen Tsao, op. cit., page 736.

was to remain. When this is coupled with the custom of "respectable women" not traveling, even if her husband were to travel temporarily; the wife should stay at home until he returns. A nineteenth century writer who lived in China describes this issue:

Chinese girls never go anywhere to speak of, and live what is literally the existence of a frog in a well. Tens of thousands of them have never been two miles away from the village in which they happened to be born.¹⁷⁸

The main asset of females is to produce sons in order to maintain the patronymic system of familial taxonomy and to adorn the male in his esthetic and sensual aspects. An excellent example of this issue was the Chinese custom of footbinding which became symbolic of feminine goodness and provided for the distinctions that were made in terms of the "small foot woman," who is considered respectable, and the "large foot woman" who is not considered respectable.¹⁷⁹ In describing the migration of the Chinese one writer concludes:

...There was so strong a sentiment in China against any respectable women leaving home even with her husband

178. Arthur Smith, op. cit., page 262.

179. The custom of foot-binding appeared in China about 950, however, it is not quite clear as to how the custom started. One theory suggest that it began with the dancing girls that were popular during this time and the style of shoes used required small feet, thereby the solution was foot-binding and this solution became embedded in Chinese mores. The practice however, was not adopted by certain segments of the population, i.e., the boat women of Kwangtung, the Hakka women, Mangols and Manchu. For an interesting, if not informative account, see Howard Levy's Chinese Foot-Binding: The History of a Curious and Erotic Custom, (New York: Walton Rawls, 1966).

that very few went to America or Australia. The few who went to California were for the most part large footed women of the working class or women of disreputable character. But since 1880, public opinion in China has changed appreciably on this point and in recent years the merchant class have brought their small footed wives to this country.¹⁸⁰

With the custom of the female staying at home while the male travels overseas, it places a further handicap on permanent migration, because if the group cannot marry out and it is restricted by an imbalanced sex ratio, then it needs constant migration in order to not die out. Further, this problem will be seen when we discuss the settlement of the Chinese migrant in the United States.

Before we conclude this section, three factors must be touched briefly because they add to the already problematic conditions of southeastern China.

The first deals with the overpopulation in the region which created an added burden on the restricted economic outlets available in southeastern China. Ling in his description of Chinese emigration comments:

Still while we are pointing out the reasons why the other provincials would not emigrate and why only the Cantonese and Fookienese emigrate, we cannot deny that the density of population in these provinces has an important influence ...The mild climate of southern China also encourage the increase of population. So Canton, one of the treaty ports has an enourmous population which, by the census of 1899 was 2,500,000 compared with that of northern cities, we find that this is more than trice that of Hankow (709,000) or four times that of Shang hai (615,000), the great commercial center at the mouth of the Yangtse River.¹⁸¹

180. Coolidge, op. cit., pages 18-19.

181. Ling, op. cit., page 75.

Thus, overpopulation placed increasing pressures on an already limited food supply¹⁸² and a desperate need to find new economic outlets.

The second factor deals with a typhoon creating flooding conditions in the southeastern region in 1849 where "ten thousand people were destroyed and domestic animals drowned in untold numbers; crowds, even of first families, were begging bread..."¹⁸³

The third factor was brought about by the Taiping Revolution of 1851 which created havoc within the region. The Manchu forces, in trying to suppress the rebellion, destroyed many of the villages in Southeastern China. Many of the inhabitants in the region found themselves homeless. Added to this political unrest were foreign intervention and ethnic conflict. Lyman summarizes the consequences of these factors when he states:

As a result of all these catastrophic and dislocating events, hundreds of thousands of Chinese were uprooted from their villages. Many fled to the coastal seaports of Canton, Hong Kong and Macao where they hoped to find work, to secure aid from kinsmen, or to go abroad temporarily until they could recoup their losses and return to loved ones as wealthy men.¹⁸⁴

In summary, we tried to establish how geographic circumstances created limited land space, scattered fields and a lack of credit. This placed the farmer at the mercy of his environment. As such, he had to seek new economic outlets. This need was further increased by the crises posed by overpopulation, flooding and rebellion. From this world, the Chinese emigrated to another world, one which will alter their lives.

182. Ho, op. cit., pages 104-250.

183. Lyman, The Asian in the West, op. cit., page 11.

183. Ibid., page 11.

5. Pull Factors: American Californian

Until 1848 most Americans knew very little about California, however, after James Marshall's discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill, California became internationally famous. News of the discovery, at first, was regarded skeptically and it took President Polk's message to Congress and a display of gold dust in the war office window to get the gold fever started.¹⁸⁵ As the gold fever spread throughout California, goldseekers left their jobs and labor became unobtainable. Towns were deserted and a stampede of prospectors left their homes and loved ones for Sutter's Mill. In a few months, news of the strike reached Hawaii, Mexico, Chile, Peru, Australia, China and Europe. The lure of gold increased the number of goldseekers from a few hundred in March of 1848 to about ten thousand by December.¹⁸⁶ Many of the migrants reached California by the overland route and others utilized the newly opened Panama route, where both the Pacific Mail Steamship Company¹⁸⁷ and the United Mail Steamship Company were engaged in the delivering of mail to California and Oregon. Both these companies participated in the

185. John Walton Caughey, Gold is the Cornerstone, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948), page 48; Ray allen Billington, The Far Western Frontier, 1830-1860, (New York: MacMillian, 1956), page 220 and Ralph T. Roske, Everyman's Eden: A History of California, (New York: MacMillian, 1948, page 242).

186. Roske, op. cit., page 241.

187. The Pacific Mail Steamship Company will figure prominently in the transportation of the Chinese to the United States.

trafficking of this human cargo to the golden hills of California.¹⁸⁸
During the height of the rush, 1848-1854, seven hundred thousand
migrants came to California, ninety five percent of whom were males,¹⁸⁹
and out of the 250,000 people who were counted in the special census
of 1852, only about 100,000 were actually engaged in mining, the
others were suppliers and servants of the miners.¹⁹⁰

Because of the gold rush, business expanded. At first the
transport sector of American society developed added outlets for mining,
as well as providing for mining equipment, clothes and miscellaneous
supplies. Later, because of the bullion, job opportunities grew,
hired men on farms, factory hands and clerks in the East went westward¹⁹¹
and European immigration filled the vacuum in the East. The prices for
goods rose and "San Francisco became a bustling manufacturing center
with foundries, flour mills, ship building yards and several
factories. Wool from California sheep was woven into cloth and
cattle hides were tanned into leather in San Francisco, all were now
required in order to clothe and feed a burgeoning population. Out of
this, California by 1870, had succeeded in building a diverse economy
which supported its 560,000 people at a high level of prosperity."¹⁹²

188. Caughey, op. cit., page 54, and Roske, op. cit., page 244.

189. Roske, Ibid., page 245.

190. Ibid., page 249.

191. Ibid., page 250.

192. Ibid., page 260.

After 1853, mining became a large scale industry utilizing elaborate machinery, and quartz mining techniques. The small scale miners increasingly became laborers for the big operators or left the industry to pursue other economic outlets. The problem of labor became acute because workers, in coming with the idea of getting rich quickly, avoided menial labor which was needed in an expanded economy. Thus, in many occupational areas there existed a vacuum. Chinese laborers would eventually fill this need by entering occupations that white workers found too demeaning or economically unrewarding. In the meantime, "the gold strike stimulated the state's population growth, flow of capital, improved technology and provided the basis of a greatly diversified economy."¹⁹³ Furthermore, out of this expansion, wages as well as laborers were at a premium, in comparison to the East. Coolidge states:

In such an aggression of men there was, properly speaking, no laboring class and those who were driven at times to day laborer, were therefore, discontented, incompetent and unreliable. The man who had set out to be an independent prospector, investor, or miner and failed; or who had lost his capital, invested in groceries, blankets or tools, did not make an ideal workingman. He was likely to add to the high wages characteristic of a pioneer community and the extravagant demands of a man who had set out for a better fortune.¹⁹⁴

Because of California's isolation and the rewards of mining, high

193. Ibid., page 342.

194. Coolidge, op. cit., pages 338-339.

wages were maintained up to 1890, and this stimulated the migration of laborers from China as well as the East. These were the attractions of California and the prospect of being miners and making a quick strike as well as the high wages, not to mention the need for laborers brought the Chinese to the United States.

In those early years they were welcomed as laborers because their services "were almost indispensable, racial hostility was subordinated to industrial necessity, and in a heterogeneous community where every Caucasian expected to be a miner or a speculator, the reticent, industrious, adaptable Chinese could find room and something more than toleration. They were highly valued as general laborers, carpenters and cooks."¹⁹⁵ In fact, they provided services that whites considered demeaning, but the Chinese were able to provide services that the expanding economy needed.

6. Immigration to the United States

In the preceding sections we tried to show how Chinese emigration was used as an economic outlet due to the inability of the southeastern part to provide sustenance for its people. The area could not maintain an equilibrium between sustenance and population. Added to this problem was the Tai-Ping Rebellion, overpopulation and the typhoon of 1847. These disasters created a dislocating effect on the

195. Ibid., page 21.

population of the region where masses gathered in the coastal cities looking for work.

On the other side of the world existed the conditions which would set in motion the migration of thousands of Chinese from the southeastern part of China to the United States. News of John Marshall's discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill reached the southeastern part of China in early 1849 and was circulated throughout the Delta, and California became known to the Chinese as the "Golden Hills." It was no accident then that the Chinese characters for California means "Golden Hills." Speculators who had witnessed the movement of Americans and others from Europe saw the potential in transporting the human cargo from China and were quick to advertise the golden prospects in California. Circulars were printed in Chinese and the region became flooded with the "Golden Hills" advertisement. One circular read in part:

Americans are a very rich people. They want the Chinaman to come and will make him welcome. There will be big pay, large houses, and food and clothing of the finest description. You can write your friends or send them money at anytime, and we will be responsible for safe delivery. It is a nice country, without mandarins or soldiers. All alike, big man no larger than little man. There are a great many Chinamen there now, and it will not be a strange country. China God is there, and the agents of this house. Never fear and you will be lucky.¹⁹⁶

Circulars such as this served to lure the Chinese to the United

¹⁹⁶. Alexander McLeod, Pigtails and Gold-Dust, (Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1947), page 23, and Speer, op. cit., page 486.

States in large numbers, even though there had been a small number of migrants previously¹⁹⁷ and a death penalty imposed on emigration.¹⁹⁸ This was difficult to enforce once the emigrants reached Hong Kong because it was a British Colony. Because of this, it seems, that the push and pull factors must have exerted considerable influence on the migrants in order for them to migrate. Coolidge states the issue well:

Law, religion and family ties hold them to the land of their birth, and only the greatest stress of war and devastation at home, coincident with the lure of gold and marvelous industrial opportunity in California, served to uproot the three hundred thousand who came to the Pacific Coast during thirty-three years of free migration.¹⁹⁹

In hope of finding gold and making a fortune the Chinese borrowed passage money on credit from the brokerage houses in Hong Kong or sold their belongings in order to reach the "Golden Hills" of California. Thus, the Chinese began arriving in large numbers, as early as 1849. In that year, the number estimated by American authorities was seven hundred and ninety-one and arrivals the San Francisco Custom House in 1849 were three hundred and twenty-five.²⁰⁰

197. H. Bromwell, History of Immigration to the United States, (New York: Arno Press, 1969), page 24 and William L. Tung, The Chinese In America, 1820-1973, (New York: Ocean Publications, 1974), page 7.

198. The laws of the Chinese Empire forbade expatriation, however, they were relaxed in 1860 and repealed in 1894. See Coolidge, op. cit., page 16.

199. Ibid., pages 15-16.

200. Ibid., page 498. Collidge's figures are perhaps the best that are available.

By 1850 the estimated number of Chinese in the United States was four thousand and eighteen.²⁰¹ In the early stages of emigration the majority of migrants were farmers and merchants who were attracted to the prospects of making a fortune in the United States.

If the immigrants could not pay the price of passage, they would obtain a loan from a Chinese brokerage firm in order to afford passage to the United States. The firm would accept the emigrant's family ties as security and his kinship group would be responsible for the debt if anything should happen to the emigrant. Collection of the debt was placed in the hands of the district organizations in the United States and migrants could not return to China until all debts were paid. Reverend Otis Gibson describes the collection of debts by the Chinese Six Companies²⁰² and the power they exercised over the migrants:

The Six Companies derive a large portion of their power from the fact that the Pacific Mail Steamship Company will not sell tickets to Chinamen unless they have a permit from the Companies or the Missionaries.²⁰³

201. Ibid., page 498.

202. The Chinese Six Companies were organizations that had their origins in the southeastern part of China. They were organized around the six districts in the region where the majority of Chinese immigrants were from. See Barth, op. cit., pages 96-100, and Coolidge, op. cit., page 48, 51, 57, 111 and 402.

203. California Report, page 26, also see the testimony of Lee Ming Hown, page 72, Leung Cook, page 66 and Reverend Loomis, page 57. The Pacific Mail Steamship Company was also engaged in the transportation of Americans to California by way of Panama in the early years of the Gold Rush, 1848.

The term "credit-ticket" system has been used to describe the method by which the Chinese obtained passage to the United States.

Lyman describes this process:

The "credit-ticket" system, as it has been called, enabled an impoverished Chinese to come across the ocean without putting up any cash, find food and lodging, and labor in the mines, on railroad, or in the Mid-west or East as a strikebreaker. Money for his passage was obtained from kinsmen or fellow villagers who assigned the collection of the debt to kinsmen or landsman in San Francisco. The latter, organized into caravansarers, met the immigrant at the point of debarkations, accompanied him to the hostel in which his compatriots dwelt, provided him with food, a place to sleep and a certain amount of protection from anti-Chinese elements.²⁰⁴

Once the migrant is in the United States, leaders of the Six Companies in the United States who were usually merchants, "acted as contractors or subcontractors and sent gangs of men out to work. The debts incurred by the Chinese immigrants were deducted from their wages by these Chinese headmen."²⁰⁵ Gunther Barth describes this issue by writing:

Indentured emigrants relied on the credit ticket system under which they obtained their passage from Chinese merchants who were reimbursed by relatives of the travelers or by their future employers. In return, the newcomers worked for who-ever extended the credit until the debt was paid.²⁰⁶

Mary Roberts Coolidge also provides the same view of Chinese

204. Lyman, The Asian in the West, page 12.

205. Ibid., page 12.

206. Barth, op. cit., page 51.

immigration when she states:

Many obtained the money to come to America by borrowing from relatives or from a passage broker. The better portion came from the small farms on which their families had lived for generations, and were sent to America to make the fortune of the family, just as other sons might be destined for the literary examinations and official life at home.²⁰⁷

The Reverend Otis Gibson, who spent ten years in the southeastern part of China also locates the same issue when he testified the following before the California Senate Committee on Chinese Immigration:

...I think all Chinamen come free, except the women. Many come under some kind of arrangement. I have never seen engagements made; but constant intercourse with Chinamen and the knowledge I have of them here leads me to believe that Chinamen who are poor and wish to get here, make a promise with someone who will advance them enough money for passage, to repay this money with a large percentage of interest. The advancing party runs the risk of non-payment. I know one case of a young man in my school. Forty dollars was advanced him for passage, and for this he had to return one hundred dollars. When Chinamen come here in that way, they are taken charge of by one of the Six Companies, and kept until work is found for them. Sometimes they have to keep them for three or four weeks. Sometimes these men run away, and the Company loses whatever was advanced.²⁰⁸

The testimony of Lee Ming Howan (California Senate Committee on Chinese Immigration), who was one of Otis Gibson's teachers at his mission school and who, at the time of his testimony, was President of the Sam Yup Company in 1876, provides for us an understanding of the method of Chinese immigration. Senator Haymond asked, "How did the Chinese come to the United States?",

207. Coolidge, op. cit., page 4.

208. California Senate Report, page 26.

and Mr. Hown replied:

They heard that everybody in California made a fortune, so they came here. If they have means, they pay their own passage. If not, they borrow from others. They sell their farms and property to get here. If they have no property and can't borrow, they don't come.²⁰⁹

Again, the same theme is echoed in the testimony of Ah Dan, who had been in the United States for ten years and who came from the region of Canton. Senator Haymond asked, "Do you know how Chinamen who come to California come here?" Ah Dan replied:

Yes. Some come themselves, paying their own fare out of money they have earned working out; when they have no money they borrow it, agreeing to pay a good rate of interest. Sometimes, where a man is honest, no security is required; but where he is not good, the lender takes a mortgage on whatever property he may have.²¹⁰

Thus, the Chinese immigrant would sell his property, borrow money from relatives or borrow from a brokerage firm, using property and family ties as security. The passage fee, on an average was about forty dollars. The following series of testimony will serve to document the issue of credit. Mr. F.F. Low, a resident in China for three years testified at the California Senate Committee on Chinese Immigration:

Their contract is simply to repay the amount advanced for their passage with sufficient bonus to recompense them for the risk, interest, etc...In other words, if they advance forty dollars for passage, they exacted that they should pay one hundred dollars, perhaps in return to be deducted from wages-five dollars a month or

209. Ibid., page 71.

210. Ibid., page 120.

ten dollars a month after they arrive; after they work that out, they are free.²¹¹

Mr. Low continued his testimony and stated that "forty or fifty dollars was the passage money by steamer. You take a common laborer, one who has not that amount of money, and advance it; he agrees to work it out. Those who have that much money will not come, because they are independent."²¹² George F. Seward, United States Minister to China in the 1870's also stated that "many of the Chinese came upon their own means and that the reason why this is so is that it requires the little sum of forty dollars."²¹³

It was due to the "credit-ticket" system of migration that many of the Chinese immigrants were tied to their organizations, located in Chinatown. These sojourners were required to repay their debts and they could not return to China unless this was done. The Six Companies were in consort with the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, which refused to sell tickets to those Chinese who were not cleared by the Companies. Lyman, in The Asian in the West writes:

Most important, the merchant leaders of the Hui Kuan acted as contractors or subcontractors and sent gangs of men out to work. The debts incurred by the Chinese headmen, and defalcating debtors were prevented from escaping back to China by special arrangements

211. Ibid., page 120.

212. Ibid., page 11.

213. Seward, op. cit., page 137, also see Barth, op. cit., pages 61-62.

between the Chinese creditor associations and the merchant fleet.²¹⁴

Leung Cook, an immigrant from Canton and who had resided in the United States for four years testified the following to Senator Haymond's question: "Why is it that the Pacific Mail Steamship Company refuses to sell tickets to Chinamen unless they have the stamp of the Companies?"

When my countrymen come to California my company takes care of them, pays their boarding and lodging expenses. For this they collect afterwards from each man five dollars. This is considered to pay back the amount due the company for its advances, for expenses and its trouble. When they pay it they get a paper or permit, and can buy tickets. When men are sick, poor and unfortunate, they remit the five dollars and give the permit anyhow. Where men are in debt to anyone and the company, it will not give the permit...²¹⁵

Another sojourner, Lee^a Ming Hown, President of the Sam-Yup Company also testified in relation to the repayments of debts incurred by the Chinese. Senator McCoppin asked, "What must a Chinaman do before he can go home to China by steamer?" President Hown replied: "He can go by letting the Company know it. He must have the permit of the Company. But some go without permits, such as actors, sailors, etc..."²¹⁶ When Senator McCoppin asked "When was this arrangement made with the steamship company"? Hown's reply was that it occurred

214. Lyman, op. cit., page 12.

215. California Senate Report, page 66.

216. Ibid., page 272.

with the first voyage of the China Steamer.²¹⁷

From the foregoing testimony then, it seems that a Chinese immigrant who came across the ocean on credit was bound to this Company until his debts were paid. Repayment could take a few years or it could take a lifetime. The issue here is that the Chinese were obligated to repay money borrowed contractly rather than being contracted for labor. The distinction between the two is important in the understanding of Chinese immigration. George Seward provides for us an understanding of the distinction when he writes:

It will be understood at once that a distinction is to be drawn between a contract to labor, and a contract to repay money advanced or due and owing in any, out of earning. Under the former the individuals might be required to give his service for a month, or a year, or two, or five years, to his creditor. He would not be at liberty to choose his employment, he would be in a sense, a man in bonds, and any considerable class of such labor might be justly considered service. The policy of our Government discourages such contracts ...But our laws do not disfavor to repay money advanced nor discourage in anyway the sense of obligation which a debtor should entertain towards his creditors.²¹⁸

With the distinction between contract to labor and contract to repay money advanced in mind, early Chinese migration was voluntary and free of contract to labor. However, in subsequent years, some Chinese were imported in terms of contract to labor, especially those imported by

217. Ibid., page 272.

218. Seward, op. cit., page 139.

Charles Crocker to help finish the Central Pacific Railroad.²¹⁹

For the most part, Chinese immigration was voluntary and the only restrictions attached were contracts made to repay passage money borrowed.

When the push and pull factors are combined we may say that the motive for Chinese migration to the United States was to find gold or to make enough money so that they may return back to the Pearl River Delta and live comfortably. Many borrowed or sold their little possessions in order to afford the price of passage to the "Golden Hills" of California. In those days, the passage fare from Hong Kong, the point of departure to San Francisco averaged from thirty to forty dollars. Whereas, the cost of transportation from Chicago to San Francisco was approximately sixty dollars.²²⁰ With the accessibility of the "Golden Hills" and the gold discovery in California the state experienced a heavy influx of Chinese migrants (three hundred and twenty five arrived in 1849, four hundred and fifty in 1850 and over twenty seven hundred in 1851). This would explain their concentration in the Western United States rather than in the East. The sojourners were exposed to the favorable reports and the opportunities available in California to make money because ship captains would flood the region with

219. Because of newspaper reports it became a common idea that Chinese immigration was of the contract variety. See Barth, op. cit., chapters three and four. However, the evidence suggests that this was not the case. See Coolidge, op. cit., pages 63, 343 and 349; Seward, op. cit., page 140-141, and Ralph Roske, op. cit., pages 331-332.

220. Joint Special Committee to Investigate Chinese Immigration, Senate Report, No. 689, 44th Congress, 2nd session, 1876-1877.

accounts of the Golden Hills. The reason being many of these men realized the profits to be made in transportating the human cargo of Chinese to the United States. Another factor in the exposure of the riches of California was that early gold seekers (1851-1853) had returned to China, after years of toil, with packets of gold dust which made possible a better life in the Delta (see Chapter Three). Influenced by these advertisements the sojourners felt that they too could obtain the riches of California and also enjoy their fortunes in China. In relation to this economic motive for migration, the sojourner's strong family ties at home made inevitable their return.

Without females, the sojourners toiled with the hopes of one day returning to their homes. In the meantime, they sought the solidarity of their compatriots from the Pearl River Delta. The Chinese Six Companies then played an important role in the lives of the sojourners. Its organization was not simply an unique American invention, rather, in China, differences in dialects and customs fostered the necessity that in every urban center, sojourners from the same districts should come together for mutual aid, entertainment and protection.²²¹ In those urban centers where large clans existed individuals may band together in terms of kinship loyalties. This was the institutionalized process of rural China because without the

221.

See Augustus W. Loomis, "The Six Chinese Companies," Overland Monthly, No. 1, (October, 1868), pages 221-227, and Fong Kum Ngon, "The Chinese Six Companies," Overland Monthly, No. 23, (May, 1894), pages 518-526.

assistance of kinship or organizational ties the lives of individuals could be taken without impunity by any one having a mind to do so, not to mention, the need for economic and social assistance. Thus, the sojourners migrated with the institutions of the Pearl River Delta in mind when they erected kinship and district organizations in the various parts of the world. This was simply a transplanting of the organizational structure of China where kinship and regional ties were stronger than the individuals ties to the state. Lyman states:

The imperial and republican governments depended on local village headmen to maintain peace and ensure the payment of taxes. The adoption of conservative and family minded confucian piety as an official ideology represented the state's wish that the "primary" units of the Empire, that is, the family and lineage, control themselves in the interest of political order.²²²

The necessity of establishing these organizational ties became important in the United States as soon as the Chinese began migrating in large numbers after 1850. In 1850, sojourners "from the districts of Nanhai, Pwanyu and Shunte organized the first district company, the Sam Yap, which encompassed the three districts

222. Lyman, The Chinese Americans, page 11. The Chinese Government found itself caught in the paradox of Chinese social structure, (Ibid., page 11) because the family had a political function and also that the loyalty of the individual was to this unit. The Communist regime has tried for years to destroy the political function of the family so that it may have absolute control over every individual without interference from the family. This has been achieved to some extent, however, the southeastern part of China even to this day has traces of traditional family loyalty. See Ezra Vogel, "From Friendship to Comradeship: The Change in Personal Relations in Communist China," China Quarterly, No. 22, (April-June, 1968) pages 46-60.

of Canton. In the same year, the Sze Yap was formed and it linked the districts of Sinhwui, Sinning (Toisham), Anping and Haiping."²²³ By 1854 there were five district companies (See Table IV) based in San Francisco's Chinatown. These organizations controlled, as the organizational ties in the Pearl River Delta, the relations of the Chinese with the outside world. The merchant leaders of these companies became official spokesmen for the Chinese in America. All newcomers were required to register with these companies, and all debts must be cleared with them before they may return back to China.

TABLE IV. Estimates of the Growth of the Five District Companies, 1854.

Name of Company	Arrivals in California	Figures Died	Members
Sam Yap	8,400	300	6,800
Sze Yap	13,200	300	9,200
Yeong Wo	16,900	400	14,000
Yan Wo	2,100	160	1,780
Ning Yeong	8,349	173	6,907
TOTALS:	48,949	1,333	38,687

Source: Barth, op. cit., page 90.

The shipment of the dead back to China, an important aspect of Chinese custom, because of the necessity to be buried on ancestral land, was also provided for by these organizations.

The conflicts of the Pearl River Delta were also recapitulated

223. Barth, op. cit., page 88.

on the American scene and these organizations served to maintain these old trends. Barth states:

The running feuds of villages and clans which upset the equilibrium of the Pearl River Delta found new expressions in the fights among the district companies. Punti and Hakka, as well as Sam Yap, Sze Yap, Ning Yeong and Yeong Wo, continued their old hostilities in California.²²⁴

Lyman states:

...The Hakka-Punti war was fought not only in Kwangtung between 1855 and 1868, but also in Malaya as the Larut War of 1872-1873, and in the United States as the Weaverville War of 1854. In the American phase of this war, the Sam Yap hui Kuan composed of Cantonese; fell out with that of the Yan Wo, which represented the Hakka group at China Camp and at Weaverville, California. In one battle at Kentucky Ranch 900 soldiers of the Yan Wo group met 1,200 of the Sam Yap army and fought until the latter were victorious.²²⁵

By 1862 a sixth district company was added, and the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association was formed, an organization which was dominated by merchants, and which regulated the ties of the residents of Chinatown.²²⁶ In addition to organizations based on district, the Chinese also possessed clan organizations based on surnames. For example, in Kwangtung province the Chan, Lee and Wong

224. Ibid., page 93-94.

225. Lyman, The Chinese Americans, page 50.

226. For the membership figures in the Chinese Six Companies in 1876 and 1942, see S. Lyman, The Asian in the West, page 74. and William Hoy, The Chinese Six Companies, (San Francisco: Chinese Benevolent Association, 1942), page 16.

clans were large organizations and they were also transplanted to San Francisco. Thus, the elements of social control found in the Delta were grafted on to the American scene and the homeless sojourners, without family ties, found themselves relying on these organizations for protection, assistance, gambling, prostitution and social support.

Indirectly, the methods of migration, the credit-ticket system, tied the sojourners to these organizations until their debts were paid, and for many of them, it took several decades. Further, the avenues of recreation offered by secret societies and district organizations provided the invaluable services of prostitution, gambling and opium dens for these men. These services also serve to tie the sojourners to Chinatown, and no matter where they were working, Chinatown was considered home.

CHAPTER IV.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MIGRATION

In the preceeding pages we tried to argue the implications of the sojourner type of migration. Further, we characterized Chinese immigration to the United States as a sojourner type. In locating the motives for the migration, we highlighted the push and pull factors which fostered the movement and the main thesis was that the group could not maintain an equilibrium between sustenance and population in their ecological complex. Thus, the Chinese migrated in order to seek income or wealth, with the intention of returning home. Out of this, the group maybe characterized as a migratory labor force, with a high remigration rate. In order for us to empirically test the generalizations of sojourner migration, let us briefly review some of them.

First, the sociological literature describes the Chinese as sojourners in the sense that they left their families behind when they migrated because they had the intention of returning home, and that their hope was to make economic gains in the country of sojourn. For example, Rose Hum Lee argues: "Sojourners, or early immigrants sought different objectives. They emigrated to better themselves economically with the ultimate expectation of retiring to their home village, restablising themselves and enjoying their new status."²²⁷

227. Rose Hum Lee, op. cit., page 422.

There are several implications that must be tested here. If sojourners migrated for economic gain, it presupposes that there were few economic opportunities in the homeland, an issue which has been addressed, and if there were economic opportunities the remuneration was too low for sustenance requirements, an issue which must be addressed. Thereby, it is necessary to formulate an idea as to the rate of wages in China, a difficulty because of the lack of data. However, in the examination of testimony of those who lived in China, as well as that of the Chinese, we have formulated a general impression as to what wages were like in China.

Another implication of sojourner migration is that many of the Chinese immigrants left their wives behind in China because of proscriptions affecting the travel of women, an issue which was addressed, and also because they intended to return home, an issue which must be addressed. We intend to locate the existence of wives in China by inferring it from the marital statistics of the Chinese population in the United States. The reason being, the difficulty that exists in obtaining data on the marital characteristics of the migrants themselves. If there exists in the population a larger percentage of males who are married in comparison to the number of females in the population, then we may make the inference that many of these men left their wives in the homeland. Added to this will be the statistics of the remigration rate for the group, as well as the increase and decrease in the population due to migration and remigration.

Extension of this issue will be the sex ratio of the group, that is we intend to argue that it was because of the intention to return home that the sex ratio of the Chinese was so imbalanced. Sojourner migration then, as we have outlined it, tend to reflect an "abnormally" low percentage of women and children and that this statistic has serious implications in terms of assimilation, social life and the community structure of the group.

Second, we intend to examine the occupational characteristics of the Chinese immigrants in order to argue that sojourners tend to be used as a migratory labor force in those occupations that whites refused to enter, as well as, being used to undercut the native work force. Further, there will be no correlation between the type of work performed in the homeland and the type of work done in the country of sojourn. Rather, the issue is one of wage labor and not occupational specialization. In addition to this, there exists the tendency to be concentrated in those occupational areas where assets may be liquidated easily, due to the intention of returning home.²²⁸

Third, while we are testing the generalizations involved in sojourner migration, we are keeping in mind the generalizations in

228. There may be exceptions to this. For example, the migration of the Japanese may be characterized as a sojourner migration, (See Lyman, The Asian In The West, page 76.) However, many of the immigrants went into farming, an economic activity that is characteristic of permanent immigration. See Masakazy Jwata, "The Japanese Immigrants in California Argiculture," Argicultural History, 36, (January, 1962, pages 25-37.

terms of permanent migration, as a way of highlighting the demographic similarities and differences involved in both types of migration. Implicit in the different demographic characteristics of sojourner and permanent migration will be differences in community settlement resulting from these two types of immigration to the United States. It is our contention that the communities of sojourners, especially that of the Chinese, are drastically different from those of permanent immigrants. The reason being that these "communities are too small and specialized to maintain all the usual community functions, such as the reproduction of the population, economic independence, integration into the larger society and permanent settlement."²²⁹ Thus, the implication here is that the type of migration employed by the group; permanent or sojourner, has an important effect on the type of community life that the group possesses. One cannot fully understand the communal settlement of the group unless one understands the type of migration employed.

Fourthly, all of our generalizations involving the migration of the Chinese as sojourners will be taken from secondary sources and our discussion of each generalization will begin with the statements made by contemporary writers.

1. The Economic Motive for Chinese Immigration

In the area of demography, a popular theory is that immigrants

²²⁹. Lee, op. cit., page 422.

tend to migrate to those areas where their skills are in demand. This however, presupposes that the migrants possess types of skills in the homeland that are not being utilized because of the large pool of individuals with the same skills. It is then logical to assume that if this were the case, then there would be the tendency of migrating to those areas where there exists a demand for skills. However, the history of migration to the United States indicates that immigrants migrate not because of the demand for skills in one's occupation, but because of the availability of employment at better wages. Thus, there was no correlation between skill and occupation, rather, if anything there was more of a frequency of change in occupation. This is even more so when we consider immigration from an agricultural orientation. Maurice Davie states:

Recent immigrants have been largely peasants and farm laborers from the less industrialized countries of Europe. About four-fifths are unskilled laborers without previous experience in mining and manufacturing, yet they find work mainly in these industries. This employment has been made possible by the invention of mechanical devices and processes which have eliminated the skill and experience formerly required in a large number of occupations.²³⁰

It is obvious that the economic conditions in the country of immigration are important because it is due to an expanding economy that migrants are able to utilize skills they never used before.²³¹

230. Davie, op. cit., page 238.

231. See Harry Jerome, Migration and Business Cycles, (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1926), and Dorothy S. Thomas, Social and Economic Aspects of Swedish Population Movements, 1750-1933, (New York: MacMillan, 1941).

The lure of economic opportunities then is important in determining the migration rate. There are two issues then we must examine in regards to Chinese migration to the United States. First, we must look at the economic opportunities for wages available in California in relation to the migration rate of the Chinese, and second, we must also examine whether or not a change in occupation took place. Let us look at the latter first.

China at the time of migration to the United States was an agricultural society and "sustenance came mainly from the land because there was little industry to speak of, and human labor was too plentiful and much too cheap to exchange for a decent livelihood."²³² Because of this we would expect Chinese migration to the United States to be mainly comprised of those who were farmers or farm laborers. Thus, Coolidge states:

The bulk of the population in China is engaged in agriculture and fisheries--and these classes, as producers, are more highly valued than manufacturers and merchants--but only small farmers, laborers and merchants have emigrated in any considerable number...The greater part of the emigration to British Columbia, Australia and the United States, has been from small farmer class.²³³

It is interesting to note that the merchants, who were ranked below farmers in China, tended to migrate in terms of their occupation and also tended to dominate the Chinese community in the United States.

232. Sung, op. cit., page 14.

233. Coolidge, op. cit., page 4.

Sandmeyer writes:

The merchants who ranked near the bottom in the social scale in China, were looked upon as the leaders of the Chinese in this country. These men not only handled practically all of the merchandise consumed by the Chinese population, but also dominated the "companies" to which the Chinese men belonged...The merchants group, however, constituted a very small proportion of the total Chinese population.²³⁴

The majority of Chinese who migrated to the United States came as goldseekers at first and then later turned to other economic areas. Thus, historically, the majority of Chinese migrants have been laborers, engaging in a wide variety of occupations. For example, the records of the Chinese Six Companies in 1869 listed the occupations of its members in San Francisco:

TABLE V. Occupations of the Chinese in San Francisco, 1869

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Number</u>
Merchants or connected with Mercantile Firms	376
Storekeepers, Butchers, Bakers, etc.	1200
Laundrymen	746
Peddlers	216
Fishermen	50
Tinsmiths	33
Carpenters	48
Artists and Photographers	16
Doctors	17
Laborers	1000
Cigar Makers	2750
Rag and Offal Gatherers	70
Shoemakers	830
Factory and Millhands	1500
Domestic Servants	4580
Miscellaneous Occupations	500

Source: Helen Cather, The History of San Francisco's Chinatown, (San Francisco, California: R and E Research Associates Reprint, 1974), page 35.

234. Sandmeyer, op. cit., pages 12-13.

We may conclude from Table V that over fifty percent of the early chinese migrants were laborers. To a large extent, they were attracted to California because of the higher wages paid there than in China. If we were to take a look at the wages paid in China, we see that few occupations were comparable to the rates of pay in California, (See Tables VI and VII).

TABLE VI. Testimony of Wages Paid in China.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Type of Work</u>	<u>Rate</u>
F.F. Low	Laborers	\$3-6 Dollars per month
Rev. Gibson	Laborers	4-6 Dollars per month
C. Brooks	Laborers	5-6 Dollars per month
Rev. Loomis	Laborers	3-5 Dollars per month
Lee Ming Hown	Skilled Laborers	8-10 Dollars per month
Lee Ming Hown	Unskilled Laborers	2-3 Dollars per month
Sin How	Clerks (Large Houses)	25-30 Dollars per month
Sin How	Clerks (Small Houses)	2-Up Dollars per month

Source: California Senate Report, pages 7,27,40,54,71 and 96 through 97.

Further, the testimony revealed that wages in China was in accordance with the cost of living. Reverend A.W. Loomis testified the following to the question, "How much will it take to support the family of a laboring man in China?"

Three or four dollars a month. Some live on less than that. Everything is very cheap. A man acquires three hundred dollars or four hundred dollars is rich-esteemed comfortably well off.²³⁵

In addition to Reverend Loomis, Lee Ming Hown also testified that the

²³⁵. California Senate Report, page 55.

cost of living in China was such that it took only "one dollar to support each individual in the family per month."²³⁶ If we now look at the rate of pay in California, (Table VII), there exists a big difference between wages in California and wages in China.

TABLE VII. Wages of Chinese Laborers in California, 1883-1884.

<u>Occupations</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>With Board</u>
Domestics	\$18-25 month	Yes
Cooks	10-30 month	Yes
Farmers	25-30 month	Yes
Farm Laborers	20-25 month	Yes
Brick Makers	25-35 month	No
Slipper Makers	16-20 month	No
Bag Makers	16-24 month	No
Miners	24-48 month	Yes
Cannery Worker	.75-1.75 per day	No
Boot and Shoe Makers	.75-1.75 per day	No
Cigar Makers	\$4-12 per 1000	No

Source: Sandmeyer, op. cit., page 22.

It is easy to see then that from our rough estimates, California's main attraction was the wage rate paid the Chinese in comparison to that paid in China. Implicit in Sin How's testimony is this issue. When Senator McCoppin asked him, "What induced you to come to this country?" Mr. How's reply was: "I came here to keep store and do business. There are a good many in this country who send back to China and praise it up, and that induces some folks to come."²³⁷

236. Ibid., page 7.

237. Ibid., page 96.

Added to the high wages in California is the fact that these early immigrants, in leaving their families behind, did not have to support them in accordance with the cost of living in California, but rather in accordance with the cost of living in China, which was remarkably lower. It is because of this and the thrift of the sojourner that he was able to support a family in China as well as save enough to return home. Further, the estimated cost of living for the Chinese in California in 1876 was between one hundred and sixty five dollars and two hundred dollars a year.²³⁸ This rate seems inconsistent with the facts. For example, many occupations included board, which meant that a large portion of the Chinese population did not pay for food or lodging. Although the majority of the Chinese became wage laborers, their migration coincided with the discovery of gold in California in 1848. In fact, the Chinese were not the only migrants induced into the state by the prospects of a fortune. Rather, the state's population growth illustrates the great attraction of California, (See Table VIII) because of the rapid increase in its population.

TABLE VIII. Growth of California's Population, 1850-1870

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>
1850	92,597
1860	279,994
1870	560,247

Source: Compendium of the Ninth Census of the United States, (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1872), page 28.

238. Coolidge, op. cit., page 433.

California became known to the Chinese as "Chin Shan" or Golden Mountain²³⁹ and Australia became known as "Hsin Chin Shan" or the New Golden Mountain because of its gold discovery. Those who migrated to the United States were called "Gum Shan Hok" or guest of the Golden Mountain.²⁴⁰ The early miners who went to America were eager to impress their friends and relatives and they sent as well as brought back packets of gold dust and gold nuggets. The news spread rapidly, and the migration to the Golden Mountain became collective behavior or a stream. Sandmeyer describes the process by stating:

The spell of the "Golden Romance" became even stronger when some of the first arrivals returned and exhibited substantial evidence of success in their venture. Nor was this attraction temporary. Throughout the period of war devastations the call of the golden Mountains...was ringing in the air of the distressed regions of Canton.²⁴¹

The same theme is echoed by Pyan Ling, whom Sandmeyer quoted:

The call to the Golden Mountains, the name given by the Chinese to California, was ringing in the air of the distressed regions of Canton. To go over there and dig the gold up was the thirsty desire of the poor suffers.²⁴²

Finally, Coolidge also locates the same reason for Chinese migration:

"The news of the discovery of gold in Sacramento Valley in January,

239. Barth, op. cit., page 57.

240. Sung, op. cit., page 16.

241. Sandmeyer, op. cit., page 14.

242. Ling, op. cit., page 80.

1848, reached Hong Kong in the spring and created much excitement there as well as at the seaports on the Atlantic Ocean."²⁴³ Consequently, when we examined the figures on Chinese immigration we noticed that between 1820 and 1848 only fourteen Chinese immigrants came to the United States. However, three hundred and twenty-five arrived in 1849, four hundred and fifty in 1850 and two thousand and seventeen in 1851.²⁴⁴ Thus, the increase in Chinese migration tended to coincide with the gold discovery in California.

Added to the pull factors of California's gold discovery, the migration also coincided with the Tai-ping Rebellion of 1851, the typhoon of 1849 and the problem of overpopulation in the Delta by 1850. Thus, Lyman writes:

Chinese immigration to America effectively began in 1847. A coincidence of catastrophe in China and opportunity in California supplied the expulsive and attractive elements that linked the middle kingdom to the United States. Political and unrest...overpopulation ...the terrible flood in 1849...uprooted hundreds of thousands of Chinese from their villages. Many fled to the coastal seaports of Canton, Hong Kong and Macao where they hoped to find work, to secure aid from kinsmen, or to go abroad temporarily until they could recoup their losses and return to loved ones as wealthy men.²⁴⁵

The fact that the Chinese were motivated by the prospects of becoming rich as miners maybe illustrated by Table IX. Of the 34,933 Chinese listed in the 1860 census, over seventy percent were

243. Coolidge, op. cit., page 17.

244. Ibid., page 498.

245. Lyman, op. cit., page 11.

listed in the mining counties.²⁴⁶ Added to this is the total, paid by the Chinese, of \$4,821,145.28 as foreign miner's license taxes between

TABLE IX. Chinese in Mining Counties of California, Including San Francisco, 1860-1880

<u>Counties</u>	<u>1860</u>	<u>1870</u>	<u>1880</u>
Alameda	193	1,939	4,386
Amador	2,568	1,627	1,115
Butte	2,177	2,082	3,793
Calaveras	3,657	1,441	1,037
El Dorado	4,762	1,560	1,484
Mariposa	1,843	1,084	697
Nevada	2,147	2,267	3,003
Placer	2,392	2,410	2,190
Sacramento	1,731	3,595	4,892
San Francisco	2,719	12,022	21,745
Sierra	2,208	810	1,252
Trinity	1,638	1,099	1,951
Tuolumme	1,962	1,524	805
Yuba	1,781	2,337	2,146

Source: Tenth Census of the United States, also see the Compendium of the Ninth Census, page 29.

1850-1870. When we compare that amount to the total paid by all foreigners, \$4,919,536.40, we see that the Chinese constituted the largest single foreign miners group in the state.²⁴⁷ Even though many were engaged in mining, they did not compete directly with white miners, rather, they bought worked out claims of white miners which

246. Compendium of the Ninth Census of the United States, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1872), page 29.

247. Coolidge, op. cit., page 37. For a discussion of the Foreign Miner's License Tax and its impact on the Chinese, see Coolidge, Ibid., pages 26-40.

enabled whites to relocate elsewhere. Many of these abandoned claims produced a meager living due to the hard work and industriousness of the Chinese people.²⁴⁸ Taliesin Evans writing for the Overland Monthly in June of 1870 states that of the 63,482 men reportedly engaged in mining in California in 1868, as many as 15,814 of them were said to be Chinese. However, only fifty-eight of them worked in the more lucrative quartz mines, which used machinery to get out the ore, while the remainder were alluvial or placer miners, whose finds had by then become much smaller than in the early days of the gold rush.²⁴⁹

With the decline of mining and the passage of the Foreign Miner's License Tax of 1852, many of the Chinese had to seek other occupational outlets.²⁵⁰ This was possible because of the industrial expansion of the state as a result of the wealth involved in gold mining. Thus, by 1870 only forty-five percent of the Chinese were in mining counties and thirty-eight percent of them were to be found in the cities of San Jose, Sacramento and San Francisco.²⁵¹ Further, between 1862 and 1867 approximately twelve to fifteen percent of the

248. Ibid., page 35.

249. Taliesin Evans, "Gold and Gold Mining," Overland Monthly, No. 4, (June, 1870), page 498, and C. Robinson, "Old California Placers and their Possibilities," Overland Monthly, No. 23, (March, 1894), page 300.

250. Coolidge, op. cit., page 34.

251. Ibid., page 35.

Chinese left mining and went to work in railroad construction, six percent were engaged in manufacturing and there was a tendency on the part of the group to work in occupations in which there was the greatest scarcity of laborers.²⁵² After gold mining then, Chinese migration was maintained by the wages immigrants received in California, in comparison to those received in China. If they could not earn a fortune from gold mining then they hoped to work and save enough of their wages in order to return back to China financially well off.

2. Empirical Indication of the Intention to Return Home

Of all the generalizations about age composition of migrants, by far, the most established one is that migrants tend to be mainly adolescents and young adults. For example, the majority of immigrants to the United States in the nineteenth century were aged between fifteen and forty years of age.²⁵³

In terms of the Chinese, contemporary writers argued that the age composition of the Chinese was mostly young males. However, they failed to mention any age range. Mary Coolidge, for example states:

During the first thirty-three years-the period of free immigration-the Chinese, despite their racial peculiarities, were of much the same age and class as the Germans and Irish agricultural immigrants of the period at the port of New York. Like them, they sold

252. Ibid., pages 334-349.

253. Petersen, op. cit., page 262.

their little property or borrowed on family security the necessary passage money.²⁵⁴

Both E. Sandmeyer and S. Lyman conclude that the great majority of Chinese migrants were young males.²⁵⁵ If this were the case, then we should expect that ten years after the immigration, that is, in 1860, the majority of the Chinese immigrants should range in age from twenty-five to fifty years of age. In 1860, the Chinese population was 34,933,²⁵⁶ which included, 33,149 males and 1,784 females.²⁵⁷ The following table shows the age distribution of the Chinese population in 1860 by sex, and from the data in Table X, it seems that the Chinese were of the same general age grouping as European immigrants. The majority of the Chinese migrants were young adults. Approximately eighty percent of the migrants in 1860 were between the ages of twenty and thirty-nine (27,004). This indicates that the migrants were comprised of those individuals who were able to enter the labor force immediately. Because there were few children and old people, in comparison with the total number of migrants, it seems that the migrants were not a random distribution of the population. Further, the age break-down of the Chinese suggest that family migration was not the case because of the lack of an even age distribution in the population.

254. Coolidge, op. cit., page 21.

255. Sandmeyer, op. cit., page 13, and Lyman, The Asian In The West, page 28.

256. United States Bureau of the Census, Compendium of the Ninth Census, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1872), page 19.

257. United States Bureau of the Census, The Eight Census of the United States, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1864).

TABLE X. Population of California by Age and Sex, 1860

Age	Chinese		Whites		Free Blacks		Indians	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Under 1	3	3	4,474	4,336	38	36	130	155
1-4	20	24	16,282	15,419	140	157	826	717
5-9	20	17	12,245	11,841	112	103	961	773
10-14	313	33	8,689	8,011	81	86	1,031	826
15-19	1,896	431	9,039	7,697	108	96	1,146	1,076
20-29	14,906	862	71,434	22,920	718	282	2,819	1,717
30-39	10,924	312	69,697	16,264	839	277	1,750	960
40-49	3,772	71	23,625	6,153	504	145	1,012	492
50-59	919	18	8,227	2,518	211	64	340	181
60-69	344	12	2,436	927	48	10	295	126
70-79	23	1	359	207	16	2	104	64
80-89	4	-	67	64	3	-	69	39
90-99	-	-	11	8	-	-	48	26
Over 100	-	-	6	3	-	-	26	29
TOTALS	33,149	1,784	226,774	96,403	2,827	1,259	10,587	7,211

Source: Eighth Census of the United States, pages 26-29.

From this we may infer that the migration was economically motivated.²⁵⁸ This suggests that the migrants wanted to economically better themselves or that there were few opportunities available to them in their ecological complex, and migration was used as an economic outlet. From our previous discussions of the causes of Chinese emigration, we tend to feel that the latter is the case. The next issue is to ascertain the sexual composition of the migrants. We tend to agree with the conclusion that the majority of Chinese immigrants were young males, however, we must add, young males, mainly in the 20-39 age range and the main reason "for this high proportion of young adults is that, any migration involves a certain amount of

258. Petersen, *op. cit.*, page 220.

adjustment at the destination, and youth connotes a better ability to adapt to new circumstances."²⁵⁹ When you also take into account that these sojourners migrated because of economic reasons, then the unequal distribution of the age range tend to confirm this assumption.

3. Sexual Characteristics of the Group

The generalizations involving sex in demography suggests that males tend to predominate in international migration, females tend to predominate in internal migration, males predominate in the earlier stages of migration, in non-western societies males predominate in both international and internal migrations and that the numerical dominance of males over females of remigrants is very high.²⁶⁰

We have maintained that sojourners intend to return home to their families and because of this, the migration is mainly a male migration. On the other hand, permanent immigrants reflect more of an even distribution in regards to sex, even though males maybe the majority. For us, the sex ratio becomes a crucial characteristic in locating the intention to return home because if sojourners are mostly males, then the group cannot adequately reproduce itself. Let us now consider the assumptions contemporary writers have made in regards to the sexual characteristic of Chinese immigration. Stanford Lyman in

259. Petersen, op. cit., page 262.

260. Ibid., pages 263-264.

two different sources states:

The most significant feature of overseas Chinese settlement has been the imbalance in the sex ratio. Throughout the nations and colonies of southeast Asia, the almost womanless conditions of the Chinese aroused concern and encouraged condemnation of colonial officials.²⁶¹

Elsewhere he states:

The principal social problem affecting the Chinese in America was the shortage of women. So few Chinese women came to America that it was not until the middle of the twentieth century that there occurred even a proximity in balancing the sex ratio.²⁶²

Coolidge located the imbalance in the Chinese sex ratio by citing some of the reasons why the women did not migrate. She states:

At the period of immigration there was so strong a sentiment in China against any respectable woman leaving home even with her husband that very few went to America or Australia. The few who went to California were for the most part large-footed women of working class, or women of disreputable character.²⁶³

Sandmeyer arrives at the same conclusion when he states:

Concerning one class of Chinese in California there was little if any difference of opinion. Relatively, very few Chinese women came to America, the reasons being that custom forbade women to leave their homes, and that very few of the Chinese came expecting to remain permanently.²⁶⁴

From the preceeding statements we may conclude that very few

-
261. Lyman, Chinese Americans, page 87
262. Lyman, The Asian In The West, page 18.
263. Coolidge, op. cit., page 19.
264. Sandmeyer, op. cit., page 13.

women came to America. The reasons are that proscriptions at home restricted their travel, just like many African groups and that the sojourners intended to return home. We tend to agree with Petersen's statement that the sex ratio of remigrants is very high and since we are conceptualizing remigrants as sojourners, we are assuming that males will predominate in the migration. Now let us look at the facts in order to see if they fit our assumptions.

TABLE XI. Chinese in the United States, 1820-1900

<u>Year</u>	<u>Arrivals at San Francisco</u>	<u>Coolidge's Figures</u>	<u>Number in the Census</u>
1820-30	3	-	-
1830-40	8	-	-
1849	325	-	-
1850	450	-	-
1851	2,716	7,370	-
1852	20,026	25,116	-
1853	4,270	24,466	-
1854	16,084	37,447	-
1855	3,329	36,557	-
1856	4,807	37,569	-
1857	5,924	40,730	-
1858	5,427	42,743	-
1859	3,175	42,599	-
1860	7,341	46,897	34,933
1870	10,870	71,083	63,199
1880	5,802	104,991	105,465
1890	1,860	-	107,488
1900	1,247	-	89,863

Source: Coolidge, op. cit., page 489, California Senate Report, page 171, and United States Census of 1860, 1870, 1880, 1890, 1900, pages 27, 29, 419, 513 and 551.

Given the numerical listing of Chinese in the United States, let us now look at the migration figures in relation to sex and then look at

the population figures in relation to sex. Table XII indicates that the number of migratory females is extremely small in comparison to

TABLE XII. Sex of Chinese Immigrants
Admitted to the United States, 1854-1864

<u>Year</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Number of Chinese Women Listed in the Census</u>
1854	15,411	673	-
1855	3,327	2	-
1856	4,791	16	-
1857	5,474	450	-
1858	5,107	320	-
1859	2,708	467	-
1860	7,312	29	1,784
1861	7,915	515	-
1862	7,525	650	-
1863	6,431	1	-
1864	2,518	164	-

Source: Coolidge, op. cit., page 505, and
California Senate Report, page 171.

the number of migratory males. In order to see the difference in the sex ratio between sojourners and permanent immigrants, we constructed another table from the immigration data, (See Table XIII). We maintain that there is a greater percentage of women in the migration of permanent immigrants. This is so, because these migrants would either bring their families or send for them at a later date. Thus, women would either be joining their husbands, arriving with their husbands or that female children would also be included in the data. On the other hand, sojourners tend not to bring their families with them, nor send for them, thereby, a different sex ratio emerges

TABLE XIII. Comparison of Permanent Immigrants and Sojourners
by Place of Origin and Sex, 1853-1855

Year	England		Germany		Italy		Ireland		China	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1853	16,075	1,292	83,520	57,133	293	14	86,353	76,296	42	0
1854	28,989	19,912	121,766	84,288	681	303	56,029	2,128	12,427	673
1855	21,286	16,885	37,356	28,863	837	187	26,029	23,598	3,524	2
Totals	67,050	49,589	242,642	170,284	1,921	554	168,876	102,022	15,993	675

Source: William J. Bromwell, History of Immigration to the United States, pages 164,168 and 972.

out of the difference in the two types of migration. As the data in Table XIII suggest, even though males are in the majority for both the permanent immigrants and the sojourners, there is usually a higher percentage of females in permanent migration than there exists in sojourner migration. Thus, it seems that there were factors at work that prevented the immigration of the Chinese females. We conclude that the intention to return, as well as the proscriptions placed on the migration of Chinese females accounted for the difference in the sex ratio between the two types of migrants.

Further, when the Chinese made the transition from sojourners to permanent immigrants the subsequent migration of females and children reflect a similarity to that of permanent immigrants. This is so because Chinese husbands would send for their families and there would be more of an equal distribution in the age composition and the sex composition of new immigrants. In order to illustrate this, we have included Table XIV from the immigration data. Table XIV suggests that the earlier factors that prevented the migration of Chinese females were no longer

TABLE XIV. Age and Sex of Chinese Immigrants Admitted to the United States, 1950-1960

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>%</u>
0-14	2,903	26.0	2,524	15.0
15-44	5,069	46.0	12,046	69.0
45 and Over	3,073	28.0	2,761	16.0
TOTALS	11,045	100	17,331	100

Source: Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1950-1960).

in effect after 1950. Further, since there was a larger migration of females, especially in the 15-44 age group (69 percent), we may assume that many of them were joining their husbands in the United States. Also, the large proportion of children suggests that families were being united because the data suggest that historically, children constituted a very low percentage of the Chinese population. For example, if we were to look at the data in Table X, page 121, we again see that in 1860 there was a total of 34,933 Chinese in the United States, of whom 33,149 were males and 1,784 were females. Thus, the migration indicated that more females migrated in the ten year period of 1950 to 1960 than in the eighty year period of 1850 to 1930. Thus, we may argue that by 1930 the group had made the transition from sojourners to permanent immigrants, and in this vein, the immigration of females began to occur in large numbers. If we were to examine also the number of children in the age group of 0-14 in Table X, we would see that out of the total population there were only four hundred and thirty-three children in that age group. Now, if we

were to compare this number with the figures of Table XV, we see that in 1900 children in the age group 0-14 still accounted for a small percentage of the population, and we must bear in mind that this is

TABLE XV. Percentage of the Chinese Population Reported for each Age Period, by sex, 1900

<u>Age Periods</u>	<u>Both Sexes</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Under 1 year	0.2	0.1	0.1
1 to 4 years	1.1	0.6	0.5
Under 5 years	1.3	0.7	0.6
4 to 9 years	1.2	0.7	0.5
10 to 14 years	1.0	0.6	0.4
15 to 19 years	2.4	2.0	0.4
20 to 24 years	5.1	4.4	0.7
25 to 29 years	7.6	7.0	0.6
30 to 34 years	11.7	11.2	0.5
35 to 39 years	17.0	17.3	0.4
40 to 44 years	18.8	16.7	0.3
45 to 49 years	10.2	13.5	0.3
50 to 54 years	5.4	10.0	0.2
55 to 59 years	3.8	5.3	0.1
60 to 64 years	1.3	3.7	0.1
65 to 69 years	0.4	1.3	-
70 to 74 years	0.1	0.4	-
75 to 79 years	-	0.1	-
ALL AGES	100.1	94.9	5.1

Source: Twelfth Census of the United States, Table XXVI.

approximately fifty years after migration to the United States began. When we compare these figures with the immigration data in Table XIV, we see that in the ten years of immigration there is a higher proportion of children migrating to the United States than was produced by birth in fifty years of residence in the United States. In order to see why this is so, let us examine the marital status of the

Chinese in the United States. First, Table XVI lists the Chinese population by sex. The data in Table XVI tend to confirm the fact

TABLE XVI. Chinese Population in the United States by Sex, 1860-1900

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number in the Census</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Sex Ratio</u>
1860	34,933	33,149	94.9	1,784	5.1	1,858.1
1870	63,199	53,633	92.9	4,566	7.2	1,284.1
1880	105,465	100,686	95.5	4,779	4.5	2,106.8
1890	107,488	103,620	96.4	3,868	3.6	2,678.9
1900	89,863	85,341	95.0	4,522	5.0	1,887.2

Source: Eight, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh and Twelfth Census of the United States: 1860, 1870, 1880, 1890, 1900. Pages 29, 551, 419, 27 and 513.

that females constituted a small fraction of Chinese immigration. As such, the ratio between the two sexes illustrate an "abnormally" high percentage of males in comparison to females. It is because of this high sex ratio that we maintain that these sojourners intended to return to the homeland. Obviously, the ratio suggest that under no circumstances could the group reproduce itself and it is this issue that provides one of the empirical indicators of sojourner migration. Further, the data suggests that the community structure of the group would be different in comparison to that of permanent immigrants, in that, institutional linkages with the larger society, such as the public school, could not occur on any meaningful level. This is so because the group could not produce enough children in order to warrant such an institution.

4. Marital Status of the Chinese Immigrants

In demography it is a well accepted assumption that when the sex ratio varies drastically from one hundred, it indicates that many of the migrants are not married and the explanation offered is that migrants tend to be mainly single young adults. However, when we examined the writings on the Chinese, there seems to be a common agreement that a large proportion of the Chinese immigrants were married and that they left their wives in China. However, these writers did not provide any empirical evidence for such an assumption. For example, Coolidge states:

Of the Chinese who came to California at least one half were married and expected not merely to make their personal fortune, but to support a family at home; for no man in China over twenty remains unmarried unless he is a wanderer or very poor.²⁶⁵

Stanford Lyman uses Coolidge's quote and states:

Of those who sailed for California, at least fifty percent were married, leaving their wives behind in accord with the prohibitory Chinese laws and customs concerning women.²⁶⁶

and again he states:

Although exact statistical evidence is unavailable to verify the fact, it appears that at least half of the Chinese men who came to America were married. Many others were young single men at the time of their

265. Ibid., page 18.

266. Lyman, The Asian In The West, page 73.

arrival in America, but, having acquired a small amount of money, returned to China, married and remigrated back to America without their wives.²⁶⁷

Agustus W. Loomis, writing for the Overland Monthly in 1869, a California publication states:

Peasants under normal circumstances hold on to their ancestral land. Even merchants doing extensive business in another part of the country usually lived alone. Therefore, the journey of common laborers across the ocean to an entirely unknown America... with the expectation that most of the men expected to return to China after a few years, accounted for the scarcity of normal Chinese families in California in the early days. This led to the consequent introduction of prostitutes by enterprising individuals.²⁶⁸

It would seem that both the historical and contemporary sources tend to agree in regards to the migration of the Chinese sojourners without their families.

Although direct evidence is not readily available in regards to the marital status of the Chinese immigrants, we may empirically verify whether or not there was a large proportion of married males, by using indirect statistical evidence. Thus, Table XVII indicates the marital status of the Chinese in America, yet these figures in Table XVII seem to be somewhat misleading because the percent of males married is too large for the total number of females in the United States. For example, if we were to focus on the year 1900, the sex ratio would be 1,887.2 males to every 100 females

267. Ibid., page 28.

268. Agustus W. Loomis, "Chinese in California," Overland Monthly, No. 2, (April, 1869), pages 344 to 346.

(see Table XVI, page 129), which then means that there was an excess of 80,819 males. The data in Table XVII however, suggest that

TABLE XVII. Marital Status of the Chinese in the United States, 1890-1910

Year	Population by Sex	SINGLE		MARRIED	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1890	Male 102,322	70,625	69.0	26,720	26.1
	Female 3,074	993	32.3	1,951	63.5
1900	Male 83,633	48,997	58.6	31,794	38.0
	Female 3,204	779	24.3	2,157	67.0
1910	Male 64,394	34,330	53.3	26,449	41.1
	Female 2,995	680	23.0	2,016	68.22

Source: Eleventh, twelfth and thirteen Censuses of the United States. 1890,1900,1910. Pages 27,513 and 417.

thirty-eight percent of the males were married, a figure of 31,794 when there were only 2,157 women who were married. This would leave roughly, 29,637 married males unaccounted for. We must thereby conclude that these individuals left their wives in China, otherwise we would not be able to account for the discrepancy. If that were the case, then it would indicate another empirical aspect of our contention that Chinese migration was of the sojourner variety. Further, if customs in China prevented the wives of sojourners from joining their husbands in the United States, then we must assume that these males intended to return to China and that would agree with the statements made by writers on the Chinese.

Further, evidence that suggests that many of the Chinese left their wives in China may be seen in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII. Marital Status of Chinese Laborers
in Selected Industries, 1910

Industry	Number	Single	Married	Widowed	Wife in U.S.	Wife in China
Beet, Sugar (California)	1	0	1	0	0	1
Fruits and Vegetable Canneries (California)	131	27	100	4	6	91
Coke and Coal (Wyoming)	23	11	12	0	0	12
Salmon Canneries (Columbia River)	22	11	10	1	2	8
Steam Railways	68	26	40	2	1	36

Source: S. Lyman, Chinese Americans, page 290.²⁶⁹

Table eighteen suggest that out of two hundred and forty-five individuals, one hundred and sixty-three were married, of whom one hundred and forty-eight had their wives in China. Coolidge also provides us with empirical evidence that many of the Chinese left their wives at home when she cites that out of the twenty-eight Chinese killed at the Rock Springs Massacre of 1865, fifteen of them had wives and children²⁷⁰ in China.

From the preceeding data we may conclude that a large proportion of the sojourners left their wives in China and that this accounted also for the shortage of women in the United States. Out of

269. S. Lyman's data is taken from U.S. Congress, Senate Reports of the Immigration Commission, Immigrants in Industry. Japanese and other Races in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States. Sixty-First Congress, Second Session, Sen. Doc., 633, Vol., 11, pages 672-673, 712, 724-734. Vol., 111, pages 324-331, 468-498, 663-665, 712-714.

270. Coolidge, op. cit., page 19.

this shortage, we may see the group's inability to reproduce itself. Table XIX examines the figures of the native born Chinese in comparison to the foreign born twenty years after the immigration began. The data is revealing because it indicates the inability of the population to maintain itself through reproduction.

TABLE XIX. Native Born and Foreign Born of the Chinese Population, 1870

POPULATION		NATIVE BORN		FOREIGN BORN	
Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
58,633	4,566	308	209	58,325	4,357

Source: Compendium of the Ninth Census, page 551.

Table nineteen indicates that out of a total Chinese population of 63,199 in 1870 only five hundred and seventeen offspring were born in the United States. during the twenty years the group has been in this country. This issue empirically indicates the inability of the group to reproduce itself and also its total dependence on immigration for population maintenance. The main reason being, the "abnormal" sex ratio of the group which averaged approximately 1571.1 males per 100 females. As late as 1940, the Chinese birth rate was the lowest among all racial groups at 14.5 percent in comparison to 19.4 percent for all races.²⁷¹

271. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service, Vital Statistics of the United States, Vol. I, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1950), page 79.

5. Remigration of the Chinese

Our study began with Petersen's contention that there were special factors at work in affecting the remigration rate of the Chinese (see Table I), however, he never told us what those factors were. He did argue that "remigrants-those who leave their country (or area) for a period and then return to it, ordinarily differ from the immigrants who remain abroad, but not necessarily in terms of any consistent pattern."²⁷² In the preceding discussion we have tried to show how remigrants may be conceptualized as sojourners and in that regard, they reflect temporary migration because there exists the intention to return home, and that they do differ consistently from immigrants. Further, we maintain that sojourners do differ from permanent immigrants, in that there will be an "abnormally" low percentage of women and children in the migration. We arrived at this contention because of Davie's assumption that the larger the percentage of women and children in the migration, the more permanent the migration.²⁷³ In using this as our starting point, we argued that Chinese immigration to the United States may be conceptualized as a sojourner type and we added a series of propositions involved in this type of migration. First, we argued that it was economically motivated, second, we added that migration involving

272. Petersen, op. cit., page 260.

273. Davie, op. cit., page 223.

non-western societies, is mainly restricted to males due to the prohibitions involved in females migrating, third, as an outgrowth of these prohibitions mainly males migrate, and fourth, that the migration must be temporary because the group cannot reproduce itself due to an extreme imbalance in the sex ratio. The crucial empirical indicator of sojourner migration then, was the remigration rate. We now maintain, that the higher the remigration rate the more temporary the migration. Thus, Petersen's contention that remigrants are not different from the immigrants who remain abroad in any consistent pattern, should be re-examined.

We will now look at the remigration rate. Table XX examines the arrivals and departures at the Port of San Francisco from 1852 to 1876. The table indicates that the Chinese had an extremely high remigration rate, where in 1855, 1864, 1866 and 1867 there were more immigrants leaving than arriving. This would tend to indicate their sojourner status, that is, their intention to return to the homeland and this maybe seen in the decrease in their population by 1910. Also it should be pointed out that another reason for the decrease in immigration after 1880 was the Chinese Exclusion Act which prohibited Chinese immigration to the United States beginning in 1882. Let us discuss this briefly because it played a critical role in the demographic characteristics of the group.

Although the bases of the anti-Chinese movement in the United States

TABLE XX. Chinese Passengers Arrived and Departed
at the Port of San Francisco, 1852-1876

<u>Year</u>	<u>Arrived</u>	<u>Departed</u>
1852	20,026	1,768
1853	4,270	4,421
1854	16,084	2,339
1855	3,329	3,473
1856	4,807	3,028
1857	5,924	1,932
1858	5,427	2,542
1859	3,175	2,450
1860	7,341	2,090
1861	8,430	3,580
1862	8,175	2,792
1863	6,432	2,942
1864	2,682	3,910
1865	3,095	2,295
1866	2,242	3,111
1867	4,290	4,475
1868	11,081	4,210
1869	14,990	4,895
1870	10,870	4,230
1871	5,870	4,230
1872	9,770	4,890
1873	17,075	6,805
1874	16,085	7,710
1875	18,021	6,305
1876	5,065	625
TOTALS	214,226	90,089

Source: California Senate Report, page 171.

were laid before 1875,²⁷⁴ the force of the movement did not actually gain momentum until 1875. The major resentments were that the Chinese were a cheap labor supply that came to California under coolie contracts and that they were an alien element, without interests in citizenship

^{274.} For a discussion on the basis of the anti-Chinese movements in California, see Sandmeyer, op. cit., pages 25-39.

TABLE XXI. Increase and Decrease of the Chinese Population in the United States, 1850-1920

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Increase or Decrease</u>	<u>Percent Increase or Decrease</u>
1850	758	-	-
1860	34,933	34,175	97.8
1870	63,199	18,266	80.9
1880	105,465	42,266	66.9
1890	107,488	2,010	1.9
1900	88,869	-17,265	-16.4
1910	71,531	-18,332	-20.4
1920	61,639	-9,892	-13.8

Source: Rose Hum Lee, op. cit., page 426.

and without interest in the United States.²⁷⁵ These charges "were repeated in so many speeches, editorials and other forms of expression that one could hardly escape the conviction that they represented widely prevalent beliefs."²⁷⁶

Further, the irony is that these charges were derived from the type of migration the Chinese utilized as well as the reasons for their migration. That is, because the Chinese were sojourners, they left their wives and families behind and they migrated as migratory laborers. Given the cost of living in China they were able to work for less and for longer hours in the United States. Because they undercut the native labor force, they were regarded as contract laborers. The charge of cooliesim became a prevalent one, and it is

275. "Joint Special Committee on Chinese Immigration," Senate Report, 689, 44th Congress, 2nd Session, 1876-1877, pages 1001-1003.

276. Sandmeyer, op. cit., page 25.

in this context that the anti-Chinese movement in California sought to limit their competition. For example, one writer in the 1880's summed up the general concerns about the Chinese when he states:

Competition with Chinese labor is simply competition with the conditions under which the Chinese laborer chooses to exist. But the Caucasian can neither eat the food, nor breath the air, nor sleep in the dens that are opulence and comfort to the Chinese coolie. For unnumbered generations, the latter has existed under the same conditions that he makes for himself in the new world, and his nature has become dulled to the influence of noxious ordors, of foul surroundings, of crowed rooms, and of a noisome atmosphere...The Chinaman, it is claimed, and apparently with truth, will learn any given mechanical operation in one third of the time required by a white workman. He has no family; he lives in the most frugal manner; he lodges upon a wooden bench; he has been used at home to wages that would hardly more than sustain life. His sole ambition is to accumulate from two hundred to four hundred dollars, which is to him a fortune, and which enables him to return as a rich man to his own country. He is obedient and servile By means of all this he is enabled to live as no white man could live, even if the white man were not burdened with the support of wife and children.²⁷⁷

Added to the change of coolieism was the national panic of 1875 which resulted in depression like conditions in California. With this economic crisis, workingmen were unemployed and they gathered in San Francisco to voice their grievances. By 1877, Denis Kearney, born in County Cork Ireland, became leader of the Workingmens' Pary in California and the anti-Chinese movement became a national concern.

²⁷⁷. James Whitney, The Chinese and the Chinese Question, (New York: Tibbals Book Company, 1888), reprinted by R and E Associates, 1970, pages 113-114.

The Chinese must go, became the adopted slogan of the workingmen in the United States and the political pressures they exerted ultimately led to Chinese exclusion.²⁷⁸

The Exclusion Act, in prohibiting the coming of Chinese laborers and their wives to the United States²⁷⁹ resulted in the decrease in the number of Chinese in the United States (see Table XXI, page 138.) Thus, from 1890 to 1920 the Chinese population declined from 107,488 to 61,639 which was a decrease of 45,849. Added to this decrease was the voluntary segregation of the Chinese in Chinatowns because of their withdrawal from competition with organized labor, and they shifted their economic emphasis from diversified economic outlets to mainly the restaurant and laundry businesses located in Chinatowns.²⁸⁰ With this emphasis, the Chinese became highly urbanized. Rose Hum Lee states:

The reason for the concentration of Chinese in cities with metropolitan status maybe found in the nature of their principal occupations-laundries and restaurants ...It appears that the larger the city's population, the greater is the demand for Chinese laundry service. The same holds true for Chop-Suey and Chow-Mein establishments.²⁸¹

278. See Sandmeyer, op. cit., pages 40-108; Coolidge, op. cit., pages 109-141; Miller, op. cit., pages 191-204; Lyman, The Chinese Americans, pages 54-85, and Sung, op. cit., page 37-57.

279. For a discussion of Chinese Exclusion, see Roderick McKenzie, Oriental Exclusion, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928).

280. See D.Y. Yuan, "Voluntary Segregation: A Study of New York Chinatown, op. cit."

281. Rose Hum Lee, op. cit., page 428, and Kung, op. cit., page 180

With the Chinese Exclusion Act, "the Chinese sojourners were isolated, negelected and demoralized. Forced back into the Chinatowns of America's larger cities, they preserved a modest sense of cultural freedom, strengthened their dependence on traditional associations, and maintained themselves in a precarious independence. Many of the sojourners found work by being recruited into the easily exploitable labor force of Chinatowns."²⁸² Stanford Lyman sums up the results of the Chinese Exclusion Act eloquently when he writes:

But by far the majority remained homeless and trapped, too impoverished to return to China and too oppressed to enter fully into American society, sojourners without wives to provide them with a home and children, they could not even procreate a second generation of substantial size in America. For two decades their numbers declined in America, and some thought the Chinese would eventually die out, remaining but a memory in America's history.²⁸³

In sum, the purpose of the preceeding chapter was to present the demographic characteristics of Chinese migration and show how these characteristics indicate a sojourner type of migration. The evidence suggests the following: an economic motive for the migration, the migrants were predominantly males, a large percentage of the migrants left their wives in China, and a high rate of remigration. It is because of these characteristics why we have made the inference that the migration between

282. Stanford Lyman, The Chinese Americans, pages 84-85.

283. Ibid., page 85.

1850 and 1870 was of the sojourner variety. The evidence may not be overwhelming, however, we feel that a plausible case was made and the data tend to confirm our formulations. The next is to provide an analysis as to the relationship between demographic characteristics and community settlement. This will be the purpose of the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND COMMUNITY STRUCTURE

In chapter four three important issues were raised in regards to the demographic characteristics of Chinese migration to the United States. First, the Chinese migrated because their subsistence economy could not maintain a balance between population and sustenance. Thus, migration to an industrial economy was used as an economic outlet. Second, the migration was predominantly male because it was the custom of the Chinese for females to remain at home. Added to this, many of the Chinese sojourners could not afford the price of passage to the United States, thereby, bringing a family along was prevented by the lack of funds, and third, the sojourners had no desire to settle permanently in the United States. The desire was to accumulate money and return to the homeland.

It is our contention that these issues influenced the type of settlement the Chinese possessed and that their community structure was different from that of permanent immigrants. To put the matter simply, since the Chinese were not interested in permanent settlement, their early communities were too small and specialized to maintain important community functions, e.g., the reproduction of the population. It was also due to their temporary migration that the Chinese were tied to their social organizations. The purpose of this chapter then, is to analyze the relationship between temporary migration and community structure. In this way, we hope to provide a framework

for the analysis of the path immigrant groups take in their quest for integration or isolation from the larger society.²⁸⁴ This type of analysis makes it possible for us to understand the adjustment stages of immigrant groups, as well as the response to these groups by the larger society. Thus, the immigrant's demographic "baggage needs sociological inspection to ascertain its effects on community organization and acculturation."²⁸⁵

Chinese migration to the United States began in 1849. With the Chinese came a series of social organizations that tied them to their sojourner status. Let us describe briefly the historical background of these organizations.

As it was stated in chapter three, the differences in dialects and customs as well as the family being the chief social unit in China created the need that in every large urban center, the Chinese would band together for economic assistance, protection and entertainment. Further, through these organizations, the Chinese would be tied to their ancestral lands and native villages, thus, making them temporary residents in these urban centers. The Chinese in these locations would maintain their loyalty to their kinship

284. See Stanford Lyman, "Contrasts in the Community Organization of the Chinese and Japanese in North America," page 51, and Park and Miller, op. cit.

285. Ibid., page 52.

groups and villages rather than the particular city. Max Weber in his analysis as to why an urban community did not develop in China understood this issue when he wrote:

An urban community, in the full meaning of the word, appears as a general phenomenon only in the occident ...The Chinese urban dweller legally belonged to his family and native village in which the temple of his ancestors stood and to which he conscientiously maintained affiliation.²⁸⁶

Given the social structure of China, the Chinese were tied to their kinship group and this made them devoted to their families.²⁸⁷

Filial piety was a moral obligation which required self-sacrifice. We may say that this relationship of the Chinese to the family made the migratory Chinese a sojourner because the ties to his village made inevitable his return.

The establishment of kinship organizations and district societies were not peculiar to China. Rather, it became a feature wherever the Chinese settled. Transplanted to America were the lineage system of southeastern China and the district societies of the region. The lineage system united all those who could trace their descendants back to a common ancestor, whose surname they bear. Stanford Lyman describes the importance of surnames overseas when he states:

Clans in the Chinatowns of the United States and other overseas Chinese settlements have their origins in the lineage communities of southeastern China. Although descent in the lineage community was carefully

286. Weber, The City, page 80-82.

287. Kung, op. cit., page 206.

recorded in the overseas colonies the surname was used to indicate clanship. Direct descent therefore could not be assured, and clan brothers assumed their blood relationship on the basis of a common name.²⁸⁸

Also transplanted to the United States were the district societies, which united those who spoke the same dialect, or who came from the same district, or were of the same ethnic group. This type of organization was called a "Wui Kun" or "hui Kuan" and "it was similar to its urban counterpart in China."²⁸⁹ Since this type of organization was more prevalent in the United States, we will describe its historical development.

The first district society in the United States was organized in 1849 and it united all of the Chinese in San Francisco because of the small number of migrants at that time. However, the first district society to be organized around dialect, district or ethnicity was the Sam Yup hui Kuan in 1851. This society united the sojourners from the districts of Nan-hai, Pwanyu, Hsuntak and Canton City (See Table II). The Chinese from these districts spoke a purer form of Cantonese which was hardly understood by members of the Sze Yap hui Kuan, which was also organized that same year. The latter united the Chinese from the districts of Hsin-hui, Yan-ping, Hoi-ping and Toisham. In 1852, the sojourners from the districts of Chung-sham formed the third district society called the Yeong Wo hui Kuan. A fourth society was organized during

288. Lyman, The Chinese Americans, page 30.

289. Ibid., page 32, and Barth, op. cit., page 77.

that year, which was not based on district, but it united those Chinese who were from the ethnic group known as the Hakka people, who drifted into the southeastern region of China in the seventeenth century. This ethnic group possessed different customs and spoke a dialect that was closer to the Mandarin Chinese than to the Cantonese. Historically, they were always in conflict with the majority of inhabitants in the southeastern region, called Punti. This conflict resulted in the Hakka-Punti wars, 1854-1868,²⁹⁰ which also "spilled on to the American scene."²⁹¹ In any event, this society was called the Yan Wo hui Kuan or Hip Kat society. In 1854 the fifth district society was created by the Chinese from the district of Toi-Sham, who because of their large numbers withdrew from the Sze Yap hui Kuan to form the Ning Yeong. Other districts followed suit and the migrants from the districts of Anping, Sin-huwi and Hai-ping withdrew to form the Hop Wo society. Those left in the Sze Yap society assumed the name of Kong Chow hui-Kuan. These six districts societies, Sam Yap, Yeong Wo, Yan Wo, Ning Yeong, Hop Wo and Kong Chow, accounted for almost all of the migrants from China.²⁹² Because of the conflicts between these societies, a coordinating council was formed in 1862 in San Francisco and it was made up of the presidents of all six societies. This

290. Ibid., pages 16-17.

291. Barth, op. cit., pages 93-94.

292. See Table II, Sung, op. cit., page 15, and Barth, op. cit., pages 87-97.

organizational structure became known to Americans as the Chinese Six Companies.

Merchants dominated these companies because of their dealings with the larger society, their knowledge of English and their confinement to Chinatown, as a resultant of their commercial transactions. Although this class ranked lower than farmers in the status hierarchy²⁹³ of China, they became the leaders of the Chinese in the United States, where they possessed a more superior station than in China. As a consequence, many of the merchants brought their wives with them from China or sent for them at a later date. Given the economic and social advantage of residing in the United States, many of these individuals adopted the new country and acculturated to the new environment. However, this group constituted a small portion of the Chinese population in the United States. The majority of the Chinese were laborers and they did not view their stay in the United States as permanent.

The Chinese Six Companies recruited migrants by meeting each ship and ascertaining the name and district of each sojourner. Immigrants from particular districts would go directly to the district organization headquarters in San Francisco. The necessity of meeting the sojourners required that Chinatowns be situated near transportation facilities. This resulted in Chinatowns being near railway stations, such as those

293. Sandmeyer, op. cit., page 12.

of Boston, Pittsburg and St. Louis or near the docks, such as New York and San Francisco.²⁹⁴ In this way, the Six Companies were able to keep track of the migrants²⁹⁵ numerically as indicated in Table XXII. Further the total of 104,300 Chinese listed by the Six Companies in their testimony before the California Senate Committee on Chinese Immigration, roughly corresponds to Coolidge's figures of 111,971 Chinese in the United States in 1876.²⁹⁶

TABLE XXII. Testimony of the Presidents
of the Six Companies, 1876

Company	District	President	Members	Place of Birth of President
Yan Wo	Hakka	Chin Fong Chow	4,300	Two days travel from Canton
Sam Yup	Nan-hai, Hsun-Tak, Pwan yo, Canton City	Lee Ming Hown	11,000	-----
Hop Wo	An-ping, Sim hui, Hai ping	Yeong Ty	34,000	Three days travel from Canton
Kong Chow	Those who left after the division of Sze Yap	Sin How	15,000	Canton
Y.Wo	Chung-Shan	Si Quen	10,000	-----
N.Yeong	Toi-Shan	Leung Cook	40,000	Toi-Shan
TOTALS			104,300	

Source: California Report, pages 95,97,70,94,95 and 64.

294. Kung, op. cit., page 199.

295. Otis Gibson, The Chinese In America, (Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden, 1877), page 15.

296. Coolidge, op. cit., page 498.

Once the Chinese migrants were met by representatives of the Six Companies, they were taken to the district headquarters in Chinatown and they would be provided lodging, food, equipment that was needed and assistance in employment. For this, each sojourner was required to pay a membership fee, which ranged from five to ten dollars per year. In some cases, payment was required in six months.²⁹⁷ Those who stayed at the company's headquarters because their employment confined them to Chinatown, were required to pay a lodging fee of roughly two dollars per year.²⁹⁸ The company headquarters was usually an old building leased from a white landlord. Because these dwellings had to provide accommodations for single transient males, they were cut-up into small compartments, which permitted the housing of thousands of sojourners. In some cases there was extreme overcrowding. For example, San Francisco's health officer described the overcrowding in Chinatown in 1870:

...Notwithstanding, politicians and demagogues have mounted this hobby for the purpose of bringing themselves into public favor, there is no disguising the fact, that they (the Chinese) are not only a moral lepers in our community...but their manner of life is such as to breed and engender disease wherever they reside. Dwelling as they do in the very center of the city, any contagious disease would necessarily spread with frightful rapidity...The great majority of them live crowded together in rickety, filthy and dilapidated tenement houses, like so many cattle and hogs...Apartments that would be deemed small for a

297. Ibid., page 403.

298. Ibid., page 432.

single American are occupied by six, eight or ten Mongolians.²⁹⁹

The Chinese who migrated to the United States under the credit-ticket system (See Chapter III) found that his district company organization was responsible for collecting that debt, and the headmen of those organizations would deduct from their wages the amount required for the settlement of their accounts. It was because of this that many of the sojourners were caught in a never ending cycle of work. Further, the Six Companies were able to control remigration back to China due to the arrangements made with the steamship companies. A sojourner required a certificate from his district organization, stipulating that all accounts were settled. If he did not possess such a certificate, he would not be able to purchase tickets back to China. This practice was enforced from 1862 until 1880, when the state legislature passed a law making it a misdemeanor for steamship companies to enact such a statement,³⁰⁰ (See Chapter VI). The Chinese could only be caught in such a situation, if they had intended to return to China. Otherwise, they would be able to escape payment by adopting America as their home. However, because of their kinship obligations, they were unable to exercise the choice of adopting the new land. Due to this, they were subjected to the control of their district organizations.

299. San Francisco Municipal Reports, 1869-70, pages 62-63.

300. Coolidge, op. cit., page 410.

The Chinese were also dependent on merchant leaders for the products imported from China such as food, clothing and a wide variety of paraphernalia required for the celebration of local customs. This created a lucrative trade for the merchants because it was they who ran the import and export aspects of Chinatown. Thus, the sojourners were, by consumption, tied to the confines of Chinatown and this reinforced their sojourner status even further.

Other responsibilities of the Six Companies were to arrange for the dead to be shipped back to China and the settlement of disputes which arose periodically. The shipping of the dead was a resultant of the Chinese customs which required that one be buried on his ancestral land and that the spirit of one's ancestors be appeased or misfortune would strike the family. Thus, the custom of shipping the dead back to China was an outgrowth of the relationship between Chinese values, religion and material objects (See Chapter III). Large companies would establish special organizations which would perform only this function.

The settlement of disputes was a customary way of dealing with local problems in China. Due to the differences in dialects in many parts of China and arbitrary administrative divisions, the local people relied on their kinship group for the settlement of problems. "The imperial and republican governments depended on local village headmen to maintain peace and ensure the payment of taxes. These local headmen

in the villages were an unofficial government."³⁰¹ The same was the case in the United States because the merchants in control of Chinese organizations constituted an unofficial government. This resulted in the "Chinese in the United States possessing a measure of self-government far exceeding that of other ethnic communities."³⁰² Mary Coolidge in citing the rule of the Yeung society in 1854, provides an idea of the functioning of district societies:

Disputes will not be settled by those who have not paid the entrance fee of ten dollars. Members intending to return to China must make the fact known when their accounts will be examined, and measures will be taken to prevent it...if debts remain unpaid. In the company house there must be no concealment of stolen goods; no strangers brought to lodge; no gunpowder or other combustable material; no gambling; no drunkenness, no cooking except in the proper quarters; no burning of sacrificial papers; no accumulation of baggage; no filth; no bathing; no filching of oil...Invalids that cannot labor, are poor without relatives may be returned to China at the expense of the company; quarrels and troubles about claims in the mines should be referred to the company...³⁰³

Since the Chinese sojourners intended to return to the homeland, they were attracted to wage labor and other predictable economic outlets.³⁰⁴ The occupations selected provided wages in cash or an easily negotiated monetary form, such as gold. Although the

301. Lyman, The Chinese Americans, pages 8-9.

302. Ibid., page 29.

303. Coolidge, op. cit., pages 403-404. Quoted from W. Speer, "Democracy of the Chinese," Harper's Monthly, Vol. 37, (1868).

304. Lyman, The Asian in the West, page 74.

prior occupational background of the sojourners was farming, they did not become farmers, but farmhands receiving a wage. From a comparative perspective, the Japanese, who were farmers in Japan, became farmers in the United States. However, "the Chinese tended to invest money in personal property rather than in land and they preferred to take long leases in order to sublet easily."³⁰⁵ With this in mind, let us examine the occupational outlets the Chinese selected in the United States.

Their first major occupational outlet was gold mining, the reason being that they were attracted to the prospect of making a quick fortune. The migration coincided with the gold discovery in California and from three hundred and twenty-five Chinese in 1849, the number grew to four hundred and fifty migrants in 1850 and over twenty thousand in 1852 (see Table II). By 1860 there were 34,933 Chinese in the United States, of whom, only 2,719 were in San Francisco. The bulk of the population was scattered throughout the mining districts of California (see Table IX). El Dorado, for example possessed a Chinese population of 4,762, almost twice the amount in San Francisco.

In the mines, the Chinese were never direct competitors with the white miners. Rather, they bought out abandoned placers from white miners and through hard work, they were able to produce an income of

305. Kung, op. cit., page 202.

anywhere between five and twenty-five dollars a day. Their unaggressive character was not conducive to striking it rich in the mines because they were preyed upon by all factions of the mining community. When miners needed a stake, the common solution was to lay in wait for a Chinese and rob him.³⁰⁶ If white miners discovered that the Chinese had a strike they would drive them out and take over their claim. In those days, frontier justice prevailed, and even if there were available courts of law, the Chinese were not permitted to exercise their rights (See Chapter VI). By 1854, small scale mining had declined, and the Chinese became employees of the more lucrative quartz mines, which possessed a mechanized system of mining. In this type of employment, they performed the work that whites refused to do or found too demeaning for their station. Apart from mining, many of the sojourners turned to other occupational outlets, such as agricultural workers, manufacturing, service occupations and fishing. All of these occupations provided a wage, which was lower than that of whites,³⁰⁷ and longer hours.

The second most important occupational outlet in the early days was railroad construction. The Central Pacific Railroad began construction on January 8, 1863. Because many whites refused to enter this type of work, there was a shortage of labor. Charles Crocker hired all

306. Caughey, op. cit., page 195.

307. Seward, op. cit., pages 58-68.

of those willing to work and the majority were Chinese. They became reliable workers and Crocker sent away to China to recruit more of the sojourners. Before the Central Pacific was completed, a force of ten thousand Chinese was employed, all of whom were nicknamed "Crocker's Pets" by white workers.³⁰⁸ Because of the labor, courage and dedication of the Chinese in building the Central Pacific, it was the common opinion that the railroad could not have been completed without them.³⁰⁹

When railroad building ended those sojourners who remained in the United States turned to other types of wage labor. They became cooks, milkmen, industrial workers and established laundries.³¹⁰ Due to the diversity of these occupational outlets, the Chinese population was dislocated throughout California and the Pacific Coast. This continued until the anti-Chinese movement forced the Chinese back to the confines of Chinatown and the restaurant and laundry provided the economic livelihood for the group. Overall, the occupational outlets of the Chinese provided reliable, steady income which enabled them to remit wages back home to their families.

Because the sojourners were predominantly males, family life in the United States was virtually non-existent, even though a large

308. Roske, *op. cit.*, page 367.

309. Benjamin P. Avery, "The Building of the Iron Road," *Overland Monthly*, May, 1869, page 475.

310. Sandmeyer, *op. cit.*, page 21.

portion of the migrants were married. The resultant was that the sex ratio in 1860 was 1,858, in 1870 it was 1,284.1, in 1880 it was 2,106.8, in 1890 it was 2,678.9 and in 1900 it was 1,887.2 (See Table XVI). With such a small number of females, the group could not provide a family life, thus, Chinese families were rare. Further, with the separation of married men from their families in China, the Chinese also suffered from what has been called a mutilated family³¹¹ system, where the family is united by bond due to the remittances sent home and the visits to the homeland, but were separated physically. The Chinese population had to depend on migration in order to increase its numbers because it was unable to produce a large second generation in America (See Table XIX). Thus, the Chinese lacked the most important aspect of community structure, the ability to reproduce itself.³¹² Since, the laws of the United States prevented inter-racial marriages at that time, the Chinese could not marry outside the group as they did in other parts of the world. In Thailand for example, the Chinese were able to inter-marry and they received citizenship easily. In fact, there were few homes before 1920 in that country, in which both the husband and wife were Chinese.³¹³ With families, the Chinese were able

311. Sung, op. cit., page 155.

312. Amos Hawley, Human Ecology, (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1950), page 206.

313. Kenneth P. Landon, The Chinese in Thailand, (New York: Russell and Russell, 1941), page 52.

to assimilate quickly and they became an important part of the population. However, it seems that Chinese communities in European settlements were segregated and racial prejudice prevented the Chinese from marrying into the ruling group.³¹⁴ The point to bear in mind, is that one's sojourner status may be mitigated by the ability to establish a family in the host country, given the willingness on the part of the ruling group to permit inter-marriage. However, such a willingness presupposes a low degree of hostility.³¹⁵ Further, not all sojourners exercised the option of permanent settlement by establishing families. For example, even in Thailand there existed a high remigration rate for the Chinese.³¹⁶ In any event, even though both the emigration to Thailand and the United States were a resultant of the same causes,³¹⁷ the settlement pattern in the two places were drastically different. The critical difference in the two types of settlement lies in the differences in responses to the Chinese, by the host country. However, this is not the only factor in establishing settlement differences. Rather, cultural proscriptions which permit or prevent women from migrating are also important in

314. W.J. Cator, The Economic Position of the Chinese in the Netherland Indies, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1936), pages 13-34.

315. Milton Gordon, Assimilation In American Life, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pages 125-126.

316. Landon, op. cit., pages 52-53.

317. See Ta Chen, Emigrant Communities in South China, (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1940), pages 259-260.

establishing settlement differences. If we were to consider the migration of the Japanese in relation to that of the Chinese, they appear similiar and different in the ability to establish a family in the United States. Let us consider the data from the following tables. The reader should keep in mind that both groups

TABLE XXIII. Chinese Males and Females,
Native and Foreign Born: 1850-1950

Year	MALES			FEMALES			TOTAL	
	Native	Foreign	Total	Native	Foreign	Totals	M-F	M per 100 F
1850	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1860	-	-	33,149	-	-	1,784	34,933	1,858.1
1870	-	-	58,633	-	-	4,566	63,199	1,284.1
1880	-	-	100,686	-	-	4,779	105,465	2,106.8
1890	-	-	103,620	-	-	3,808	107,488	2,678.9
1900	6,657	78,684	85,341	2,353	2,169	4,522	89,863	1,887.2
1910	11,921	54,935	66,856	3,014	1,661	4,675	71,531	1,430.1
1920	13,318	40,573	53,891	5,214	2,534	7,748	61,639	695.5
1930	20,693	39,109	59,802	10,175	4,977	15,152	74,954	394.7
1940	25,702	31,687	57,389	14,560	5,555	20,116	77,504	285.3
1950	-	-	77,008	-	-	40,621	117,629	189.6

Source: S. Lyman, The Asian in the West, page 79.

migrated to the United States because of economic deprivation, they are physiologically similiar and both groups of migrants were farmers. Also, of extreme importance, both groups were subjected to oriental hostility in the United States and in both groups, the early migrants were predominantly males. The critical difference lies in the ability of females to migrate. It seems that the Japanese had no cultural proscriptions against females migrating; whereas, such

proscriptions existed for the Chinese. Thus, even though the Japanese possessed a sex ratio of 2,369.6 males per 100 females in 1900, they were able to reduce it substantially thirty years later to

TABLE XXIV. Japanese Males and Females, Native and Foreign Born: 1850-1950

Year	MALES			FEMALES			TOTAL	
	Native	Foreign	Totals	Native	Foreign	Totals	M-F	M per 100 F
1850	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1860	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1870	-	-	47	-	-	8	55	-
1880	-	-	134	-	-	14	148	-
1890	-	-	1,780	-	-	259	2,039	687.3
1900	156	23,185	23,341	113	872	985	24,326	2,369.6
1910	2,340	60,730	63,070	2,162	6,925	9,087	72,157	694.1
1920	15,494	57,213	72,707	14,178	24,125	38,303	111,010	189.8
1930	35,874	45,897	81,771	32,483	24,580	57,003	138,834	143.3
1940	42,316	29,651	71,967	37,326	17,654	54,980	126,947	130.9
1950	-	76,649	-	-	-	65,119	141,768	117.7

Source: S. Lyman, The Asian in the West, page 79.

143.3 males per 100 females. Further, by 1930 almost half of their population was native born, a total of 68,357. The trend of females migrating continued beyond 1930, and by 1950 there were 117.7 males per 100 females. In comparison, the Chinese in 1930 produced a native born population of 31,868, even though their migration began as early as 1850. Even in 1950, one hundred years after the Chinese migrated to the United States, their sex ratio was high at 189.6 males per 100 females. The ability of the Japanese to produce a large second generation faster than the Chinese was an outgrowth of the lack of

cultural proscriptions against women migrating. The consequence has been that they were able to assimilate faster than the Chinese,³¹⁸ even though they suffered the setback of having to be relocated during World War II. In contrast, two groups of sojourners, facing many of the same obstacles reflected drastically different settlements. In the words of a sociologist who has studied both groups:

After 1910 the Japanese began the importation of brides from Japan, cutting the sex ratio and providing the possibility of offspring. Whereas, the Chinese may have been inhibited from land investment because of the desire to return to wife and family in China, the Japanese were not so inhibited. While both Chinese and Japanese paid lip service to their status as sojourners in America, the willingness to invest in what might involve long-term settlement—a farm—was greater for the Japanese. Moreover, the importation of Japanese brides from 1910 to 1923 reveals—when coupled with the increase of farm tenancy and management in spite of legal obstacles—the intention to abandon sojourner status and take up semi-permanent or permanent residence in the United States.³¹⁹

The point is that sojourners may migrate with the intention of returning to the homeland, however, during their sojourn they may abandon that intention. Both the legal restrictions placed on sojourners, as well as the ability to establish a family in the host country play a crucial role in whether or not sojourners are transformed into permanent residents.

318. See Harry Kitawo, Japanese Americans, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1969), page 161.

319. Lyman, The Asian in the West, page 78.

The Chinese were not able to make the transformation to permanent residence until approximately 1930 because of the lack of women. From 1850 to 1930 the Chinese community was organized for a transient male population.³²⁰ By 1880 they began concentrating in urban areas³²¹ as a resultant of the anti-Chinese movement, which drove them out of their diverse economic outlets. In these urban locations, the possibility of supporting the special services of the Chinese existed. Thus, the two main occupational outlets left for the Chinese, restaurant and laundry businesses, needed the link to a larger non-Chinese community because in such an environment, a larger number of clients, tourist, transients and unmarried persons exist, and it is they who provide the demand for these Chinese businesses. Further, these service occupations absorbed Chinese labor and this eliminated conflicts with the larger society, due to their economic competition with domestic workers and labor unions.³²² In effect, the Chinese voluntarily isolated themselves from the larger society in order to avoid the hostility that was directed towards them.³²³ Not only did the Chinese retreated to Chinatown because of the anti-Chinese movement, but they also migrated to the East in order to avoid

320. Kung, op. cit., page 202.

321. Lee, op. cit., page 426.

322. Ibid., page 427.

323. Yuan, op. cit., page 204.

the hostility that was concentrated in the Western states. Chinatowns were established in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Washington and Jersey City.³²⁴

Before the anti-Chinese movement developed its momentum, there were signs that indicated a transition from sojourner to immigrant for some of the Chinese. This began as early as 1870 when due to the demand for cheap labor in the East and South, the Chinese were quick to seize this opportunity. For example, in 1870, the Chinese were used to break the strike of St. Crispins shoemakers in North Adams, Massachusetts, and again in 1877, they were used to break a strike in a cutlery plant in Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania. The Chinese were recruited to develop rice culture and to replace blacks on railway projects in the South.³²⁵ This movement weakened the ties of the Six Companies and some of the Chinese found that they could develop economic opportunities for themselves. Being isolated from the rest of their countrymen on the Pacific Coast, many of these sojourners found it necessary to acculturate. For them, it constituted "a shift in the traditional goal of returning to China, and some began to accept a permanent tenure in the United States."³²⁶ However, once

324. Lee, op. cit., page 427.

325. Lyman, The Asian in the West, page 74, and see James Loewenberg. "Efforts of the South to Encourage Immigration, 1865-1900," South Atlantic Quarterly, (October, 1934), pages 188-193.

326. Barth, op. cit., page 183.

the anti-Chinese movement reached national proportions, the Chinese were forced to retreat back to Chinatown, which retarded their assimilation. In addition, the population being unable to adequately reproduce itself, began to age and die.³²⁷ Added to this, the enforcement of the Exclusion Act, which prevented the migration of the Chinese to the United States, meant that the population eventually would die out if it was maintained, and "the Chinese would remain but a memory in America's history."³²⁸ Inside Chinatown the sojourners were easy victims of the merchant class. They were kept from organizing labor unions, paid low wages and had to endure harsh working conditions, a situation which still exists today.

It is obvious that legal and political acts have an influence on sojourner settlement in general and on Chinese settlement in particular. In many instances the laws of the host country serve to perpetuate sojourner status. Before we explore the legal perpetuation of the sojourner status of the Chinese, let us examine the relationship between the need for cheap labor on the one hand, and the legal system which provides the labor on the other.

When a state recognizes the industrial or commercial need for workers, given a shortage in the domestic work force, it usually sponsors the migration of temporary workers by making immigration an easier process. When this is coupled with the need of some groups to

327. Kung, op. cit., page 36.

328. Lyman, Chinese Americans, page 85.

maintain their families in a particular ecological environment, which lacks adequate means of subsistence, one then discovers a stream of migrants. On the part of the migrants, the interest is in jobs and not permanent settlement. Thus, the expense of bringing the family along is not incurred. The state on the other hand, through its legal decisions, reinforces the inability to bring the family along by making permanent integration in the host country impossible. This is done through the process of denying temporary workers the rights of citizenship and adequate protection under the laws. Given the lack of legal protection in the country of sojourn, sojourners must band together in enclosed ethnic communities and organize their own institutional network for protection, economic assistance and entertainment. This isolates sojourners from the larger society and if the group happens to be racially or culturally different, the group is further segregated because of these differences. The family in the homeland must be maintained because sojourners "have no permanent legal or political status in the country of sojourn."³²⁹ Their status exists in the homeland and sojourners become aware quickly, that their option of permanent settlement is non-existent. It is quite conceivable that they would like to settle in the host country. However, given the legal insecurity, it makes this course of action impractical. The state on the other hand relies on the separation of sojourners from their

329. Barawoy, op. cit., pages 1052-1053.

families³³⁰ and this implies the ability to recruit sojourners when their labor is needed and also being able to get rid of them when their labor is no longer needed. If however, their families were present, then the state would have to bear the cost of maintenance of these workers directly. Michael Burawoy describes this system of labor when he writes:

For a capitalist economy to function, its labor force must be maintained; that is, workers must receive a historically determined minimal day-to-day subsistence. It must also be renewed, that is, vacancies must be filled. A system of migrant labor is characterized by institutional differentiation and physical separation of the processes of renewal and maintenance. Accordingly, migrant labor entails a dual dependence upon employment in one place and an alternate economy and/or state in another. In addition, the separation of migrant workers from their families is implied. It is enforced through specific legal and political mechanism which regulate geographical mobility and impose restrictions on the occupational mobility of migrants. These mechanisms in turn are made possible by the migrant workers' powerlessness in the place of employment, in the labor market, and under the legal and political systems where they are employed. One consequence of a system of migrant labor is the externalization, to an alternate economy and/or state, of certain costs of labor-force renewal—costs normally borne by the employer and/or state of employment.³³⁰

Because sojourners are denied permanent integration in the host country, they are forced to maintain their families in the homeland. This is done by remitting home income which is left over from maintenance. This structures a sense of frugality on the part of sojourners and they hope to save enough money in order to return to the

330. Ibid., page 1050.

homeland and purchase a farm or some other commercial outlet. This hope becomes problematic when one understands the sojourner's powerlessness in the country of sojourn. First, he is regarded as an alien without rights of citizenship. Second, he is differentiated even further by his "racial and/or cultural characteristics." Third, because of these differences he is set apart in the labor market and receives a wage lower than that of domestic workers or used to keep native workers in line. This situation structures a conflict between sojourners and domestic workers, which is essentially an economic one. However, there is the tendency for racist ideology to mask this conflict³³² and postulate that sojourners are a moral blight upon the national community. If domestic workers organize themselves in order to deal with sojourners, then the final outcome usually is the exclusion of the aliens. In the process, sojourners may adapt to the conditions in the host country and become transformed into immigrants.³³³ This may occur if they are able to marry outside the group or able to send for their families.

Other factors which intensify the conflict between sojourners and the domestic labor force as a result of direct competition, are migratory increases in the sojourner population³³⁴ and economic crisis

332. Ibid., page 1061.

333. Ibid., page 1061.

334. G. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1958), pages 220-221, and W.P. Frisbie, and Lisa Neldert, "Inequality and the Relative Size of Minority Populations: A Comparative Analysis," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 82, (March, 1977), pages 1007-1013.

in the host country.³³⁵ Having introduced the reader to some of the effects of demographic characteristics and community settlement, as well as a general outline of the reinforcement of sojourners status by enacted legislation in the host country, let us now consider how legislation reinforced the sojourner status of the Chinese in the United States.

335. Semour Martin Lipsett, "Democracy and Working Class Authoritarianism," American Sociological Review, (August, 1959), pages 489.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS: SOJOURNER MIGRATION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO ENACTED LEGISLATION

During the early days of Chinese migration, 1849-1850, they were welcomed because they provided a labor supply which was badly needed in California. All of the available workers were to be found in the gold fields and the Chinese proved to be indispensable, performing menial tasks at low wages. Samuel Gompers wrote:

In the early settlement of the state...when mining was the chief industry and labor by reason of its scarcity well paid, the presence of a few thousand Chinese, who were willing to work in occupations then seriously in want of labor and at wages lower than the standard, caused no serious alarm or discomfort. The state of California at that time presented more or less a great mining camp, industrial or agricultural development not then being thought of.³³⁶

They were also regarded as a picturesque addition to the state. However, one must bear in mind that in the early days, the Chinese numbered only 7,370. Thus, their small numbers did not indicate extensive competition and many felt that they were an ideal addition to California. As an index of their welcome, the early sojourners were invited to take part in the funeral procession for President Tyler in 1850, the celebration of the admission of California to the Union in 1850, and the Fourth of July celebration that same year.³³⁷ One California newspaper predicted that "the Chinese will yet vote at

336. S. Gompers and H. Gutstadt, Meat vs. Rice..., page 1.

337. Coolidge, op. cit., pages 22-24.

the same polls, study at the same schools, and bow at the same altar as our own countrymen."³³⁸ In the mines, the Chinese were unaggressive and they enabled white miners to relocate by buying out abandoned claims and were content to receive a meager living. For the most part, it was their labor which received the greatest praise. G.T. Renner attributed the foundation of California's industry to the Chinese when he writes:

...With this supply of cheap labor available in the midst of a society largely engrossed by gold hunting, the beginning of other industries were laid, beginnings which have subsequently proved to be the foundation of California's present economic greatness.³³⁹

Even Governor MacDougal in 1852 was in favor of the Chinese. In his annual message he proposed the utilization of them in reclaiming the swamp lands in California:

...By this course a large portion of the state now lying in a useless condition would be made productive, contribute to the state treasury, and induce a further immigration and settlement of the Chinese...one of the most worthy classes of our newly adopted citizens-to whom the climate of these lands are peculiarly suited.³⁴⁰

Suddenly however, the welcome of the Chinese turned to resentment and hate. There were two main reasons for this. First, hatred towards the

338. Ibid., page 23, quoted from the Alta California, May 12, 1852.

339. G.T. Renner, "Chinese Influence in the Development of Western United States," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 52, November, 1930, page 360.

340. Journal of the Senate of California, (1852), page 15.

Chinese became a political platform and a way to be elected for public office and second, Chinese immigration had increased to 25,116 by 1852 (See Table XI) and because of their large numbers, they became obvious competitors in the mines. Let us briefly explore the latter. By 1850 most of the loose ore had been panned out of California's streams and the competition for good placers became intensified. The days of the small miner was declining³⁴¹ and a xenophobic movement began to sweep across the mining districts of California in 1850. This movement was directed towards the French, Mexicans, Peruvians and Chilenos,³⁴² and many mining districts passed resolutions forbidding foreigners to mine, mainly the French and Latin Americans. The slogan, California for Americans became a reality when in 1850, the first foreign miners license tax law was passed. This law stipulated that "all persons not native born citizens of the United States (California Indians exempted) or who could not become citizens under the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, must take out a license to mine at twenty dollars per month."³⁴³ This resulted in the depopulation of many mining camps and the foreigners drifted elsewhere. This law was repealed in 1851.³⁴⁴ With the loss of the foreign miners and the influx of Chinese migrants,

341. Roske, op. cit., page 247.

342. Coolidge, op. cit., pages 26-29.

343. Ibid., page 29.

344. Ibid., page 30.

they constituted "the largest single body of unnaturalized foreigners in the state."³⁴⁵ Attention was drawn to them by Senator George Tingley's Coolie Bill on March 6, of 1852. The purpose of the bill was to "legalize contracts by which Chinese laborers could sell their services for periods of ten years or less at fixed wages."³⁴⁶ The debate of the bill provided the arguments that would be used against Chinese migration in the future.³⁴⁷ Governor John Bigler was one of the first politicians to seize the Chinese issue as a political platform. In his speech of April, 1852, he lashed out at the Chinese in the hope of receiving the mining vote. He stated that "inferior people were not fit to be citizens, and that China's enormous squalid population might soon overrun California and destroy the economic freedom of Americans by working as contract laborers, virtually slaves in the hands of capital. They were ignorant of moral obligations, incapable of being assimilated and dangerous to the welfare of the state. For these reasons their immigration must cease."³⁴⁸ Because of Bigler's political success in using the Chinese issue, an anti-Chinese platform became mandatory if one had aspirations for political office. Not only did politicians attack the Chinese, the

345. Ibid., page 31.

346. Barth, op. cit., page 136.

347. For this debate, see Journal of the Assembly, 1852, pages 67-68.

348. Ibid., page 592, and Coolidge, op. cit., page 31.

media also adopted an anti-Chinese position when "the most influential paper in the state, the Daily Alta California, went over to the Bigler party in 1853 due to a change in editors."³⁴⁹ The series of anti-Chinese editorials published in the spring of 1853 did much to inflame the people. Thus, the stage was set for the use of Chinese migration as a political issue as well as using the Chinese as the scape-goats for the economic evils that would occur in the state.

The resultant of the anti-Chinese hostility was a series of laws enacted by the state legislature and the City of San Francisco that harassed and tried to exclude the Chinese from the state. Many of these laws failed on a local level because they were declared unconstitutional and the consequence was to make the Chinese issue one of national concern, the final outcome of which was the Exclusion Act of 1882. Further, many of these laws coincided with the increase in Chinese migration and in addition, they tended to reinforce the group's sojourner status. Let us now review some of this legislation.

In 1853 the Foreign Miners Tax Law of 1852 was increased to four dollars per month, and the law was printed in Chinese.³⁵⁰ The next year a new Foreign Miners Tax Law was passed which exempted residents who could be naturalized from paying the four dollars per month fee.³⁵¹ The Chinese were not exempted from this law because

349. Ibid., pages 57-58.

350. Statutes of the State of California, (1853), pages 62-82.

351. Ibid., (1854), page 55.

they were not eligible to be citizens under the constitution of California which was formulated in 1849. Article two, section one stated:

Every white male citizen of the United States and every white male citizen of Mexico who shall have elected to become a citizen of the United States under the Treaty of Queretaro (Guadalupe Hidalgo) 352...shall be entitled to vote.353

Further, the naturalization laws of the United States at that time only applied to free whites and since the Chinese were considered non-whites, they were ineligible for naturalization. Their racial status was defined by Justice Hugh Murray in the case of People vs. Hall. Although the Chinese were denied citizenship under the constitution of California, there was no provision in regards to their testimony against whites in the courts. Legally, the constitution excluded the testimony of Blacks and Indians, however, for the Chinese, a ruling was made by Justice Murray:

Indian as commonly used, refers only to the North American Indians, yet in the days of Columbus, all shores washed by the Chinese waters were called the Indies, therefore all Asiatics were Indians. In the second place, the word white necessarily excludes all other races than caucasian, and in the third place, even if this were not so, I would decide against admitting the testimony of the Chinese on the grounds of public policy.354

352. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was the treaty with Mexico after the Mexican American War. It provided citizenship for Mexicans who lived in California prior to 1848.

353. Constitution of the State of California Annotated, compiled by Paul Mason, (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1946), page 1431.

354. People vs. Hall, 1854, California, 399, and Speer, op. cit., page 574.

The implication of this ruling meant that whites may rob, kill or destroy Chinese property and if the only witnesses were Chinese, they would be unable to receive legal redress. They were then excluded from the courts. Further indication that the Chinese were unwanted in the state occurred in 1858 when the state legislature passed a Chinese exclusion law which was declared unconstitutional in 1862.³⁵⁵

By 1860 the Chinese had moved into occupations other than mining and they were constantly harassed in whatever new endeavor they engaged in. That year, "an act for the protection of fisheries" was passed by the legislature, which stipulated that no Chinese could fish in Californian waters without paying a license fee of four dollars a month.³⁵⁶ Upon failing to pay this fee, the Chinese were subjected to having their property siezed after one hour's notice. This law was repealed four years later because it only provided a small revenue.³⁵⁷ In that year also, the Chinese were barred from the public schools of California by a statute which provided separate schools for them at the expense of the local communities.³⁵⁸ In 1862, the state legislature tried once more to discourage Chinese migration by passing "an act to protect free white labor against competition with Chinese

355. Ling Sing vs. Washburn, 20 California, 534.

356. Statutes of California, (1860), page 307.

357. Coolidge, op. cit., page 73.

358. Statutes of California, (1860), page 325.

coolie labor, and to discourage the immigration of Chinese into California." It provided for a two dollar and fifty cents license fee to be paid monthly by all Chinese not engaged in the growing of rice, tea, coffee or sugar.³⁵⁹ At that time, the law was directed at the majority of the Chinese in the state. Further, this law was an attempt to stimulate agricultural development in the state, and it was declared in violation of the commerce clause that year, and once more the state Supreme Court inhibited the attempt to harass the Chinese.³⁶⁰ In 1865 there was a state of economic prosperity, due to the building of the Central Pacific Railroad and the employment of a large part of the Chinese population. With the decrease of Chinese competition in the labor and the general prosperity in the state, anti-Chinese legislation became dormant during the years of 1865-1867. This is not to say that the sojourners were not on the decline. On the contrary, popular feeling against the sojourners remained strong however, general prosperity channelled the interests of the legislators elsewhere.

In 1868 there were two issues which would affect the status of the Chinese in the years to come and which would prove to be a major obstacle for California's legislators. The first was the Burlingame Treaty in 1868 and the second was the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. The treaty with China,

359. Ibid., (1862), page 462.

360. Ling Sing vs. Washburn, page 534.

negotiated by Anson Burlingame, United States Minister to China in 1868, politically provided for the recruitment of Chinese laborers. However, it did not provide for citizenship because it stated that "nothing herein contained shall be held to confer naturalization upon citizens of the United States in China, nor upon the subjects of China in the United States."³⁶¹ Further, although citizenship was granted to Blacks, there were no provisions made for the Chinese nationally. The only way the sojourners could have obtained it was to produce native born Americans, and this was impossible in any large numbers, given the lack of women. It should also be noted that the Burlingame Treaty was welcomed by business interests, but the majority of the people in California did not favor the treaty³⁶² and it became a legal hurdle in the local attempts to exclude the Chinese.

From a legal point of view, this treaty confined the Chinese to their sojourner status because it was a clear indication that the government did not wish citizenship for the people of China. This meant that the Chinese were not considered a permanent part of the American community. This will become obvious when one considers the due process of law and equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution, and the ultimate exclusion of the Chinese. In a way, the United States violated its constitution

361. Malloy, op. cit., page 236.

362. Lucile Eaves, A History of California Labor Legislation, (Berkeley: University of California Publication in Economics, II, University of California Press, 1910), page 127.

and its treaty with China when Congress passed the Exclusion Act of 1882. However, let us return to the legal complications that the Burlingame Treaty and the Fourteenth Amendment posed for California's legislators.

In the spring of 1869, railroad construction was completed and thousands of Chinese and white workers were out of work. Many of these individuals migrated to San Francisco in the hopes of securing employment. Workingmen blamed the Chinese for their circumstances and a series of organizations sprang up in order to exclude the Chinese because of the conception that the Chinese were coolies, being dominated and exploited by the Six Companies. The years of depression, 1870-1877 in California further aggravated the situation and the anti-Chinese movement began its chant, "the Chinese must go." In 1870 the California School law was passed and it provided for separate schools for Blacks and Indians and made no provision for the Chinese.³⁶³ That same year a statute prevented the participation of the Chinese in the labor and employment exchange³⁶⁴ and on working on ditches and canals of the West Side Irrigation District.³⁶⁵ Because Chinese women did not migrate, secret societies imported a large number of prostitutes in order to service the sojourners and this traffic became a target for the state legislators. In 1870 it was required that Chinese women who migrated

363. Statutes of California, (1869-1870), pages 838-839.

364. Ibid., (1869-1870), page 543.

365. Ibid., (1875-1876), page 747.

to the United States be of good character and that their migration was voluntary.³⁶⁶ In 1873 the state commissioner of immigration was granted the right to collect a bond of five hundred dollars in gold from any woman immigrant he considered "lewd or debauched."³⁶⁷ This piece of legislation was declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court in 1874 as a violation of the Burlingame Treaty. In 1875 the Page Law was enacted and it prohibited the involuntary emigration or immigration of the Chinese and it nullified all contracts for labor or prostitution.³⁶⁸ The same year the California state legislature passed the "Cubic Air Law" as a way of dealing with the overcrowding in Chinatown. It required that everyone, except public institutions, who rented a room which did not possess at least five hundred cubic feet of breathing space would be fined.³⁶⁹ Even the Chinese custom of sending the dead back to China was the target for the state legislators, when in 1877 they passed an act prohibiting disinterment, except under rigid supervision and certification by public officials.³⁷⁰

It seems that the major thrust of California's legislation from 1852 up to 1877 was enacted in order to harass the Chinese and

366. Ibid., (1869-1870), pages 330-333.

367. Acts Amendatory to the Codes of California, (1873-1874), page 39.

368. United States Statutes at Large, (1875), pages 477-478.

369. Statutes of California, (1875-1876), page 759.

370. Ibid., (1877-1878), pages 1050-1051.

discourage their migration. After 1877 however, the legislation became a reflection of the sentiments of the workingmen of California. Most of it was concerned with the direct exclusion of the Chinese from the state. This sentiment was officially sanctioned by the committee to investigate Chinese immigration, which was convened in 1876. The Memorial to congress asked for the prohibition of Chinese migration because they were inassimilable.³⁷¹ Also, in 1876 a Joint Special Committee of Congress studied the Chinese question and recommended that Congress modify the Burlingame Treaty and restrict Chinese migration.³⁷² By 1877, the Workingmen's Party, under the leadership of Dennis Kearney began its vociferous opposition to the Chinese. The objections raised claimed that the Chinese were contract laborers, they were moral degenerates, racially inferior, filthy, sent their money out of the country, destroyed the standard of wage and were unable to assimilate. The anti-Chinese resentment came to a boiling point in July of 1877 when members of the party rioted as a result of the inflammatory speech of Kearney.³⁷³ The California Constitutional Convention was held in 1879 and the Workingmen's Party influenced its direction, to the point where its provisions excluded

371. California Senate Report, Memorial, page 63.

372. Joint Special Committee on Chinese Immigration, Senate Report, 689, 44th Congress, 2nd Session, 1876-1877.

373. Ira Cross, A History of the Labor Movement in California, University of California Publication in Economics, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1935), pages 88-118.

the Chinese, and they resulted in a violation of the Burlingame Treaty. A brief review of its provisions will indicate the extent of the hostility towards the Chinese:

Article one, section seventeen stated: foreigners of the white race, or of African descent, eligible to become citizens...under the naturalization laws shall have the same rights...of all property, other than real estate, as native born citizens.³⁷⁴

It seems that although rights were granted to blacks and whites in this section, it was conspicuously silent on the Chinese. This however, was no accident because the framers of the constitution were aware that the Chinese were ineligible for citizenship under the Burlingame Treaty. Consequently, article two, section one clarified the issue by stating:

...No alien ineligible for citizenship, no idiot, no insane person...not being able to read the constitution in...english...shall ever exercise the privileges of an elector of this state.³⁷⁵

Having denied the Chinese access to citizenship, the legislators went beyond that when they denied the sojourners employment opportunities in California. Article nineteen, sections two, three and four stated:

No corporation...shall...employ in any capacity, any Chinese. The legislature shall pass such laws as may be necessary to enforce this provision. No Chinese shall be employed on any state, county, municipal or other public work, except in punishment for a crime. The presence of foreigners ineligible to become citizens...is declared to be dangerous...

374. Constitution of the State of California, pages 52-53.

375. Ibid., page 54.

and the legislature shall discourage their immigration. Asiatic coolieism is a form of human slavery, and is forever prohibited in this state and all contracts for coolie labor shall be void. The legislature shall empower the cities and towns to remove the Chinese to the limits of such cities and towns...or for their location within prescribed portions of those limits.³⁷⁶

Most of these provisions violated the treaty with China as well as the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. However, following the ratification of the constitution, the state legislature enacted a series of anti-Chinese laws, most of which were struck down by the United States Circuit Court. In 1880, the segregation of the Chinese by the removal of Chinatowns from cities and towns was authorized.³⁷⁷ The agreement between the Chinese Six Companies and the steamship lines requiring a certificate showing that all debts were paid was outlawed that same year.³⁷⁸ In 1881, the state legislature prohibited the smoking of opium.³⁷⁹ Added to state enactments directed at the Chinese, were a series of federal laws which also sought to restrict Chinese migration. The first such enactment was the "Fifteen Passage Bill" of 1879³⁸⁰ which prohibited the bringing of more than fifteen Chinese passengers by any single vessel at one time. This act was vetoed by President Hayes because it violated the Burlingame Treaty,

376. Ibid., page 159.

377. Statutes of California, (1880), page 22.

378. Ibid., page 15.

379. Ibid., (1881), page 34.

380. Sandmeyer, op. cit., page 90.

however, "it was significant because it marked a turn in the road in the immigration policy of the United States, for in spite of the veto, restriction was evidently a matter of time."³⁸¹ In 1880 there was a modification of the Burlingame Treaty and the United States attained the right to limit or suspend the immigration of Chinese laborers, but not absolutely prohibit it.³⁸² In 1881 Senator John F. Miller from California introduced in the senate a bill which provided that the immigration of Chinese laborers shall be suspended for twenty years. This was vetoed by President Arthur because he regarded the suspension of immigration for so long a period as a breach of the treaty with China. In 1882 the same bill was submitted, with minor changes, one of which was the reduction from twenty years to ten years in the suspension of immigration of Chinese laborers.³⁸³ Finally, the exclusion of the Chinese became a reality. However, the Workingmen's Party was not satisfied with the Exclusion Act of 1882. They wanted absolute exclusion of the Chinese and this was granted in part by the Scott Act of 1888 which suspended further Chinese immigration by also excluding those in transit between China³⁸⁴

381. Ibid., page 91.

382. United States Statutes at Large, (1880), Volume 22, page 826.

383. United States Statutes at Large, (1882), Volume 22, page 426.

384. United States Statutes at Large, (1888), Volume 25, page 569.

and the United States. On May 5, 1892, the Geary Act was passed, which enforced exclusion for another ten years.³⁸⁵ The year before the termination of the Exclusion Act of 1892, the Pacific Coast intensified its interest in the exclusion laws again. The American Federation of Labor led the campaign at the Convention of Labor held in San Francisco on November 21st and 22nd in 1901.³⁸⁶ Congress interpreted this as an indication that the principle of exclusion should be enforced and the Exclusion Act of 1902 was passed, which extended the exclusion laws and prohibited Chinese migration from all United States possessions.³⁸⁷ After this, the anti-Chinese movement lost most of its momentum, except when they were included in the anti-Japanese resentment.³⁸⁸

The major federal statute after the Exclusion Act of 1902 was the Immigration Act of 1924, which did not provide immigration quotas for those ineligible for naturalization.³⁸⁹ However, this law was amended

385. United States Statutes at Large, (1892), Volume 27, page 569.

386. One of the consequences of this convention was the pamphlet, by Gompers and Gustadt, op. cit.

387. United States Statutes at Large, (1902), Volume 32, page 176.

388. Bertram Schrieke, Alien Americans: A Study of Race Relations, (New York: The Viking Press, 1936), page 16.

389. United States Bureau of Immigration, Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration, (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1924), pages 24-30.

in 1926 by an act which permitted the admission as non quota immigrants, certain alien wives and children of United States citizens.³⁹⁰ For some of the Chinese this provided some measure of relief, but for the majority, it was far from satisfactory.

Exclusion began on a local level as a resultant of competition between Chinese laborers and white workers, however, this was disguised by a racist ideology of the inferior Chinese and the issue of assimilation and amalgamation became the manifest reasons for exclusion. Thus, from the arrival of the Chinese in 1849 until the granting of citizenship in 1943,³⁹¹ they were regarded legally as aliens who could not become a permanent part of American society. As such, they were beaten, robbed, killed and deprived of basic rights. It was no wonder that the phrase a "chinaman's chance" succinctly described the life of the Chinese in the early years of 1849 until 1943.

Amidst the violence and the series of legislation that reaffirmed their alien status, it was hard for the Chinese to conceive of permanent settlement in the United States. The feeling of Americans and the enactment of state and federal laws left no doubt that they were not desired as residents. In this light, why was there a steady influx of the Chinese? The answer to this question was that the

390. "Admission of Wives of American Citizens of Oriental Ancestry," House Report, 6544, 69th Congress, 1st Session, 1926.

391. United States Statutes at Large, (1943), Volume 32, page 600.

Chinese were able to earn a living in the United States and earn comparatively more than they could have in China. To be sure perhaps, some of the sojourners found America more exciting than China, however, this cannot be the main reason why so many would leave their loved ones for an unknown future.

In addition to their reasons for migrating, the Chinese reflected a series of demographic characteristics that influenced the type of settlement they established in the United States. The most important characteristic was the shortage of women and this assisted legislators in reaffirming the sojourner status of the Chinese because it paved the way for the arguments for exclusion as well being denied the only outlet for citizenship, that is, the birth of a large second generation in the United States. Let us briefly explain the former, since the latter has been dealt with in chapter five. Because of the shortage of women, the Chinese were accused of not intending to establish permanent settlement due to the fact that they came without families. Further, given the lack of women, a large number of prostitutes were imported in order to provide a sexual outlet for the sojourners. Added to this, it was believed that many of the prostitutes were brought by the secret societies and that they were held in virtual slavery. In fact, there was an ordinance enacted in San Francisco for the purpose of eliminating prostitution as well as contract labor:

It shall be unlawful for any person...to sell...any human

being, to claim the services, possession or person of any human being...to...induce any person to be, or remain in a state of servitude...to be, enter, remain or dwell in any brothel or house of ill-fame, except for a lawful purpose...to threaten any person for... assisting...any person who was bought, sold, held, claimed...in violation of this section.³⁹²

This involvement in prostitution created the charge of immorality of the Chinese and the argument that they were corrupting the morals of American youth. Further, many argued that the Chinese practiced polyandry and concubinage³⁹³ and this was cited as an aspect of their moral degeneracy. Although these charges were highly exaggerated, the fact still remains that the shortage of women in the Chinese migration had a wide variety of implications. Interestingly enough, prostitution began to decline in Chinatown when there began an immigration of women.

In conclusion, we may summarize this study as being interested in the conditions under which a migrant group is likely to take an intergrationist path, which involves assimilation or a pluralist path which involves separation from the institutions, organizations and social life in the host country. Whether a group selects one path or the other depends on their reasons for migrating, as well as the legal sanctions of the host government. If we were to regard all migrations as the same then we would not be able to grasp the differences between

392. General Orders of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco and Ordinances of Park Commissioners, (San Francisco: W.M. Hinton and Co., 1878), pages 29-30.

393. Lyman, Chinese Americans, page 94.

temporary settlement and permanent settlement. Further, we would not be able to adequately understand the impact of law on both types of settlement as well as the dynamics of adjustment. Because of this we have tried to present a case for one type of migration, sojourner. It may not be the definitive word on this kind of population movement, but, we feel that a prima-facie case was made and that was the important goal. Along the way, we have also exposed some of the problems of demography and it is hoped that in the future we will be able to rectify some of these problems.

APPENDIX

The main focus of the appendix is to provide some comparative data about the Chinese and other ethnic groups and also provide an idea of Chinese migration to other parts of the world. Table XXV provides data of the Chinese population in Canada and it indicates a disparity in the number of males and females. Thus, it suggests that the

TABLE XXV. Chinese in Canada, by Province, 1931-1951

Province	1931			1941			1951		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
British Columbia	27,139	29,900	2,239	18,619	16,220	2,399	15,933	12,347	3,586
Ontario	6,919	6,448	471	6,143	5,497	646	6,997	5,529	1,468
Alberta	3,875	3,607	268	3,122	2,817	305	3,451	2,754	697
Saskatchewan	3,501	3,365	136	2,545	2,392	153	2,144	1,786	358
Quebec	2,750	2,549	201	2,378	2,140	238	1,904	1,524	380
Manitoba	1,732	1,636	96	1,248	1,147	101	1,175	1,002	173
Novia Scotia	340	304	36	372	322	50	516	394	122
New Foundland	0	0	0	0	0	0	386	354	32
New Brunswick	231	214	17	152	134	18	146	112	34
Yukon	1	1	0	0	0	0	37	35	2
Prince Edward Island	31	27	4	45	41	4	35	28	7
Northwest Territories	0	0	0	3	3	0	4	4	0
TOTALS	46,519	43,051	3,468	34,627	30,713	3,914	32,728	25,869	6,859

Source: Kung, *op. cit.*, page 266. Taken from the 7th, 8th and 9th censuses of Canada.

demographic aspects of Chinese migration to the United States and Canada were similiar. We may infer from this that it was no accident that the Chinese suffered from a lack of women in the United States.

The figures in this table show a predominance of males over females and the steady decline of the Chinese population in Canada. One reason for this decline may have been the migration of the Chinese from Canada to the United States.

Table XXVI shows the ethnic distribution of the Chinese in Malaya. This breakdown corresponds roughly to the districts of emigration. In this vein, the table tends to support our thesis, developed in Chapter III, that the causes of emigration were mainly due to the problems of subsistence and overpopulation. For example,

TABLE XXVI. Ethnic Composition of the Chinese in Malaya, 1931

Fukien (Hok Kien)	540,236
Canton (Kwang Fu)	418,298
Mei Hsien (Hakka)	318,739
Chao Chan (Teo Chin)	209,004
Hainan (Hoi Lam)	97,894
Kwangsi (Kwang Sai)	46,129
Foochow (Hok Chin)	31,971
Fuchia (Hok Chia)	15,303
Other	31,318
TOTALS	1,709,392

Source: Landon, *op. cit.*, pages 200-201.

Fukien, the province which had the greatest economic hardship, provided the larger number of migrants in Malaya. The same may be said of the United States as well, due to the large number of migrants from Fukien. Further, it may be argued that the ethnic breakdown for Malaya was roughly the same for Thailand and in three

different countries the majority of the migrants were from the same province. This was no accident either.

Table XXVII provides an idea of the immigration and remigration of the Chinese in Thailand during the years of 1932 to 1937. The remigration rate during these years was extremely high, given the great amount of toleration the Chinese enjoyed there.

TABLE XXVII. Immigration and Remigration
in Thailand, 1932-1937

Year	<u>Arrivals</u>	<u>Departures</u>	<u>Excess of Arrivals</u>
1932-33	52,854	39,769	13,085
1933-34	16,324	29,673	-13,349
1934-35	25,041	28,254	-3,213
1935-36	29,927	22,026	7,901
1936-37	36,537	25,390	11,147

Source: Landon, op. cit., page 208.

When we compare the remigration rate of the Chinese in Thailand to their rate in the United States, we see a similarity in the remigration rate. For both countries, even though there were difference in both environments.

Table XXVIII compares the age differences between the Chinese and Japanese in age distribution in 1940 in the United States. For the most part, the Japanese possessed a higher number in most age

categories, given the large migration of females in their population. This is so because the Japanese were able to produce a large second generation faster than the Chinese.

TABLE XXVIII. Comparison between the Japanese and Chinese in Age Distribution, 1940

Age	JAPANESE			CHINESE		
	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female
0-5	7,189	3,757	3,432	4,375	2,193	2,182
5-9	8,357	4,186	4,171	5,464	2,869	2,595
10-14	12,861	6,537	6,324	6,569	3,694	2,875
15-19	18,138	9,435	8,703	7,318	4,777	2,541
20-24	14,636	7,880	6,756	5,309	3,545	1,764
25-29	7,667	4,305	3,362	6,097	4,560	1,537
30-34	4,470	2,520	1,950	6,373	5,021	1,352
35-39	6,381	3,337	3,044	7,633	6,180	1,453
40-44	7,068	3,154	3,914	7,752	6,513	1,239
45-49	5,854	2,301	3,553	6,421	5,466	955
50-54	7,412	5,215	2,197	4,746	4,126	620
55-59	5,917	4,752	1,165	3,206	2,814	392
60-64	4,450	3,677	773	2,665	2,370	295
65-69	1,799	1,506	293	-	-	-
70-74	557	476	81	-	-	-
75+	211	152	59	-	-	-
TOTALS	112,985	63,208	49,977	77,504	57,389	20,115

Source: Kitano, *op. cit.*, page 167, and Kung, *op. cit.*, page 269.

Table XXVIII indicates that there were more children in the Japanese population than in the Chinese, the reason being, the larger number of women, and therefore, the larger number of children produced. The Japanese children, 0-14 age range, numbered 28,407, while the Chinese children, 0-14 age range, numbered 16,408. This difference is even more striking when one considers that the Chinese, in one hundred years in the United States, had only a total

of 20,115 females in the population.

The final issue we wish to pursue is why Chinese migration did not flow to the northern urban centers in China, rather than flowing overseas? In order to answer this question the reader should keep in mind the discussion presented in Chapter III. We argued there that, there were basically two Chinas, the North and the South. Further, there was little contact between the two regions. In fact, there was more contact between Southeastern China and Europeans than there was with the North. In the words of William Speer, "the Chinese who emigrated to California were almost exclusively from the province of Canton in South China, a region whose people have been more ready to venture to a country inhabited by a European race, since it has been there that the European trade has centered for the past centuries." (Speer, op. cit., page 472.) Another reason why the migration did not flow to the north was that there were no adequate outlets for wage labor at that time. Also, there was too much competition because of the large supply of laborers and the rate of pay was a small fraction of what they could have received overseas. In light of all of this, the major reason was the lack of contact between North and South. This issue offers an excellent research question and it should be pursued further.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS
CITED OR CONSULTED

A. Primary Sources

1. Congressional Documents

- 41st Congress, 2nd Session, 1869. Senate Document, No. 116, "Coolie Trade."
- 43rd Congress, 1st Session, 1873-1874. House Miscellaneous Document, No. 204, "California Legislature's Resolution on "Chinese Immigration."
- 44th Congress, 2nd Session, 1876-1877. Senate Report, No. 689. Joint Special Committee on "Chinese Immigration."
- 45th Congress, 3rd Session, 1878-1879. House Executive Document, No. 102, "Chinese Immigration Bill, Veto of."
- 47th Congress, 1st Session, 1881-1882. Senate Executive Document, No. 148, "Veto Message of President Arthur."
- 49th Congress, 1st Session, 1885-1886. Senate Miscellaneous Document, No. 107, "California Anti-Chinese Convention 1886, Memorial of."
- 51st Congress, 1st Session, 1889-1890. Senate Executive Document, No. 148, "Veto Message of President Arthur."
- 69th Congress, 1st Session, 1926-1927. House Report Document, No. 6544, "Admission of Wives of American Citizens of Chinese Ancestry."

2. Federal Documents

Census of the United States, 1850-1940.

Statutes at Large of the United States of America, 1879-1943, Volumes 17, 22, 23, 25 and 27 were used.

Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols and Agreements
Between the United States and Other Powers, 1776-1909. Senate
Document, No. 357, 61st Congress, 2nd Session, 1910. Two
volumes, compiled by William Malloy.

United States Bureau of Immigration, Annual Report of the
Commissioner General of Immigration. Washington, D.C.,
United States Government Printing Office, 1924.

Vital Statistics of the United States, 1937-1950

3. State Documents

Acts Amendatory to the Codes of California, 1873-1876.

California Senate Report on Chinese Immigration, 1876 and 1878.

California Assembly Journals, 1850, 1851, 1855, 1860, 1868, 1879,
and 1880.

California Senate Journals, 1850, 1851, 1852, 1854, 1865-1866, and
1877-1878.

California Constitutional Convention, Debates and Proceedings.
E.B. Willis, editor. Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1881,
three volumes.

Constitution of the State of California Annotated. Compiled by Paul
Mason. Sacramento, California: State Printing Office, 1946.

Statutes of the State of California, 1852, 1853, 1854, 1855, 1860,
1862, 1868, 1869, 1870, and 1875-1881.

General Orders of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of
San Francisco and Ordinances of Park Commissioners. San
Francisco: W.M. Hinton and Company, 1878.

San Francisco Municipal Reports, 1867-1870.

4. Periodicals

Avery, Benjamin. "The Building of the Iron Road." Overland Monthly,
May, 1869.

- Loomis, A.W. "The Chinese Six Companies." Overland Monthly.
October, 1868: 221-227.
- "How Our Chinamen are Employed." Overland Monthly.
March, 1861: 231-240.
- "Chinese in California." Overland Monthly. August,
1868: 152-156.
- "Chinese Women in California." Overland Monthly.
April, 1869: 344-351.
- Ng, Poon Chew. "The Chinese in Los Angeles." Land of Sunshine,
Volume 1, October, 1894: 102-103.
- Ngon, Fong Kum. "The Chinese Six Companies." Overland Monthly. May,
1894: 519-526.
- Seward, George F. "Mongolian Immigration." North America Review,
Volume, 134. June 1882: 562-577.

5. Books and Pamphlets

- Bancroft, Hubert. History of California, VI, 1848-1859. San
Francisco: The History Company, 1888.
- Gibson, Otis. The Chinese in America. Cincinnati: Hitchcock and
Walden, 1877.
- Seward, George F. Chinese Immigration. New York: Charles
Scribner's Sons, 1881.
- Smith, Arthur. Village Life in China. New York: Fleming H. Revell
Company, 1899.
- Speer, William. The Oldest and the Newest Empire: China and the
United States. San Francisco: H.H. Bancroft and Company,
1870.
- Starr, M.B. The Coming Struggle. San Francisco: Bacon and Company,
1873.
- Townsend, L.T. The Chinese Problem. Boston: Lee and Shepard
Publishers, 1876.

Whitney, James A. The Chinese and The Chinese Question. New York: Tibbals Book Company, 1888.

B. Secondary Sources

Allport, Gordon. The Nature of Prejudice. Garden City: Anchor, 1958.

Appleyard, R.T. "The Return Movement of the United Kingdom Migrants from Australia." Population Studies, 15, 1962: 214-255.

Barth, Gunther. Bitter Strength: A History of the Chinese in the United States, 1850-1872. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1904.

Berthoff, R.T. British Immigrants in Industrial America, 1790-1950. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1933.

Billington, R.A. The Far Western Frontier, 1835-1860. New York: MacMillian, 1968.

Black, Isabella. "American Labor and Chinese Immigration." Past and Present, 25. July, 1963, pages 59-76.

Boddie, Derk. China's Cultural Tradition. New York: Rhinehard and Company, 1957.

Bonacich, Edna. "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labor Market." American Sociological Review, 37. October, 1972, pages 547-559.

Bromwell, William. History of Immigration to the United States. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Burawoy, Michael. "The Function and Reproduction of Migrant Labor: Comparative Material from Southern Africa and the United States." American Journal of Sociology, 81. March, 1976, pages 1050-1087.

Campbell, P.C. Chinese Coolie Emigration to Countries within the British Empire. London: P. King and Son, 1923.

Cather, Helen. The History of San Francisco's Chinatown. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1974.

- Cator, W.J. The Economic Position of the Chinese in the Netherland Indies. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1936.
- Caughey, John Walton. Gold is the Cornerstone. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948.
- Chen, Ta. Chinese Migrations with Special Reference to Labor Conditions. Bulletin of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, No. 340. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1923.
- Emigrant Communities in South China. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1940.
- Chiu, Ping. Chinese Labor in California, 1850-1880: An Economic Study. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1963.
- Commons, John R. Races and Immigrants to America. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1962.
- Coolidge, Mary Roberts. Chinese Immigration. New York: Arno Press, 1909.
- Cornelisen, Ann. Women of the Shadows. New York: Vintage, 1976.
- Cressey, George. Land of the 500 Million: A Geography of China. New York: McGraw Hill, 1955.
- Cross, Ira. A History of the Labor Movement in California. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1935.
- Davie, Maurice. World Immigration. New York: MacMillian, 1936.
- Davis, Kingsley. The Population of India. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951.
- Dillion, Richard. The Hatcher Men: The Story of the Tong Wars in San Francisco's Chinatown. New York: Coward McCann, 1962.
- Dulles, Foster. China and America. New York: Kennikat Press, 1946.
- Eaves, Lucille. A History of California Labor Legislation. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1910.
- Erickson, Charlotte. American Industry and the European Immigrant, 1860-1885. New York: Russell & Russell, 1957.

- Fairchild, Henry. Immigration: A World Movement and Its American Significance. New York: MacMillian, 1920.
- Ferenczi, Imre. International Migrations, I: Statistics. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1929.
- Freedman, Maurice. Chinese Lineage and Society: Fukien and Kwangtung. New York: Humanities Press, 1961.
- Frisbie, W.P. and Neidert, Lisa. "Inequality and the Relative Size of Minority Populations: A Comparative Analysis." American Journal of Sociology, March, 1977, pages 1009-1013.
- Gompers, Samuel. Seventy Years of Life and Labor, I and II. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1967.
- and Gutstadt, Herman. Meat vs. Rice: American Manhood against Asiatic Coolieism - Which Shall Survive? San Francisco: Asiatic Exclusion League, 1908.
- Gordon, Milton, Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Gulliver, P.H. "Incentives in Labor Migration." Human Organization, XIX, No. 3, Fall, 1960, pages 159-163.
- Hance, William. Population, Migration and Urbanization in Africa. New York: Columbia University Press, 1920.
- Handlin, Oscar. Immigration as a Factor in American History. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1959.
- Hansen, Marcus. The Atlantic Migration, 1607-1860. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Hawley, Amos. Human Ecology. New York: Ronald Press, 1950.
- Herch, Liebmann. "International Migration of the Jews," in Walter Willcox's International Migrations 2: Interpretations. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1931.
- Higman, John. Strangers in the Land. New Jersey: ~~Rutgers~~ Rutgers University Press, 1955.
- Hill, Herbert. "Anti-Oriental Agitation and the Rise of Working-Class Racism." Society, January and February, 1973, pages 43-54.

- Ho, Ping-ti. Studies on the Population of China, 1368-1953.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Hourwich, Isaac. Immigration and Labor. New York: Arno Press,
1969.
- Hsiao, Kung-chuan. Rural China. Seattle: University of Washington
Press, 1960.
- Jerome, Harry. Migration and Business Cycles. New York: National
Bureau of Economic Research, 1926.
- Jwata, Masakazy. "The Japanese Immigrants in California Agriculture."
Agricultural History, 36. January, 1962, pages 25-37.
- Kirk, Dudley. Europe's Population in the Interwar Years. Princeton,
New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Kitamo, Harry. Japanese Americans. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice
Hall, 1969.
- Kung, Shien-woo. Chinese in American Life. Seattle: University of
Washington Press, 1962.
- Landon, Kenneth. The Chinese in Thailand. New York: Russell and
Russell, 1941.
- Lee, Rose Hum. "The Decline of Chinatowns in the United States."
American Journal of Sociology, LIV, No. 5, March, 1949, pages
422-432.
- The Chinese in the United States of America. Hong
Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1960.
- Levy, Howard. Chinese Footbinding: The History of a Curious Erotic
Custom. New York: Walton H. Rawls, 1966.
- Ling, Pyan. "Causes of Chinese Emigration." The Annals of the
American Academy of Political and Social Science, XXXIX, 39,
January, 1912, pages 74-82.
- Lipset, Semour Martin. "Democracy and Working Class Authoritarianisms."
American Sociological Review, August, 1959.
- Lowen, James W. The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White.
Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971.

- Lowenberg, James. "Efforts of the South to Encourage Immigration, 1865-1900." South Atlantic Quarterly, October, 1934.
- Lyman, Standord M. The Asian in the West. Reno and Las Vegas, Nevada: Desert Research Institute, 1970.
- Chinese Americans. New York: Random House, 1974.
- "Contrast in the Community Organization of Chinese and Japanese in North America." The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology. May, 1968, pages 51-66.
- Marden, C., and Meyer, G. Minorities in American Society. New York: Van Nostrand Company, 1973.
- McKenzie, Roderick. Oriental Exclusion. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.
- McLeod, Alexander. Pigtails and Gold-Dust. Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1947.
- Melendy, Howard B. The Oriental Americans. New York: Tayne Publishers, 1972.
- Miller, Stuart Creighton. The Unwelcome Immigrant. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- Mitchell, Clyde. "The Causes of Labor Migration." Commission for Technical Cooperation in Africa, Migrant Labor in Africa South of the Sahara, Publication No. 79, Abidjan, 1966.
- Noel, Donald. "A Theory of the Origin of Ethnic Stratification." Social Problems, 16, Fall, 1968, pages 157-172.
- Norton, Henry. The Story of California from the Earliest Days to the Present. Chicago: McClury and Company, 1913.
- Park, Robert E. On Social Control and Collective Behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- and Miller, Herbert A. Old World Traits Transplanted. New York: Arno Press, 1969.
- Petersen, William. Population. New York: MacMillian, 1969.
- Ravenstein, E.G. "The Laws of Migration." Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, XLVIII, June, 1855, pages 167-227.

- Read, Margaret. "Migrant Labor in Africa and Its Effects on Tribal Life." International Labor Review, XLVI, June, 1942.
- Renner, G.T. "Chinese Influence in the Development of the Western United States." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Volume 52, November, 1930.
- Richmond, A.H. "Demographics and Family Characteristics of British Immigrants Returning from Canada." International Migration 4, 1966, pages 21-26.
- Rosen, Bernard C. "Social Change, Migration and Family Interaction in Brazil." American Sociological Review, 38. April, 1973, pages 198-211.
- Roske, Ralph T. Everyman's Eden: A History of California. New York: MacMillan, 1968.
- Rudolph, Fredrick. "Chinamen in Yankeedom." American Historical Review, LII, October, 1947, pages 1-29.
- Sandmeyer, Elmer Clarence. The Anti-Chinese Movement in California. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1973.
- Saloutos, S.T. They Remember America: The Story of the Repatriated Greek American. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956.
- Schapera, Isaac. Migrant Labor and Tribal Life: A Study in the Bechuanaland Protectorate. London: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Schrieke, Bertram. Alien Americans: A Study of Race Relations. New York: Viking Press, 1936.
- Siu, Paul C. "The Sojourner." American Journal of Sociology, July, 1952, pages 34-44.
- Skinner, Elliot. "Labor Migration Among the Mossi of the Upper Volta." In Hilda Kuper, ed., Urbanization in West Africa. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965.
- Sly, David. "Migration and the Ecological Complex." American Sociological Review, 37. October, 1972, pages 615-628.
- Southhall, A. Social Change in Modern Africa. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

- Summer, William Graham. Folkways. New York: New American Library, 1904.
- Sung, Betty. The Story of the Chinese in America. New York: MacMillian, 1967.
- Swisher, Earl. China's Management of the American Barbarian. New York: Octagon Books, 1972.
- Tawney, R.H. Land Labor and Capital in China. London: Allen and Unwin, 1932.
- Thomas, Dorothy S. Social and Economic Aspects of Swedish Population Movements, 1750-1933. New York: MacMillian, 1941.
- Tregear, Thomas. A Geography of China. Chicago: Aldine, 1965.
- Tsao, Hen-Yen. "The Chinese Family from Customary Law to Positive." Hastings Law Journal, May, 1966.
- Tung, William L. The Chinese in America, 1820-1973. New York: Ocean Publication, 1974.
- Vance, Rupert. "Is Theory for Demographers?" Social Forces, XXXI, October, 1952, pages 9-23.
- Van Velsen, J. "Labor Migration as a Positive Factor in the Continuity of Tonga Tribal Society." Economic Development and Cultural Change, VIII, No. 3, April, 1960, pages 265-278.
- Vogel, Ezra. "From Friendship to Comradeship. The Changes in Personal Relations in Communist China." China Quarterly, No. 22, April-June, 1968.
- Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1947.
- The Religion of China. New York: The Free Press, 1951.
- The City. New York: The Free Press, 1958.
- Wolf, Kurt. The Sociology of Greog Simmel. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1950.
- Wu, Yuan-Li. China: A Handbook. New York: Draeger, 1973.
- Yang, Martin C. A Chinese Village. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.