

THE "HEATHEN CHINEE" AND AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY

A surplus labouring population . . . forms a disposable industrial reserve army, that belongs to capital as absolutely as if the latter had bred it at its own cost. . . . [I]t creates, for the changing needs of the self-expansion of capital, a mass of human material always ready for exploitation. . . . The industrial reserve army, during periods of stagnation and average prosperity, weighs down the active labour-army; during the periods of over-production and paroxysm, it holds its pretensions in check.

—Karl Marx

In 1851, six years before Hinton Helper would issue his inflammatory appeal for the overthrow of the planter class and the forced removal of all blacks from America, he traveled to California where he was appalled to see so many Chinese living and working in the recently conquered territory. Like Jefferson, Helper believed society should be homogeneous. "Certain it is," he wrote in his book *The Land of Gold*, "that the greater the diversity of colors and qualities of men, the greater will be the strife and conflict of feeling." He had left North Carolina to get away from blacks and to find vacant lands and freedom from the "diversity of color" that existed in the settled parts of the country. His hope that the West would offer sanctuary to white America was shattered when he encountered the Chinese in California. "Our population was already too heterogeneous before the Chinese came," he protested. "I should not wonder at all, if the copper of the Pacific yet becomes as great a subject of discord and dissension as the ebony of the Atlantic."¹

Eighteen years later, the Reverend John Todd of Massachusetts visited California where he found the Chinese in even greater numbers. But Todd did not feel racial anxiety. In his account of his trip, *The Sunset Land*, he gave reassurance to the Helpers of America:

If, then, I am told, as I am almost every day, that this conglomerate mass, made up of Anglo-Saxons, Europeans, Africans, Chinamen, and a sprinkling of all nations, is hereafter to cement into a sort of puddingstone race, I reply, it may be so, but I do not believe it. God has given this continent to the strongest race on earth, and to the freest and best educated part of that race, and I do not believe he is going to let it drop out of hands that can handle the globe, and put it into hands that are hands without educated brains.

Reverend Todd was confident such a divine plan existed, for he believed he had seen it manifested at Promontory Point, Utah. There he had offered official prayers at the celebration for the completion of the transcontinental railroad.²

Ah Sin in America

What Helper and Todd were witnessing was the influx of thousands and thousands of immigrants from the Far East. Between 1850 and 1880, the Chinese population in the United States shot up from 7,520 to 105,465, a fifteenfold increase; in 1870 the Chinese constituted 8.6 percent of the total population of California and an impressive 25 percent of the wage-earning force.³ Significantly, in their descriptions of these new immigrants, whites tended to identify them with groups they had historically set apart from themselves—blacks and Indians.

During the years of first encounters and impressions, the Chinese were subjected to what historian Dan Caldwell has described as a process of "Negroization." Time and again the Chinese immigrants were likened to blacks. Shortly after the Civil War, *The New York Times* issued a warning which depicted both the newly freed blacks and the newly imported Chinese as threats to republicanism: "We have four millions of degraded negroes in the South . . . and if there were to be a flood-tide of Chinese population—a population befouled with all the social vices, with no knowledge or appreciation of free institutions or constitutional liberty, with heathenish souls and heathenish propensities, whose character, and habits, and modes of thought are firmly fixed by the consolidating influences of ages upon ages—we should be prepared to bid farewell to republicanism. . . ." The *San Francisco Chronicle* compared the Chinese "coolie" to the black

slave, and condemned both as antagonistic to free labor: "When the coolie arrives here he is as rigidly under the control of the contractor who brought him as ever an African slave was under his master in South Carolina or Louisiana." Invoking Jefferson's idea of colonization, Senator John T. Morgan of Alabama regretted the impossibility of black removal and warned: "After you have got the Chinese here, and they become incorporated in one way or another with your social, industrial, and political institutions, the power will be found wanting to expel them." Governor Henry Haight echoed the free soil argument in his 1868 "Inaugural Remarks" when he declared: "No man is worthy of the name of patriot or statesman who countenances a policy which is opposed to the interests of the free white laboring and industrial classes. . . . What we desire for the permanent benefit of California is a population of white men who will make this State their home, bring up families here and meet the responsibilities and discharge the duties of freemen. We ought not to desire an effete population of Asiatics. . . ." Thus, the Chinese, like blacks, were stereotyped as enemies to republican and free-labor society.⁴

The language used to describe the Chinese had been employed before: Racial qualities that had been assigned to blacks became Chinese characteristics. Calling for Chinese exclusion, the editor of the *San Francisco Alta* claimed the Chinese had most of the vices of the African: "Every reason that exists against the toleration of free blacks in Illinois may be argued against that of the Chinese here." Heathen, morally inferior, savage, and childlike, the Chinese were also viewed as lustful and sensual. Chinese women were condemned as "a depraved class," and their depravity was associated with their almost Africanlike physical appearance. While their complexions in some instances approached "fair," one writer observed, their whole physiognomy indicated "but a slight removal from the African race." Chinese men were denounced as sexual threats to white women. White parents were advised not to send their daughters on errands to the Chinese laundry where horrible things happened to white girls in the back rooms. On one occasion in 1876, a *New York Times* reporter inquired about "a handsome but squalidly dressed young white girl" he found in an opium den. The owner replied: "Oh, hard time in New York. Young girl hungry. Plenty come here. Chinaman always have something to eat, and he like young white girl, He! He!" Writing for *Scribner's Monthly*, Sarah E. Henshaw instructed American mothers: "No matter how good a Chinaman may be, ladies never leave their children with them, especially little girls." White workers were told that Chinese competition drove wages down and forced wives of poor white men into prostitution. Compelled to sell their bodies to "Chinamen," white women were infected with the



THE QUESTION OF THE HOUR: Uncle Sam: Gosh! I've got this critter lassoed right enough, but how in thunder am I going to get him over thar to China?

"leprosy of the Chinese curse." Concerned over what he thought was the syphilitic threat of the Chinese, Dr. Arthur B. Stout warned that the introduction of Chinese and blacks into American society was like "a cancer" in the "biological, social, religious and political systems." The "Negroization" of the Chinese reached a high point when a magazine cartoon depicted them as a bloodsucking vampire with slanted eyes, a pigtail, dark skin, and thick lips. White workers made the identification even more explicit when they referred to the Chinese as "nagurs."⁵

While the Chinese were "Negroized," they were also assigned qualities which distinguished them from blacks in important ways. They were viewed as "intelligent," not "ignorant and brutish" like blacks; they would make "dexterous cotton-pickers, never bungling ones." "Quiet" and "peaceful," they were not given to "excessive hilarity"; they made "excellent houseservants," occasionally "sullen but never stupid." "Emancipation has spoiled the negro and carried him away from the fields of agriculture," the editor of the *Vicksburg Times* wrote in 1869. "Our prosperity depends entirely upon the recovery of lost ground, and we therefore say let the Coolies come. . . ." That same year a southern planters' convention in Memphis announced that it was "desirable and necessary to look to the teeming population of Asia for assistance in the cultivation of our soil and the development of our industrial interests." In his address to the convention, labor contractor Cornelius Koopmanshoop said that his company had imported 30,000 Chinese workers into California, and that many of them were working as mechanics and railroad laborers. Other supporters of Chinese labor suggested that the Chinese need not replace the blacks as workers. Rather the Chinese could be used as models to help discipline and reform blacks. Hard-working, economical, and frugal, the Chinese would be the "educators" of the blacks. In terms of industrial labor, the Chinese were thought to have more ability than blacks. The introduction of machinery was rendering black labor obsolete, it was claimed, for what was required in an industrial mode of production was "a much higher standard of intelligence." When placed in charge of labor-saving machines, the Chinese were found to be quick learners and competent operators. Even the qualities that were thought to distinguish the Chinese from blacks served as a basis for racial and class domination: They justified the use of Chinese as servants and a factory proletariat.⁶

The Chinese in America were compared not only with blacks but also with Indians. The winning of the West from the "Red Man" would be in vain, the editor of California's *Marin Journal* declared, if whites were now to surrender the conquered land to a "horde of Chinese." Indeed, for many

From *The Wasp Magazine*, January-June 1893, Vol. 30, pp. 10-11. I am grateful to the California State Library, Sacramento, and to Roberto Haro for helping me locate this cartoon.

whites, the Chinese were the “new barbarians.” The association between Indians and Chinese suggested one way to handle the “Chinese Problem.” “We do not let the Indian stand in the way of civilization,” stated former Governor Horatio Seymour of New York, “so why let the Chinese barbarian?” In his letter published in *The New York Times*, Seymour continued: “Today we are dividing the lands of the native Indians into states, counties and townships. We are driving off from their property the game upon which they live, by railroads. We tell them plainly, they must give up their homes and property, and live upon corners of their own territories, because they are in the way of our civilization. If we can do this, then we can keep away another form of barbarism which has no right here.” Senator Morgan of Alabama said he “likened” the Chinese to the Indians, “inferior” socially and politically and subject to the control of the federal government. If the Congress could locate Indians on reservations, he asked, why could it not do it also to the Chinese?⁷

Occasionally all three groups—blacks, Indians, and Chinese—were lumped together. What they all had in common was made clear in the 1854 California Supreme Court decision in the case of *People v. Hall*. “No black, or mulatto person, or Indian shall be allowed to give evidence in favor of, or against a white man,” the court declared. “Held, that the words, Indian, Negro, Black, and White are generic terms, designating races. That, therefore, Chinese and all other people not white, are included in the prohibition from being witnesses against whites.” Thus, like blacks and Indians, the Chinese were “not white.” The California superintendent of education applied the same color line to public schools. In 1859 he insisted the schools be racially segregated. “If this attempt to force Africans, Chinese, and Diggers [a term applied to a group of California Indians] into one school is persisted in it must result in the ruin of the schools,” he warned. “The great mass of our citizens will not associate on terms of equality with these inferior races; nor will they consent that their children should do so.” A year later, the California legislature authorized him to withhold public funds from any school which admitted the proscribed groups, and set up provisions for separate schools. This tendency to group together blacks, Indians, and Chinese was not peculiar to California. President Rutherford Hayes viewed the “Chinese Problem” within the broad context of race in America. The “present Chinese labor invasion,” he wrote in 1879, was “pernicious and should be discouraged. Our experience in dealing with the weaker races—the Negroes and Indians, for example,—is not encouraging. . . . I would consider with favor any suitable measures to discourage the Chinese from coming to our shores.”⁸

In the imagination of anti-Chinese exclusionists, however, the “race”

from the Far East posed a greater threat to white America than did blacks and Indians. Intelligent and competitive, Chinese men could easily eliminate the need for white labor and force white workers into poverty and idleness. Moreover, since they were coming only to make money and return to China, they could drain America of her wealth and energies.

All of these fears were acted out in 1879 in the play *The Chinese Must Go*, by Henry Grimm of San Francisco. In this fantasy, the Chinese conspire to destroy white labor, as the audience learns from a conversation between Ah Coy and Sam Gin.

AH COY. By and by white man catchee no money; Chinaman catchee heap money; Chinaman workee cheap, plenty work; white man workee dear, no work—sabee?

SAM GIN. Me heep sabee.

AH COY. White man damn fools; keep wifee and children—cost plenty money; Chinaman no wifee, no children, save plenty money. By and by, no more white workingman in California; all Chinaman—sabee?

In the play, the Chinese danger is depicted in terms of a vivid metaphor—Chinese “parasites” attacking the body of “Uncle Sam.” Thus Frank B., a white man, says to a friend:

You wasted your dimes in a candy store, I see. Let me tell you, if I take a four-bit piece, buy meat and flour with it, digest it, it turns into blood; therefore, money is blood. Now, what would you think of a man who would allow a lot of parasites to suck every day a certain quantity of blood out of his body, when he knows that his whole constitution is endangered by this sucking process; mustn't he be either an idiot or intend self-destruction? And suppose those Chinese parasites should suck as much blood out of every State in the Union, destroying Uncle Sam's sinews and muscles, how many years do you think it would take to put him in his grave?

Here, indeed, was a most ominous future for the republic. Men without families here to support, the Chinese could work for low wages. Unless the Chinese were excluded from America, they would continue to render white men impotent in the job market, and “suck” the blood from “Uncle Sam.”⁹

Three years later, Congress prohibited the immigration of Chinese laborers. The 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act made it unlawful for Chinese laborers to enter the country, and declared the Chinese already here ineligible for United States citizenship. The law was a candid expression of racism; as Massachusetts Senator George F. Hoar put it in his criticism of the bill, the

law discriminated against the Chinese because of "the color of their skin." Support for the legislation was overwhelming and geographically widespread: The House vote, for example, was 201 yeas, 37 nays, and 51 absent. While congressmen from the West and South gave it unanimous support, a large majority from the East (53 out of 77) and the Midwest (59 out of 72) also voted for the prohibition. Once more, as they had in their encounters with blacks and Indians, white Americans had to ask themselves who were the "real people," to use President Jackson's phrase. Once more, as they had in the enactment of the 1790 Naturalization Law which required the prospective citizen to be "white," they had to define their national purpose and to determine the relationship between race and nationality. The discussion this time, however, had a different emphasis. In the white imagination, the Chinese were located in the future. Unlike blacks and Indians, they were "coming" to America; moreover, they were directly identified with America as a modern industrial society, and their presence as an "industrial army of Asiatic laborers" was exacerbating the conflict between white labor and capital. Exclusionist supporters feared this conflict would lead to social revolution and chaos. They anxiously asked whether the American mechanic and worker, "forced to the wall" and degraded by Chinese labor, would continue to place his own labor in the market with the "faith" that he could receive a "civilized price" for it. They worried about the struggle between labor unions and the industrial "nabobs" and "grandees," the employers of Chinese labor; and they apprehensively viewed the "disorder, strikes, riot, and bloodshed" sweeping through the industrial cities of America. "The gate," exclusionists in Congress declared, "must be closed." Thus, one of the most critical concerns which led to the Chinese Exclusion Act was the fearful prospect that American society would be destroyed between the millstones of a hungry and violent white working class and a yellow proletariat under the control of an American industrial elite.¹⁰

During the congressional discussion on the exclusion bill, the editor of *The Nation* remarked that the prohibition of Chinese immigration would appeal to white workers, particularly the "hard-working" "Bill Nyes" of the Pacific Coast. Ironically the man who had created Bill Nye and who played a crucial role in the development of anti-Chinese attitudes in America regarded himself as a friend of the Chinese. This was Bret Harte, editor of the *Overland Monthly* and author of the poem "Plain Language from Truthful James," also known as "The Heathen Chinee." Published in Harte's magazine in 1870, the poem became very popular as newspaper

after newspaper across the country reprinted it and imprinted the phrase *Heathen Chinee* in the mind of white America.¹¹

The poem gave Harte instant and gratifying attention. Noticing Harte's sudden rise to fame, Mark Twain observed that the poem had brought "reverberations of delight which reached the last confines of Christendom," and that Harte's name "from being obscure to invisible" in one week had become "as notorious and as visible in the next as if it had been painted on the sky in letters of astronomical magnitude." On January 7, 1871, the editors of the *New York Globe* announced that they had been obliged to publish the poem twice to answer the demands of the public, and claimed that every newspaper in the country had printed the poem. "Certainly nothing has been printed of late, if ever, which has run through the newspapers of this country as this has," the editor of the *Springfield Republican* declared in his review of the poem. "Part of this effect is owing to the temporary excitement of the public about the Chinese question,—but the combination of delicate humor, and force of expression, both plain and grotesque, seen in these verses would have made them famous at any time."¹²

The timing of the poem's publication was the most important factor contributing to its immense and sudden popularity. The transcontinental railroad had been completed in 1869, and thousands of Chinese, released from employment in railroad construction, were moving into the cities and becoming more visible than ever before. White workers in California increasingly saw the Chinese as competitors in the job market, working for low wages and depressing the standard of living. Furthermore, fear of the Chinese was no longer confined to the West. Until 1870, the Chinese had been mainly a "California problem"; three months before the appearance of Harte's poem, however, the first Chinese workers had arrived in North Adams, Massachusetts, setting off hysterical reactions in the East. Thus the "Chinese problem" had become national.¹³

Harte's poem on the "heathen Chinee" helped to crystallize and focus anti-Chinese anxieties and paranoia. White workers used the poem for their slogans and politicians quoted from it as they argued for the exclusion of the Chinese, while cartoonists illustrated and playwrights dramatized the poem. Intended to be humorous, Harte's rhymes evoked from white America a nervous chuckle.

The poem describes a card game between Ah Sin and William Nye. Determined to beat his opponent, Nye has cards stuffed up his sleeves; yet, even with his extra cards, he loses time and again. Ah Sin has a "childlike" smile, but the reader learns

That for ways that are dark
 And for tricks that are vain
 The heathen Chinese is peculiar

Suddenly, Nye catches Ah Sin cheating, and shouts: "We are ruined by Chinese cheap labour." As Nye attacks the "heathen Chinese," he discovers that Ah Sin, too, has cards stuffed up his sleeves.¹⁴

Clearly, the poem is ambiguous: While it negatively stereotypes the Chinese, it also portrays Nye as a cheat and a man of violence. Yet, what most impressed Harte's readers, feeling amused and anxious at once, was the "heathen Chinese's" "peculiar" ways, his deceptiveness and slyness, his "sin"-fulness, and his threat to white labor. Harte himself quickly realized what was happening: He saw that the poem was appealing to the racism of American society and to the class resentment of white workers worried about "Chinese cheap labour." The success of the poem plunged him into painful ambivalence. He enjoyed the fame and wealth the poem's popularity gave him; yet he also hated himself for writing a poem which helped to galvanize hostility against the Chinese. Unable to contain his feelings of guilt, he once privately remarked: "Perhaps you can have little respect for a poet who wrote such trash as the *Heathen Chinese*." Harte reportedly also called it "the worst poem I ever wrote, possibly the worst poem anyone ever wrote."¹⁵

Yet, as a young writer on the make, Harte was extremely anxious about success, hungering for literary recognition and worrying constantly about financial problems. After the publication of the poem, Harte's magazine, the *Overland Monthly*, increased its circulation substantially. The poem also boosted Harte's success as a writer of sentimental local-color short stories such as "The Outcasts of Poker Flat." A year after the poem had rippled eastward across the country, Harte made a pilgrimage to Boston, the heartland of culture, where he met and had dinner with the important literary men of the age—Richard Henry Dana and William Dean Howells. The *Atlantic Monthly* offered him a generous contract, and he lectured to large audiences filled with distinguished people. Harte had, it seemed, made it.¹⁶

But then Harte had to worry about whether he would be able to maintain his reputation. The attention as well as the fortune he received disappeared almost as suddenly as they had appeared, and for the rest of his life Harte struggled desperately to recapture his success. Leaving his wife and children in America, he went to Europe to take a government position in order to give himself more time to write, producing a prodigious amount of mediocre literature. In letters to his wife, Harte left behind a sad record of

his obsession to rework the tailing of his literary materials and strike again the vein of success. "I grind out the old tunes on the old organ," he wrote to her on September 13, 1879, "and gather up the coppers, but I never know whether my audience behind the window blinds are wishing me to 'move on' or not." But he kept writing, forcing himself to the "grim routine" of his work, only to be told, as he reported to her on August 17, 1885, that the United States minister to Germany had remarked that Harte was completely "played out" in America. Two years later he admitted to her that he had placed his work "above *everything else*" and had gone into exile in order to give his publishers the impression he was "independent" and "a distinguished foreigner" and to keep up the "prices" of his writings in America. "These are the selfish considerations that are keeping me here, in spite of estranging years, apart from each other, and adding an unnatural loneliness to our lives."¹⁷ Unable to regain the literary laurels which had slipped away, Harte never did return to America.

After the publication of "The Heathen Chinese," he continued to write about the Chinese in America. While he felt sorry for them and may have felt a special sympathy for them because of his partly Jewish heritage, he also created in his writings negative images which helped to perpetuate the injustice and violence committed against them. Thus, like his popular poem, his short stories, such as "Wan Lee, the Pagan" and "See Yup," protested against yet reinforced anti-Chinese racism in America.

In "Wan Lee, the Pagan," the narrator visits merchant Hop Sing who is described as a "grave, decorous, handsome gentleman" with a pigtail and a complexion "like a very nice piece of glazed brown paper-muslin." He has an "urbane, although quite serious" manner, and speaks French and English fluently. In the merchant's warehouse, which has a "deliciously commingled mysterious foreign odor," they have a snack, drinking tea and tasting sweetmeats from a "mysterious jar" that looks as if it might contain "a preserved mouse."

The principal character in the story is Wan Lee, a twelve-year-old youth who lives with Hop Sing in San Francisco. Harte finds Wan Lee very likable: He is also quite impish, good at "imitation," and "superstitious," carrying around his neck "a hideous little porcelain god." Wan Lee "knows but little of Confucius, and absolutely nothing of Mencius," reports Hop Sing. "Owing to the negligence of his father, he associated, perhaps too much with American children." Thus Wan Lee seems to be partly acculturated, and as the story develops, his acculturation becomes crucial to the plot: He meets and falls in love with a white girl.

Wan Lee and the girl have much affection for each other. "Bright," "cheery," and "innocent," she "touches" and reaches "a depth in the boy's

nature that hitherto had been unsuspected." As she goes to school, he walks behind her, carrying her books—an act of affection which provokes attacks from "Caucasian Christian" boys. He also makes beautiful presents for her, and she reciprocates. She reads and sings to him. Representing the mainstay of beauty and culture, she is delicate and feminine, epitomizing the qualities of true womanhood. She teaches him "a thousand little prettinesses and refinements only known to girls"; gives him a "yellow" ribbon for his pigtail, as best suiting his "complexion"; shows him wherein he is "original and valuable"; takes him to Sunday school with her, against the "precedents" of the school. "Small-womanlike," she triumphs. "So they got along very well together—this little Christian girl, with her shining cross hanging around her plump, white, little neck, and this dark little Pagan, with his hideous porcelain god hidden away in his blouse." But a tragedy awaits them. At the end of the story, Wan Lee is killed during two days of anti-Chinese mob violence in San Francisco—"two days when a mob of her citizens set upon and killed unarmed, defenseless foreigners, because they were foreigners and of another race, religion, and color, and worked for what wages they could get." Enraged at the atrocities of the mob, Harte fires a blast at the "Christian" murderers of Wan Lee.

As it is in his poem on "The Heathen Chinese," the message of "Wan Lee, the Pagan," is ambiguous. The Chinese, in the character of Wan Lee, are depicted as the unfortunate victims of white working-class hatred and cruel and barbaric racism; yet they are also portrayed as a threat to white workers and to racial purity in America. Like Ah Sin, the Chinese who are attacked in San Francisco are described as "cheap labor," working "for what wages they could get." An economic threat, they also endanger racial homogeneity: Wan Lee has a relationship with a white girl, his "dark" and "yellow" skin contrasting with her "white" complexion. Thus Harte's protest against the violence perpetrated by white workers is at odds with the racial images in the story—the images of the Chinese as mice-eaters, "pagan," "dark," "impish," "superstitious," "yellow," and subversive to white labor and to white racial purity—which formed important bases for the victimization of the Wan Lees of America.¹⁸

Like "Wan Lee, the Pagan," the story of See Yup was intended to condemn the abuse and violence whites inflicted upon the Chinese in California. Yet, again the negative stereotypes were presented: See Yup, a laundryman in a small mining town, is a "heathen," "superstitious," and has a "peculiar odor"—half ginger, half opium—called the "Chinese smell."

In this story, See Yup is the target of racist attacks from the town's white miners. "Subject to the persecutions of the more ignorant and brutal," he is

"always" a "source of amusement" to whites. White boys tie his pigtails to a window, and white miners take their dirty clothes to his laundry and then pick up their cleaned clothes without paying him. One of these miners arrogantly exclaims that his "finer religious feelings" revolt against paying money to a "heathen." The victim of racial scorn and exploitation, See Yup knows he can find no justice or recourse in the courts.

Narrator Harte notices that the miners, who degrade See Yup, are suffering from indigestion. This surprises him. Why should healthy young men, living outdoors, have heartburn? And he comments:

Whether it was the result of the nervous, excitable temperament which had brought them together in this feverish hunt for gold; whether it was the quality of the tinned meats or half-cooked provisions they hastily bolted, begrudging the time it took to prepare and consume them; whether they too often supplanted their meals by tobacco or whiskey, the singular physiological truth remained that these young, finely selected adventurers . . . actually suffered more from indigestion than the pampered dwellers of the cities.

Thus, in the gold fields of California, the qualities of nervousness and acquisitiveness which Tocqueville thought were pervasive in American society during the Jacksonian era seem to have been extracted from the East and concentrated in the West. The white miners are so anxious to strike it rich they hastily wolf down "tinned" and "half-cooked" food. They also live in a virtually all-male society, far away from the genteel society of women and family in the East. The dichotomization between men (the world of business) and women (the world of the home) seems to have become regionalized, located respectively in the West and the East. And in the male society of the mining camp, white men turn to the Chinese—to See Yup—to do their laundry.

This relationship provides Harte with the framework for his plot. See Yup, the victim of exploitation and assaults, enters the Wells Fargo office one Saturday, and sends to San Francisco a bag of gold dust valued at \$500 which he appears to have gathered while working the tailings of an abandoned mine. He sends gold to San Francisco three Saturdays in a row; the clerk at the Wells Fargo office notices See Yup's good fortune and quickly spreads the news that See Yup has made a strike. The white miners organize themselves into a committee and visit See Yup's mine. In two short hours, they witness See Yup and his fellow Chinese miners take out \$20 worth of gold from the sand and gravel. The work is being performed in the "stupidest, clumsiest, yet *patient* Chinese way." And the white miners exclaim: "What might not white men do with better appointed machinery!" The miners form a syndicate and force See Yup to sell his mine,

offering him a meager \$20,000. Aware he has no choice, he yields to the miners' demand and leaves town. The miners take over operations, bringing in "new machinery" to assist them. Some gold is taken in the first week, but nothing is found the next week. Suspicious, the miners soon learn what had happened. See Yup had secretly borrowed \$500 worth of gold dust from a friend, openly sent the gold to San Francisco, and had Chinese runners return it to him. After he had been compelled to sell his mine at a "loss," he had salted the mine with some gold dust and left town, taking with him the money his oppressors had forced him to accept.

Harte's point is clear: The white miners deserve what they got. Significantly, See Yup used deception, intelligence, and Chinese runners to triumph over the miners and their technology—their "new machinery" and their telegraph. The references to technology help to delineate the difference between Chinese and whites. During one of their conversations, Harte asks See Yup: "Don't you think the electric telegraph wonderful?" And the laundryman replies: "Velly good for Mellican man; plenty makee him jump." Harte could not tell whether See Yup had confounded the telegraph with electrogalvanism, or was only satirizing "our American haste and feverishness." The Chinese have something mysterious which makes up for their lack of technology. "We knew that the Chinese themselves possessed some means of secretly and quickly communicating with one another," Harte remarks. "Any news of good or ill import to their race was quickly disseminated through the settlement before we knew anything about it. An innocent basket of clothes from the wash, sent up from the river-bend, became in some way a library of information; a single slip of rice-paper, aimlessly fluttering in the dust of the road, had the mysterious effect of diverging a whole gang of coolie tramps away from our settlement."¹⁹ Thus, See Yup represents Merlin-like an ominous threat to nervous American men: He is able to render impotent white superiority in technology.

In his poem and stories about the "heathen Chinese," Harte was criticizing American society—its pressure on everyone to strive for material success, its arrogant pride in technological progress, and its racism, particularly the anti-Chinese antagonism and violence of the white working class. Yet his life and his writing, reflecting some of the achievement-oriented anxieties and the very racist values he satirized and condemned, contained within them an irony Harte himself could not have missed. Moreover, in these writings, Harte was portraying the Chinese not only as merchants and laundrymen but also as laborers. Unlike Hop Sing and See Yup, Ah Sin represented "Chinese cheap labour" and participated in the advancement of American technology as a worker. Like Bill Nye and other

white workers, he was a part of the working class which American capitalists inducted into their service and exploited; involved in the construction of the transcontinental railroad and the industrial development of the West, Ah Sin was the persona of a yellow proletariat.

A Yellow Proletariat: Caste and Class in Industrial America

Many years before the widespread presence of the Chinese in the West and before Harte's poem on "The Heathen Chinese," Aaron H. Palmer, a "Counsellor of the Supreme Court of the United States," had formulated a plan for the future use of Chinese labor in America. Shortly after the end of the war against Mexico, which enabled the United States to acquire California, Palmer submitted to Congress a recommendation for the expansion of American markets into Asia and the importation of Chinese workers to develop American industries. Calling attention to the "increasing importance" of American trade with China, he urged Congress to strengthen steam communication in the Pacific and transform San Francisco into the entrepôt of the West Coast. "The commodious port of *San Francisco*," he declared, "is destined to become the great emporium of our commerce on the Pacific; and so soon as it is connected by a railroad with the Atlantic States, will become the most eligible point of departure for steamers to . . . China." To build the transcontinental railroad as well as to bring the "fertile lands of California" under cultivation, Palmer advocated the immigration of Chinese laborers. "No people in all the East are so well adapted for clearing wild lands and raising every species of agricultural product . . . as the Chinese."²⁰ Here, in this remarkable report, Palmer had presented a blueprint which explicitly integrated American expansion into Asia and the importation of Chinese laborers.

Twenty-one years later, a writer for the *Overland Monthly* remarked: "If Chinese labor could be used to develop the industries of California," it would be "the height of folly to forbid its entrance to the Golden Gate." The industrial potential of California was enormous: It had every variety of climate and soil for the production of raw material, a nearly completed railroad, an abundance of fuel and water power, markets in Asia and the Pacific, and an "unlimited" supply of "cheap" labor from China.²¹ Actually, what this supporter of Chinese immigration was urging was already well under way. The Chinese were already present everywhere in the industrial development of the West.

Nowhere could the importance of Chinese labor be more clearly seen than in the construction of the transcontinental railroad. Due to the short

supply of white workers, the Central Pacific Railroad depended almost entirely on Chinese labor. Approximately ninety percent of its 10,000 workers were Chinese. The use of Chinese labor enabled the Central Pacific to accelerate construction. Time was critical to the company's interests, for the amount of money it received in land and subsidy was based on the miles of track it built. The savings derived from the employment of Chinese rather than white workers for the years 1866-69 totaled approximately \$5.5 million. The company paid the Chinese workers \$31 a month; had it used white workers it would have had to pay them the same wages plus board and lodging, which would have increased labor costs by one-third.²²

The construction of the railroad, especially through the Sierras, was a Chinese achievement. Not only did they endure the sheer drudgery required to clear woods and lay tracks; they also performed important technical work which involved the use of power drills and explosives to bore tunnels through the Donner Summit. The Chinese workers were, in one observer's description, "a great army laying siege to Nature in her strongest citadel. The rugged mountains looked like stupendous ant-hills. They swarmed with Celestials, shoveling, wheeling, carting, drilling and blasting rocks and earth. . . ." Since time was money for the Central Pacific, the company forced its laborers to work through the winter of 1866. The snow drifts covered men and mountains; the Chinese lived and worked under the snow, with shafts to give them air and lanterns to light the way. Snow slides occasionally buried camps and crews, and frozen corpses, still upright, with tools in their hands, were found in the spring. "The snow slides carried away our camps and we lost a good many men in those slides," a company official reported; "many of them we did not find until the next season when the snow melted."²³

The Chinese workers went on strike in the spring. Demanding higher wages and an eight-hour day, three to five thousand laborers refused to work; on June 24, 1867, after a strike demand printed in Chinese had been circulated, the Chinese workers walked out "as one man." The company offered to raise their wages from \$31 to \$35 a month, but the strikers spurned the offer and insisted on \$45 a month and a two-hour reduction in the work day. The *San Francisco Alta* condemned the strike as a conspiracy: "The foundation of this strike appears to have been a circular, printed in the Chinese language, sent among them by designing persons for the purpose of destroying their efficiency as laborers." The insinuation was transparent: The strikers' demands had been merely drummed up, and agents of the Union Pacific were behind the Chinese protest. Meanwhile, the Central Pacific management wired New York to inquire about the

feasibility of transporting 10,000 blacks to replace the striking Chinese workers. Central Pacific Superintendent Charles Crocker isolated the strikers and cut off their food supply. "I stopped the provisions on them," he reported, "stopped the butchers from butchering, and used such coercive measures." The strike was broken within a week. Called "Crocker's pets," the laborers were praised only as long as they were, in the words of company president Leland Stanford, "quiet, peaceable, industrious, economical—ready and apt to learn all the different kinds of work required in railroad building."²⁴

Beaten, the laborers returned to work and completed the railroad, the "new highway to the commerce of Asia." The crucial role of the Chinese workers was widely admitted. In an essay on "Manifest Destiny in the West," a writer for the *Overland Monthly* exclaimed: "The dream of Thomas Jefferson, and the desires of Thomas H. Benton's heart, have been wonderfully fulfilled, so far as the Pacific Railroad and the trade with the old world of the East is concerned. But even they did not prophesy that Chinamen should build the Pacificward end of the road." After the famous meeting of the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific at Promontory Point in 1869, a writer for *Scribner's Magazine* observed: "The Central Pacific would be today a thing of the future had it not been for the labors of the Chinese." And Stanford himself testified: "Without them it would be impossible to complete the western portion of this great national highway within the time required by the acts of Congress."²⁵ But, in their assessments, Stanford and others failed to mention the cost in terms of Chinese agony and lives required to realize Aaron Palmer's recommendation.

The ceremony at Promontory Point had symbolic significance for white America. Fifteen hundred people, including prominent individuals from across the country, gathered at the historic meeting place. As he watched the celebration, a witness caught the racial and class meaning of the great event:

One fact . . . forcibly impressed me at the laying of the last nail. Two lengths of rails, fifty-six feet, had been omitted. The Union Pacific people brought up their pair of rails, and the work of placing them was done by Europeans. The Central Pacific people then laid their pair of rails, the labor being performed by Mongolians. The foremen, in both cases, were Americans. Here, near the center of the American Continent, were the united efforts of representatives of the continents of Europe, Asia, and America—America directing and controlling.²⁶

The event was the message: The American foremen, in command, transmitted to the watching audience and the nation the superiority of America over Europe and Asia. Moreover, the drama of the great connection por-

trayed symbolically the class and caste social relations in America. Seated in the stands, the class representatives of property watched the representatives of the working class, white and yellow, drive the last nails into the line.

As a labor force, the Chinese were not used exclusively in railroad construction: In fact, they were ubiquitous in the industries of California. By 1870, twenty-six percent of California's Chinese population lived in San Francisco, which was already, by Internal Revenue returns, the ninth leading manufacturing city in the United States. Chinese workers represented forty-six percent of the labor force in the city's four key industries—boot and shoe, woolens, cigar and tobacco, and sewing. The *San Francisco Morning Call* in 1872 reported that nearly half the workingmen employed in the city's factories were Chinese. Four years later, 14,000 Chinese were working in San Francisco industries. In terms of the entire state in 1880, Chinese workers constituted 52 percent of all boot and shoe makers, 44 percent of all brick makers, 84.4 percent of all cigar makers, and 32.7 percent of all woolen mill operators. The significant role of their labor in the industrial development of California was widely recognized. A. W. Loomis, in his article "How Our Chinamen Are Employed," noted the presence of thousands of Chinese factory operatives in woolen mills, knitting mills, paper mills, powder mills, tanneries, shoe factories, and garment industries. In his essay *Chinaman or White Man, Which?* the Reverend O. Gibson argued in 1873: "At the rates of labor which existed in the early days of California, or at the rates which would instantly prevail were the Chinese removed from our midst, not one of the few manufacturing interests which have lately sprung up on these shores, could be maintained a single day." And three years later, R. G. McClellan wrote in his book *The Golden State*: "In mining, farming, in factories and in the labor generally of California the employment of the Chinese has been found most desirable; and much of the labor done by these people if performed by white men at higher wages could not be continued nor made possible."²⁷

The question of Chinese labor was not confined to California and the West. In 1870 the discussion suddenly focused on a small New England town: After a long ride on the recently completed transcontinental railroad, seventy-five Chinese workers arrived in North Adams, Massachusetts, to man one of its shoe factories.²⁸ A relatively unknown little town hidden in the mountains of western Massachusetts, North Adams immediately became the subject of national attention.

North Adams could have been one of Hank Morgan's creations. Between 1840 and 1870, the community had been transformed from an iso-

lated rural village into an industrialized town. According to *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, it was "one of the busiest little towns, humming and smoking with various industry, and nestled in the most picturesque and mountainous part of the valley of the Housatonic. . . ." The "take-off" for this town occurred after the railroad connected North Adams with Pittsfield in 1846 and opened new market possibilities. The impact of the market was dramatic. Within thirty years, dwellings had increased from 100 to more than 400, and the number of cotton looms had multiplied ten times, from 22 to more than 200. In 1868, the town's 4,000 workers produced \$7 million worth of goods. Between 1860 and 1870, the population nearly doubled as it jumped from 6,924 to 12,090; almost one-third of the population were immigrants, particularly Irish. North Adams, in short, had become a concentration of manufacturing, the locus of thirty-eight factories—cotton mills, woolen mills, carriage manufactories, paper mills, and shoe factories.²⁹

The owner of one of these busy factories, Calvin T. Sampson, personified the new manufacturing era of North Adams. A descendant of the original settlers of Plymouth Colony, he had begun "life as a farmer at eighteen, with only his father's debts as a legacy. These he assumed, though not legally or morally bound to do so, paying all off to the last penny, and finally establishing himself as a manufacturer of shoes." Washington Gladden, a Congregational minister in North Adams, described businessmen like Sampson as paragons of republican and Yankee virtues: "There is wealth here,—but all of it has been earned; none of it was inherited. All the leading business men began life with no stock in trade but brains and courage. Out of this capital they have created fortunes for themselves, and have built up a flourishing town." Known as "A Model Shoe Factory," Sampson's company produced more than 300,000 pairs annually; and the local press praised it as a successful business, "built up from small beginnings, by persistent energy, industry, economy, and judgment." Actually, Sampson's success depended more on the use of machinery and the exploitation of labor. Three years after he had established his factory in 1858, Sampson introduced the first of Well's pegging machines into shoe manufacturing. The use of heeling machines in his factory, a newspaper reported, increased both efficiency and profits: "Each machine performs the labor of six men, and effects a saving of two cents on every pair of shoes made." The machine also reduced workers to low-paid, unskilled laborers; it transformed craftsmen into tenderers of the machine. Sampson's workers opposed the new machinery and went on strike; Sampson defied the strike and broke it. The mechanization of the boot and shoe industry in Massa-

chusetts enabled factory owners to reduce their labor force and increase their production: Thus, in 1875, they employed one-third fewer workers than in 1855 and produced 15 million more pairs of shoes.³⁰

To protect themselves against labor-eliminating machines and low wages, in 1867 workers founded the Secret Order of the Knights of St. Crispin. Within three years, the Crispins became the largest labor organization in the United States; 50,000 strong in membership, the union was especially active in the shoemaking industries of Massachusetts. In 1870 the Crispins at Sampson's shoe factory struck. They demanded higher wages, end of the ten-hour day, access to the company's books in order to fix wages in accordance with profits, and the discharge of workers delinquent in their dues to the Crispin organization. Sampson fired the striking workers. Unsuccessful in his effort to hire scabs from a nearby town, he decided to declare total war against the Crispins and drive a "wedge" into the conflict.³¹

The "wedge" was a contingent of Chinese workers from San Francisco. A year before the Crispin strike against Sampson's factory, the official organ of shoe manufacturers, *Hide and Leather Interest*, had condemned the Crispins and urged employers to import Chinese workers as strike-breakers. Meanwhile, Sampson had read a newspaper article on the effective use of Chinese labor in a San Francisco shoe factory, and sent his superintendent there to sign a contract with a Chinese contract-labor company. Sampson's superintendent completed his mission successfully. According to the terms of the agreement, Sampson would pay the company a commission for the Chinese workers and transport them to Massachusetts; he would pay each worker \$23 a month for the first year and \$26 a month for the next two years plus room and fuel. The workers would labor for three years and pay for their own clothing and food.³²

The arrival of the seventy-five Chinese workers in North Adams on June 13 was a moment of great interest in the East. "A large and hostile crowd met them at the depot," *The Nation* reported, "hooted them, hustled them somewhat, and threw stones at them. . . ." Thirty plainclothes policemen marched them to their dormitories at Sampson's factory, where they were placed behind locked and guarded gates. A few days later, the *Boston Commonwealth* exclaimed: "They are with us! the 'Celestials'—with almond eyes, pigtailed, rare industry, quick adaptation, high morality, and all—seventy-five of them—hard at work in the town of North Adams." The *Springfield Republican* predicted the "van of the invading army of Celestials" would free Sampson from "the cramping tyranny of that worst of American trades-unions, the 'Knights of St. Crispin.'" ³³ The Chinese, employed everywhere in the industries of California, had been brought to

the East. Everyone—white workers as well as employers—watched as Sampson opened his factory again and began production.

They did not have to wait long for results. Within three months, the Chinese workers were producing more shoes than the same number of white workers would have made. The success of Sampson's experiment was reported in the press. "The Chinese, and this especially annoys the Crispins," the editor of *The Nation* announced even before the end of the three-month period, "show the usual quickness of their race in learning the process of their new business, and already do creditable hand and machine work. . . ." The editor of *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* visited Sampson's factory and described the new workers in the December issue: "They are generally small. . . . [A]bout sixty of the Chinese workmen [are] in the room, and there can be nowhere . . . a busier, more orderly group of workmen." Writing for *Scribner's Monthly*, William Shanks agreed. The Chinese "labored regularly and constantly, losing no blue Mondays on account of Sunday's dissipations; nor wasting hours in idle holidays," he reported. "The quality of the work was found to be fully equal to that of the Crispins." Through the use of Chinese labor, Sampson had widened the margin of his profits: The saving in the cost of production for a week's work was \$840, which added up to \$40,000 a year. These figures inspired Shanks to calculate: "There are 115 establishments in the State, employing 5,415 men . . . capable of producing 7,942 cases of shoes per week. Under the Chinese system of Mr. Sampson, a saving of \$69,594 per week, or say \$3,500,000 a year, would be effected, thus revolutionizing the trade."³⁴

Sampson's success also impressed capitalists in the East. Three months after the Chinese had arrived, James B. Hervey brought sixty-eight Chinese to Belleville, New Jersey, to work in his Passaic Steam Laundry. Like Sampson, with whom he had consulted, Hervey had secured them through a labor contractor in San Francisco. Used to counter strikes by Irish workers and to meet the need for labor, 300 Chinese workers were eventually employed in Hervey's laundry. Meanwhile, the Beaver Falls Cutlery Company in Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, had transported Chinese laborers east to work in its factory and help eliminate disruptions due to strikes by whites. Within a year, the cutlery company increased the number of its Chinese workers from 70 to 190.³⁵ The message of North Adams, Belleville, and Beaver Falls was clear: The Chinese constituted an enormous potential and useful source of labor in the development of American capitalism in the East.

The promise of Chinese labor had been proven in the West and its potential had been demonstrated in the East. But the use of Chinese labor and its success raised two crucial questions for white America. "What we

shall do with them is not quite clear yet," remarked Samuel Bowles in 1869, in his book *Our New West*. "How they are to rank, socially, civilly, and politically, among us is one of the nuts for our social science students to crack,—if they can. . . ."³⁶ And what would be the future of white workers in this country as its industrial development depended more and more on Chinese labor?

One answer to both questions was a proposal for the development of a yellow proletariat in America. According to this view, the Chinese would constitute a permanently degraded caste labor force: They would be in effect a unique "industrial reserve army" of migrant laborers forced to be foreigners forever, aliens ineligible for citizenship. Neither "white" (a requirement of the 1790 Naturalization Law) nor "African" by nativity or descent (the naturalization right extended to blacks in 1870), the Chinese were ineligible for naturalized citizenship. They were what Benjamin Franklin had described as "Tawney"; they were not "lovely White." Unlike white ethnic immigrants such as Italians, Poles, and Irish, the Chinese would be a politically proscribed labor force. Thus they would be a part of America's production process but not her body politic. Serving the needs of American capitalism, they would be here only on a temporary basis. "I do not believe they are going to remain here long enough to become good citizens," Central Pacific employer Charles Crocker told a legislative committee, "and I would not admit them to citizenship." Businessmen like Crocker recognized that advances in technology had created new sources of labor for American capitalism: Steam transportation had brought Asia to America's "door" and given American industries access to the "surplus" labor of "unnumbered millions" in Asia. American capitalists would "avail" themselves of this "unlimited" supply of "cheap" Chinese labor to build their railroads and operate their factories; then, after they had completed their service, the Chinese migrant workers would return individually to the "homes" and the "land they loved," while others would come to replace them. The employers of Chinese labor did not want these workers to remain in the country and to become "thick" (to use Crocker's term) in American society.³⁷

As an "industrial reserve army" composed of migrant and caste labor, the Chinese would be used to service the industrial needs of American capitalism without threatening the racial homogeneity of America's citizenry. They would be drawn into a labor-supply process which would move labor between China and the United States in a circular pattern. Repressive laws, economic exploitation, harsh working conditions, and racial hatred and violence would assist this process and compel the Chinese to leave the country after a limited period of employment. In this "labor-

repressive system," whether the laborers themselves wished to return to China would matter little. Chinese laborers recognized this reality. Ginn Wall, for example, came to America in the 1870s to work on the railroad and brought his wife here. Many years later he told his son repeatedly: "Let's just fold up here. You come with me and we'll go back home. This is a white man's country. You go back to China when you make your money, that is where you belong. If you stay here, the white man will kill you." Other Chinese laborers, regardless of whether they viewed themselves as sojourners or settlers, must have shared Wall's apprehension and terror. The record of Chinese departing from the San Francisco Custom House indicated large numbers were returning to China. As the chart on Chinese arrivals and departures shows (Table 6), the number returning even exceeded the number arriving during the years 1864, 1866, and 1867, and remained constantly high proportionately for the fifteen-year period selected. The number of arrivals suddenly skyrocketed in 1868, 1869, and 1870 primarily in response to the railroad's needs for Chinese labor. This migrant-labor pattern was also reflected in the virtually all-male Chinese population in America. In 1870, for example, there were only 4,574 Chinese women out of a population of 63,199.³⁸ As a yellow proletariat, Chinese migrant workers would not have families in America, and America would not have a Chinese population granted citizenship by birth.

Table 6. Chinese Arrivals and Departures, 1860-1875: San Francisco Custom House*

| YEAR | CHINESE ARRIVALS | CHINESE DEPARTURES |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
| 1860 | 7,343 | 2,088 |
| 1861 | 8,434 | 3,594 |
| 1862 | 8,188 | 2,795 |
| 1863 | 6,435 | 2,947 |
| 1864 | 2,696 | 3,911 |
| 1865 | 3,097 | 2,298 |
| 1866 | 2,242 | 3,113 |
| 1867 | 4,794 | 4,999 |
| 1868 | 11,085 | 4,209 |
| 1869 | 14,994 | 4,896 |
| 1870 | 10,869 | 4,232 |
| 1871 | 5,542 | 3,264 |
| 1872 | 9,773 | 4,887 |
| 1873 | 17,075 | 6,805 |
| 1874 | 16,085 | 7,710 |
| 1875 | 18,021 | 6,305 |

*Based on information from Mary Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration* (New York, 1969, originally published in 1909), p. 498.

Here, then, from the perspective of American capitalism, was a peculiarly ideal labor force.

As advocates of Chinese labor, capitalists like Sampson and Crocker and their supporters in the press offered a new caste/class ideology. They pointed out the benefits Chinese labor would have for white workers. They said Chinese "cheap" labor would reduce production costs, and the resulting reduction of prices for goods would be equivalent to an increase of wages for white workers. They also argued that Chinese labor would upgrade white workers, for whites would be elevated into foremen and directors. Whites would be the mind and the Chinese the body; the "inventive genius of Americans" would utilize "Asiatic skill and muscle." "If society must have 'mudsills,' it is certainly better to take them from a race which would be benefited by even that position in a civilized community, than subject a portion of our own race to a position which they have outgrown."³⁹ Thus the Chinese would work the machines, and whites would be the directors of both "Asiatic muscle" and American machinery.

The possibility for advancement which Chinese labor offered white workers would involve far more than mere promotion into foremanship. If they were diligent and thrifty, white workers were told, they could even become capitalists themselves—owners of factories and employers of Chinese labor. They were urged to find "employment for twenty Mongolians to labor, under their supervision, in ditches where they labored themselves before," and to "become employers instead of continuing common laborers." In his testimony before a special legislative committee on Chinese immigration, Charles Crocker explained how this elevation of white workers and the expansion of a white bourgeoisie could occur.

I believe that the effect of Chinese labor upon white labor has an elevating instead of degrading tendency. I think that every white man who is intelligent and able to work, who is more than a digger in a ditch . . . who has the capacity of being something else, can get to be something else by the presence of Chinese labor easier than he could without it. . . . There is proof of that in the fact that after we got Chinamen to work, we took the more intelligent of the white laborers and made foremen of them. I know of several of them now who never expected, never had a dream that they were going to be anything but shovelers of dirt, hewers of wood and drawers of water, and they are now respectable farmers, owning farms. They got a start by controlling Chinese labor on our railroad.

Meanwhile, in the East, E. L. Godkin of *The Nation* urged white workers to raise themselves into the capitalist class. In an editorial on the employment of Chinese workers in North Adams, Godkin predicted that the im-

portation of Chinese labor would become a favorite mode of resisting strikes all over the country. "Between India and China it is safe to say that capital now has within its reach . . . the labor of three or four hundred millions of very cunning hands, ready to work for small wages, and for as many hours as they can support." Thus it would be "ludicrous" for white workers to struggle against capital. What then should they do? The editor advised the striking Crispins to set up their own cooperative factories and become "capitalists" themselves.⁴⁰

Thus, through Chinese labor, republican virtues of industry and thrift could be promoted and the work ethic could enable men to be "something else." Even the wives of such men could become "something else," for they could depend upon Chinese house servants to lighten their domestic duties. In "A Plea for Chinese Labor," published in *Scribner's Monthly*, Abby Richardson offered the housewives of America the promise of Chinese help in the home. "This is the age when much is expected of woman. She must be the ornament of society as well as the mistress of a well-ordered household." The introduction of Chinese domestics could free her from cooking dinners and nursing children, and give her time for literature, art, and music. Indeed, Richardson predicted, Chinese labor could become a feature of both the factory and the home. In this way tensions of class conflict in white society could be resolved, as Chinese migrant laborers became the "mudsills" of society and as Crispins became "capitalists" and their wives "ornaments of society."⁴¹

As a yellow proletariat, it was argued, the Chinese would not only provide opportunities for whites to enter the ranks of the bourgeoisie; they would also be used to suppress white workers and their unions. Chinese workers were viewed as "well-behaved" and "obedient"; they belonged to "no striking organizations." As an industrial reserve army, transported to and from America, they could be used to weigh down the "active labour-army" during periods of average prosperity, and hold the "pretensions" of white labor in check during periods of over-production and "paroxysm." Their value to capital in the war against the labor movement in America was widely recognized. In the West, a traveler noted the importance of Chinese workers as strikebreakers: "In the factories of San Francisco they had none but Irish, paying them three dollars a day in gold. They struck, and demanded four dollars. Immediately their places, numbering three hundred, were supplied by Chinamen at one dollar a day. . . ." In the East, Sampson's daring action had sobering effects on workers in the other shoe factories of North Adams. Ten days after the arrival of Sampson's "Mongolian battery," Parker Brothers, Cady Brothers, Millard and Whitman, and E. R. and N. L. Millard forced laborers to return to work with a wage

reduction of ten percent. Commenting frankly on the significance of the experiment at North Adams, a contributor to *Scribner's Monthly* wrote: "If for no other purpose than the breaking up of the incipient steps towards labor combinations and 'Trade Unions' . . . the advent of Chinese labor should be hailed with warm welcome. . . ." The "heathen Chinese," he concluded, could be the "final solution" to the labor problem in America.⁴²

A Vision of Catastrophe: Henry George and the American Tower of Babel

In their struggle against Sampson in North Adams, the striking Crispins tried to promote working-class solidarity by organizing a Chinese lodge of St. Crispin. Although little is known about this interesting Crispin response to the Chinese strikebreakers, it was probably conditioned by pragmatic concerns: The transformation of Sampson's "Mongolian battery" into Chinese Crispins would have given the union power to destroy Sampson's "wedge." Watching the Crispin drive to recruit the Chinese workers, the editor of *The Nation* remarked: "Chinese lodges and strikes will come in time when enough Chinamen are collected together in any given place; but the prospect appears not immediately flattering at North Adams." Based on practical self-interests rather than an ideological commitment to class solidarity, the Crispin attempt to unionize the Chinese quickly folded. At a meeting in Boston in July 1870 white workers turned against the Chinese workers, angrily condemning Sampson and his fellow capitalists for reducing "American labor" to "the Chinese standard of rice and rats." White labor was moving rapidly toward an exclusionist and racist response to the "Chinese Question." One of the leading theoreticians of this movement was Henry George.

Shortly after the arrival of the Chinese at North Adams, George spoke on the "Chinese Question" before 500 members of the Knights of St. Crispin in San Francisco. The use of Chinese labor, he insisted, must be viewed within the context of the great contradiction of the age: the enormous increase of wealth due to the technological advances in steam, electricity, and machinery, and the decrease in the workers' share of that wealth. This was the problem, and Chinese labor was aggravating it. "Chinese immigration really meant the reduction of wages, still greater inequality in the distribution of wealth, and . . . the substitution of Mongolians for Caucasians."⁴³ Nine years later, George presented a fully developed analysis of the problem in his book, aptly titled *Progress and Poverty*.

Remembered today as a reformer and as the author of one of the semi-

nal books of the nineteenth century, George was also one of the key architects of the anti-Chinese ideology and the author of many widely read essays which contributed directly to the exclusion of Chinese from America. His ideas on reform and race complemented rather than contradicted each other: Both were responses to what he anxiously viewed as America's movement toward a catastrophe—a terrible and bloody class conflict in American technological society.

Born in Philadelphia in 1839, Henry George grew up in a Jacksonian society, which emphasized enterprise, activity, and the accumulation of goods in order to confirm one's worth. As a child, he was told he would be successful and rewarded if he were honest and industrious. In the 1850s, like so many young and ambitious men of his time, he went to California to look for gold and make his fortune. His parents, however, thought their son should not try to become rich too quickly: Wealth was, or should be, the result of earnest and long effort. "This making haste to grow rich is attended with snares and temptations and a great weariness of the flesh," his mother warned after he had started for the Fraser River gold rush in 1858. Time and again his father sent him advice: "Fortunes are not to be made in a hurry; it takes time and application." "Be careful and nurse your means; lay up what you can and owe no man anything and you will be safe." Here was what his parents considered sound republican wisdom.⁴⁴

George's desire to strike it rich also evoked feelings of ambivalence and guilt, which were revealed in a letter to his sister Jennie:

I had a dream last night—such a pleasant, vivid dream, that I must tell you of it. I thought I was scooping treasure out of the earth by handfuls, almost delirious with the thoughts of what I would now be able to do, and how happy we would all be—and so clear and distinct that I involuntarily examined my pockets when I got up in the morning, but alas! with the usual result. Is it an indication of future luck? or do dreams always go by contraries, and instead of finding, am I to lose? . . . "Lust for Gold!" Is it any wonder that men lust for gold, and are willing to give almost anything for it, when it covers everything—the purest and holiest desires of their hearts. . . . Sometimes I feel sick of the fierce struggle of our high civilized life, and think I would like to get away from cities and business, with their jostlings and strainings and cares altogether, and find some place on one of the hillsides . . . where I could gather those I love, and live content with what Nature and our own resources would furnish; but, alas, money, money, is wanted even for that.⁴⁵

George woke up; discouraged, he went to work as a printer and also began to write as a newspaper reporter.

Yet, he still had hopes he would get ahead in life, and like Benjamin Rush before him, he decided to calculate his time and energy. To help him order his life and organize his activity, he began keeping a diary. "I have commenced this little book," he wrote in it on February 17, 1865, "as an experiment—to aid me [in] acquiring habits of regularity, punctuality and purpose." He would enter into the diary the experiences of the day as well as plans for the future. Admitting that he owed over \$200 and that he had been unsuccessful financially, he resolved to practice a "rigid economy" until he had some money saved. And he developed a list of rules, which required him:

- 1st. To make every cent I can.
- 2nd. To spend nothing unnecessarily.
- 3rd. To put something by each week, if it is only a five cent piece borrowed for the purpose.
- 4th. Not to run in debt if it can be avoided.⁴⁶

Thus, George consciously imposed self-controls in order to advance himself toward economic success.

Yet, his ascetic and "rigid economy" did not bring him any closer to success than did the dream of himself "scooping" treasure from the earth. Marriage and family, furthermore, were plunging him into greater debt and financial anxiety. In 1869, during this time of personal distress, George visited New York City, where he had what he called a "vision." In the city, he witnessed the disturbing contrast between poverty and wealth, and made a "vow" to seek out and remedy its cause. George posed the question: Why was there a deepening of poverty in the midst of advancing wealth? In his struggle to find an answer, he brought together a wide range of concerns: technology, corporate hegemony, the plight of white labor, and the presence of the Chinese in industrial America.⁴⁷

George's question was directly related to his analysis of the meaning of technology. As a young man trying to get ahead in California, he had a moving experience which forced him to reflect on the significance of the railroad to the working class. He had been sitting in the gallery of the American Theatre in San Francisco on New Year's Eve; suddenly the curtain fell and the people in the audience sprang to their feet. On the curtain they saw depicted "what was then a dream of the far future—the overland train coming into San Francisco." After everyone had become hoarse from shouting in celebration of the magnificent machine, George began to wonder whether the railroad would benefit men like himself, who had nothing but their labor. He had great hope for the development of

California, "proud of her future greatness, looking forward to the time when San Francisco would be one of the great capitals of the world, looking forward to the time when this great empire of the west would count her population by millions." Yet, beneath the excitement electrifying the audience, George recalled what a miner had said to him during a discussion on the presence of the Chinese in the gold fields of California. What harm were the Chinese doing here, George had asked, if they were only working the cheap diggings? And the old miner had replied: "No harm now, but wages will not always be as high as they are today in California. As the country grows, as people come in, wages will go down, and some day or other white men will be glad to get those diggings that the Chinamen are now working." George had come away from the discussion worried about the country's future. "As the country grew . . ." he feared, "the condition of those who had to work for their living must become, not better, but worse."⁴⁸ As George watched the curtain fall and as he cheered in the American Theatre, he had a sudden, sobering insight: The Chinese were involved in the development of progress and poverty in America—in the building of the overland train which was becoming the symbol of both.

As George struggled to get ahead and as he pondered over the warning of the old miner, he encountered the Chinese personally. His diary contains several references to the "Chinaman" and his visits to the "Chinese quarter." On February 21, 1865, he recorded in his diary: "Worked for Ike. Did two cards for \$1. . . . In evening had row with Chinaman. Foolish." The next day, he wrote: "Hand very sore. Did not go down till late. Went to work in 'Bulletin' at 12. Got \$3. Went to library in evening. Thinking of economy." Here was George, working hard as a printer, worrying about making ends meet, studying and thinking about political economy, his hand sore from a fight he had had with a "Chinaman."⁴⁹

Three years later, George wrote an essay on "What the Railroad Will Bring Us," which revealed the direction of his study of political economy and the concerns which he would analyze and articulate for the rest of his life. Calling the transcontinental railroad "the greatest work of the age," he predicted that it would convert the "wilderness" into a "populous empire." But, he quickly added, it would also bring problems. As population flowed into the West, land values would rise, benefiting only those few who were rich and owned land. Workers, on the other hand, would be forced into greater competition for employment, and thus would not be able to obtain the capital needed to buy land. Before the penetration of the railroad, California had been a Jacksonian Eden—a country "where all had started from the same level—where the banker had been a year or two before a journeyman carpenter, the merchant a foremast hand . . . and the laborer

once counted his 'pile,' and where the wheel of fortune had been constantly revolving with a rapidity in other places unknown. . . ." But steam was ushering in a new era, in which wealth tended to be concentrated. The locomotive was "a great centralizer," killing little towns and little businesses and building up great cities and great businesses. This process made possible the rise of the "very rich," corrupted by "luxury," and undermined "personal independence"—"the basis of all virtues" in a "republican state." Much of this transformation, George argued, could already be seen in the mining business, where the "honest miner" had passed away, succeeded by the "millowner" with his "Chinaman."⁵⁰

In his widely read essay "The Chinese on the Pacific Coast," published in the *New York Tribune* in 1869 George gave an elaborate explanation of what he thought was the relationship between American technology and the "Chinese Problem." He observed that the Chinese had possessed much knowledge of technology at one time, and had been able to realize such technological achievements as the compass, gunpowder, and printing. But then a "strange petrification" fell upon the Chinese. Consequently, they did not utilize technology; gunpowder, for example, was used merely as a toy. Turning to the nineteenth century, George noted how the steamship was breaking down the geographical isolation between the East and the West and making possible mass Chinese immigration to California. Here was a new peril. The 100,000 Chinese on the West Coast represented the thin end of the wedge which had for its base the 500 million people of eastern Asia.

Not only were the Chinese crowding into California and rapidly monopolizing employment; they also seemed to be ideal workers for technological production.

The great characteristics of the Chinese as laborers are patience and economy—the first makes them efficient laborers, the second cheap laborers. . . . This patient steadiness peculiarly adapts the Chinese for tending machinery and for manufacturing. The tendency of modern production is to a greater and greater subdivision of labor—to confine the operative to one part of the process, and to require of him close attention, patience, and manual dexterity, rather than knowledge, judgment, and skill. The superintendents of the cotton and woolen mills on the Pacific prefer the Chinese to other operatives, and in the same terms the railroad people speak of their Chinese graders, saying they are steadier, work longer, require less watching, and do not get up strikes or go on drunks.

Thus, in George's view, the Chinese had certain qualities which made them "peculiarly" adaptable for use in machine-based production: They were patient, economical, manually dexterous, and controllable. As a controlled

working class in industrial America, they represented the "peons" of the "captains of industry"—yellow labor pitted against white.

In assessing these "peons" as a threat to the white working class, George compared antebellum southern slave society with the new order emerging in technological America. While the ruling class of the Old South was white and the workers black, the ruling class of modern industrial America would again be white but the workers would be yellow. This posed a serious problem for the maintenance of a "homogeneous" society. While the Chinese differed from "our own race" by as strongly marked characteristics as did blacks, George warned, they did not so readily fall into "our ways." The black, when brought to this country, was "a simple barbarian with nothing to unlearn." The Chinese, on the other hand, had a civilization, a vanity which caused them to look down on all other races, and "habits of thought rendered permanent by being stamped upon countless generations." The yellow working class constituted "a population born in China, reared in China, expecting to return to China, living while here in a little China of its own, and without the slightest attachment to the country—utter heathens, treacherous, sensual, cowardly and cruel." Thus, they were a more serious problem than blacks: Unlike blacks, who were "docile" and capable of accepting white ways, the Chinese could not be "assimilated." Here, George declared, were "dragon's teeth enough for the sowing of our new soil—to germinate and bear ere long their bitter fruit of social disease, political weakness, agitation and bloodshed; to spring up armed men, marshalled for civil war. Shall we prohibit their sowing while there is yet time, or shall we wait till they are firmly imbedded, and then try to pluck them up?" His conclusion, advanced years before the appearance of Denis Kearney—fiery anti-Chinese orator and leader of the Workingman's Party of California—was clear: The Chinese must go!⁵¹

Seeking a response on the "Chinese Question" from John Stuart Mill, George sent the English philosopher a copy of his essay. In his letter to George on October 23, 1869, Mill made a distinction between the moral issue and the economic issue. Chinese immigration to the United States raised "two of the most difficult and embarrassing questions of political morality—the extent and limits of the rights of those who have first taken possession of the unoccupied portion of the earth's surface to exclude the remainder of mankind from inhabiting it, and the means which can be legitimately used by the more improved branches of the human species to protect themselves from being hurtfully encroached upon by those of a lower grade in civilization." Concerning "the purely economic view of the subject," Mill stated he "entirely agreed" with George. He had no doubt

that Chinese immigration, if it attained great dimensions, must be "economically injurious to the mass of the present population," diminishing their wages and lowering their standard of living. On this basis, exclusion would be justifiable. Yet, Mill held back from this conclusion. "Is it justifiable," he asked, "to assume that the character and habits of the Chinese are insusceptible of improvement?" In his comment on Mill's letter, George dealt specifically with this question. He claimed Mill's opinion justified the restriction of Chinese immigration, for there was little, if any, possibility for the improvement of the Chinese population in America. The Chinese did not settle here permanently; thus the Chinese population here would be composed continuously of "fresh barbarians, with everything to forget and everything to learn." Even American education would not provide much hope for Chinese children, for the traditions and influences surrounding them would render the majority of educated Chinese children still "essentially Chinese."⁵²

George's essay on "The Chinese on the Pacific Coast" immediately became the center of excited commentary. In his endorsement of George's call for the restriction of Chinese immigration, the editor of the *San Francisco Daily Herald* estimated that it would be logistically possible to transport four million Chinese laborers to America within eighteen months if the demand for their importation were made. Thus the Chinese population in the United States could be increased within two years to equal the total black population in the country. "The question of Chinese settlement and labor in this country," the editor declared, "is one of great present concern. . . . Establish the Radical doctrines of political and social equality for all races, and then induce the Mandarins to 'supply the labor demand of the country' . . . and the day of the downfall of the Republic is not far distant."⁵³ Reprinted in journals and pamphlets of workingmen's organizations, George's essay helped to crystallize anti-Chinese racism, sharpened white working-class hatred of the Chinese, and contributed to the movement which culminated in the enactment of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.

Many of the concerns which agitated George in his analysis of the "Chinese Question"—land, labor, industrialization—led directly to the writing of his most important book, *Progress and Poverty: An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want with Increase of Wealth. The Remedy*. Published three years before the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act, the book had an undeniable political relation to the question of Chinese immigration restriction which was a focus of national political discussion. George's publisher was aware of the controversy and recognized the opportunity to promote the book. In a letter to W. H.

Appleton, A. J. Steers of the editorial department recommended the publication of a "cheap edition" and predicted the book would have an "Enormous" sale. "It treats of a question of live interest at the present moment when the extraordinary influx of Chinese laborers now going causes fear of a labor Émence of the [Denis] Kearney Stamp to spread in the community and the book is so attractive that it would need but little advertising to make its own way."⁵⁴

Progress and Poverty represented the culmination of ten years of research and reflection. George had finally developed an understanding of the problem of poverty in America and had also formulated a remedy. Opening his analysis with a litany on the utilization of steam and electricity and the introduction of labor-saving machinery, he pointed out the paradox of the existence of poverty amid material progress. Why was there poverty? George had an answer: Wages constantly tended to be minimal and to give but a bare living in spite of the increase of productive power because of the tendency of rents to increase faster than productive power and thus force down wages. The problem was the monopolization of the land. In order to "extirpate" poverty and make wages what justice demanded they should be, George argued, "common" ownership would have to be substituted for the individual ownership of land. This could be accomplished through a "single tax" on all "unearned increment"—the increased value of land generated from the increase of population and productivity. Unless the unjust and unequal distribution of wealth were remedied, American society would face an overwhelming crisis. The public domain and the availability of land in America had been in the past the "transmuting force," which had turned the "thrifless, unambitious European peasant into the self-reliant Western farmer." Foreshadowing Frederick Jackson Turner, George declared: "All that we are proud of in the American character; all that makes our conditions and institutions better than those of older countries, we may trace to the fact that land has been cheap in the United States, because new soil has been open to the emigrant." But, he observed ominously, the American advance had reached the Pacific. As George drew his book to a close, he referred specifically to the Chinese in his reaffirmation of American progress and civilization. While whites had progressed from a savage state to nineteenth-century civilization, the Chinese had stood still. The transformation of the European peasant into the American farmer did not apply to the Chinese immigrant: Due to the "Chinese environment," the immigrants from the East remained "Chinese."⁵⁵

Thus, in George's view, the Chinese were "unassimilable," and shortly after the publication of *Progress and Poverty*, he spelled out the particular

threat they constituted in industrial America. In his essay "Chinese Immigration," he identified technology with American civilization, and warned that the use of "Chinamen" in American industries would erode the progress of technology. The low wages and low standard of living in China, he argued, hindered the development of technology there, for machinery was unnecessary in a society where labor was cheap. The same thing could happen in America. Chinese cheap labor in this country could destroy the "spirit of invention," and "stagnation" could take the place of "progress."⁵⁶ The Chinese were a most awesome threat: Bodies—yellow ones—could undermine the ascendancy of machinery and mind. The Chinese could not only retard but also subvert the very genius of the age—American technology.

Like Henry Adams and Mark Twain, George perceived catastrophe within the context of technology; but George related it directly to what he called the "Mongolization of America." Not only would the Chinese "barbarians," carried here by the magic of steam, throw America backward to an earlier age when society depended on the labor of men's bodies, they would also help to harden class divisions within the United States. The Chinese would accelerate the prevailing tendency of the concentration of wealth—"to make the rich richer and the poor poorer; to make nabobs and princes of our capitalists, and crush our working classes into the dust. . . ." As American industry developed and as the Chinese became the main supply of labor for the "captains of industry," there would be intense competition and conflict between white workers and "Chinese coolies." Thus there would be both progress and poverty, and in the midst of both, there would be bloody conflict.⁵⁷

Such conflict was already evident. The fear and rage of white workers were expressed repeatedly in the frenzy of anti-Chinese violence. The victims of white working-class racist attacks, the Chinese were frequently beaten in the streets of San Francisco and driven out of Eureka, Truckee, and other towns. In 1871 a white mob in Los Angeles killed twenty-one Chinese and looted the Chinese quarters. An even more violent mob action occurred in 1885 at Rock Springs, Wyoming, where whites refused to work in the same mine with Chinese laborers; armed with rifles and revolvers, they invaded the Chinese section of town, shot Chinese workers as they fled, and burned the buildings. Fifteen Chinese were wounded and twenty-eight murdered during the massacre.⁵⁸ George could see that white working-class violence against Chinese laborers was only part of a larger conflict.

What horrified George was the possibility that the conflict could unleash the "savagery" latent in whites which their civilization had to restrain in

order to maintain itself. "Nor should we forget," he cautioned, "that in civilized man still lurks the savage." Men of the nineteenth century, living in an era of progress, were still essentially the same as the men of the past, who "fought to death in petty quarrels," "drunk fury with blood," and burned cities and destroyed empires. While "social progress" had "softened manners," yet man was still capable of as "blind a rage as when, clothed in skins, he fought wild beasts with a flint." And present tendencies of class conflict threatened to rekindle passions which had so often before "flamed in destructive fury." Relating social tensions in America to the class strife already intense in Europe, George saw the "terrible struggle of the Paris commune" as a fiery example of the social conflicts which seemed to be punctuating Western civilization. "And in the light of burning Paris," he fearfully suggested, "we may see how it may be that this very civilization of ours, this second Tower of Babel . . . may yet crumble and perish."⁵⁹

This vision which haunted George was depicted vividly in Ignatius Donnelly's novel *Caesar's Column*. In this story, published in 1890, an industrial elite, with the help of Chinese "coolies" as workers, take power and suppress the white workers and farmers of America. "Nabobs" and "a few great loan associations" own the land, driving the once independent farmers into labor competition with "vile hordes of Mongolian coolies." A bloody revolution is in the making. "When the Great Day comes, and the nation sends forth its call for volunteers . . . that cry will echo in desolate places; or it will ring through the triumphant hearts of savage and desperate men who are hastening to the banquet of blood and destruction. And the wretched, yellow, under-fed coolies, with women's garments over their effeminate limbs, will not have the courage or the desire or the capacity to make soldiers and defend their oppressors." During the revolution, a "banquet of blood and destruction" takes place; the bodies of the dead are stacked up in a huge pile and concrete is poured over them, forming a column rising toward the heavens like a skyscraper and symbolizing what George regarded as the "savagery" still lurking within "civilized man."⁶⁰

38. James Creelman, in *New York World*, reprinted in Harlan, *Booker T. Washington Papers*, vol. 4, pp. 3, 9, 10, 16.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

X. The "Heathen Chinese" and American Technology

1. Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* (New York, 1906), pp. 693-4; Hinton Rowan Helper, *The Land of Gold: Reality Versus Fiction* (Baltimore, 1855), p. 96.
2. John Todd, *The Sunset Land* (Boston, 1870), p. 303.
3. Mary Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration* (New York, 1969, originally published in 1909), p. 425.
4. Dan Caldwell, "The Negroization of the Chinese Stereotype in California," *Southern California Quarterly*, vol. 53 (June 1971), pp. 123-32; *New York Times*, September 3, 1865, quoted in Stuart C. Miller, *The Unwelcome Immigrant: The American Image of the Chinese, 1785-1882* (Berkeley, Calif., 1969), p. 170; *San Francisco Chronicle*, March 6, 1879, quoted in Elmer C. Sandmeyer, *The Anti-Chinese Movement in California* (Urbana, Ill., 1939), p. 26; John T. Morgan, U.S. Cong., *Congressional Record*, 47th Cong., 1st sess., 1882, p. 3266; Governor Henry Haight, "Inaugural Remarks," reprinted in H.J. West, *The Chinese Invasion* (San Francisco, 1873), pp. 86-7.
5. *San Francisco Alta*, June 4, 1853; *Hutching's California Magazine*, vol. 1 (March 1857), p. 387, quoted in Caldwell, "Negroization of the Chinese Stereotype," pp. 123, 128; *Report of the Joint Special Committee to Investigate Chinese Immigration*, Senate Report No. 689, 44th Cong., 2nd sess., 1876-7, p. vi; *New York Times* and Sarah E. Henshaw, quoted in Miller, *Unwelcome Immigrant*, pp. 76, 184, 185, 198; *The Wasp Magazine*, vol. 30 (January-June 1893), pp. 10-1; *Report of the Committee to Investigate Chinese Immigration*, p. 688.
6. Charles W. Brooks, "The Chinese Labor Problem," *Overland Monthly*, vol. 3 (November 1869), p. 413; Frank Norton, "Our Labor System and the Chinese," *Scribner's Monthly*, vol. 2 (May 1871), pp. 61-6; A. W. Loomis, "How Our Chinamen Are Employed," *Overland Monthly*, vol. 2 (March 1869), pp. 238-9; Planters' convention report, reprinted in John R. Commons, et al., eds., *A Documentary History of American Industrial Society* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1910-11), vol. 9, p. 81; *Vicksburg (Miss.) Times*, June 30, 1869, in James W. Loewen, *The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), p. 22; John Todd, *The Sunset Land*, pp. 284-5. See also Charles H. Wesley, *Negro Labor in the United States, 1850-1925* (New York, 1967), p. 197.
7. *California Marin Journal*, April 13, 1876, quoted in Sandmeyer, *Anti-Chinese Movement in California*, p. 38; Horatio Seymour, letter to a workingmen's association, in *New York Times*, August 6, 1870; *The Nation*, vol. 9 (July 15, 1869), p. 445; Morgan, *Congressional Record*, 47th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3267.
8. California Supreme Court, *The People v. Hall*, October 1, 1854, in Robert F. Heizen and Alan F. Almquist, *The Other Californians* (Berkeley, 1971), p. 229; superintendent of education, quoted in Franklin Odo, et al., *Roots: An Asian-American Reader* (Los Angeles, 1971), p. 175; Hayes, quoted in Miller, *Unwelcome Immigrant*, p. 190.

9. Henry Grimm, *"The Chinese Must Go": A Farce in Four Acts* (San Francisco, 1879), pp. 3, 4, 8, 19.
10. Miller, *Unwelcome Immigrant*, p. 189; *Congressional Record*, 47th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2973-4; *U.S. Statutes at Large*, vol. 22, pp. 58-61. See debate, *Congressional Record*, 47th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2033, 3310, 3265, 3268; appendix, pp. 48, 89, 21.
11. *The Nation* (March 16, 1882), p. 222; Bret Harte, "Plain Language from Truthful James," *Overland Monthly*, vol. 5 (September 1870), pp. 287-8.
12. Mark Twain, quoted in Margaret Duckett, *Mark Twain and Bret Harte* (Norman, Okla., 1964), p. 52; *New York Globe*, January 7, 1871, quoted in George R. Stewart, Jr., *Bret Harte: Argonaut and Exile* (Boston, 1931), p. 180; *Springfield Republican*, quoted in Duckett, *Mark Twain and Bret Harte*, p. 38.
13. See Miller, *Unwelcome Immigrant*; Alexander Saxton, *The Indispensable Enemy: Labor and the Anti-Chinese Movement in California* (Berkeley, Calif., 1971); Robert McClellan, *The Heathen Chinese: A Study of American Attitudes toward China, 1890-1905* (Columbus, Ohio, 1971); Frederick Rudolph, "Chinamen in Yankeedom: Anti-Unionism in Massachusetts in 1870," *American Historical Review*, vol. 53, no. 1 (October 1947), pp. 1-29.
14. Harte, "Plain Language," pp. 287-8.
15. Harte to Mrs. M. Sherwood, in *New York Times*, May 10, 1902; and Harte, in S. R. Elliot, "Glimpses of Bret Harte," *The Reader* (July 1907), both quoted in Stewart, *Bret Harte*, p. 181.
16. See William P. Fenn, *Ah Sin and His Brethren in American Literature* (Peking, 1933), p. xi; Stewart, *Bret Harte*, pp. 183, 208, 210-1; Duckett, *Mark Twain and Bret Harte*, p. 32.
17. Harte to Nan Harte, September 13, 1879; August 17, 1885; and November 28, 1887; in Geoffrey Bret Harte, ed., *The Letters of Bret Harte* (London, 1926), pp. 154, 285-6, 322.
18. Harte, "Wan Lee, the Pagan" in Harte, *Harte's Complete Works*, 20 vols. (Boston, 1929), vol. 3, pp. 262-79.
19. Harte, "See Yup," in *ibid.*, vol. 7, pp. 144-60.
20. Aaron H. Palmer, *Memoir, geographical, political, and commercial, on the present state, productive resources, and capabilities for commerce, of Siberia, Manchuria, and the Asiatic Islands of the Northern Pacific Ocean; and on the importance of opening commercial intercourse with those countries*, March 8, 1948. U.S. Cong., Senate, 30th Cong., 1st sess., Senate misc. no. 80, pp. 1, 52, 60, 61.
21. Henry Robinson, "Our Manufacturing Era," *Overland Monthly*, vol. 2 (March 1869), pp. 280-4.
22. See Saxton, *Indispensable Enemy*, pp. 60-6; Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration*, p. 63; B. P. Avery, "Building the Iron Road," *Overland Monthly*, vol. 2 (March 1869), p. 232.
23. Albert P. Richardson, *Beyond the Mississippi: From the Great River to the Great Ocean. Life and Adventure on the Prairies, Mountains, and Pacific Coast, 1857-1867* (Hartford, Conn., 1867), p. 462; company official, quoted in Saxton, *Indispensable Enemy*, p. 65. See Charles W. Brooks, "The Chinese Labor Problem," *Overland Monthly*, vol. 3 (November 1869), p. 408; Wesley S. Griswold, *A Work of Giants:*

- Building the First Transcontinental Railroad* (New York, 1962), p. 196; E. L. Sabin, *Building the Pacific Railway* (Philadelphia, 1919), p. 121.
24. *San Francisco Alta*, July 1 and 3, 1867; Leland Stanford, quoted in Sabin, *Building the Pacific Railway*, p. 111.
25. Palmer, *Memoir*, p. 1; F. F. Victor, "Manifest Destiny in the West," *Overland Monthly*, vol. 3 (August 1869), pp. 148-59; Frank Norton, "Our Labor System and the Chinese," *Scribner's Monthly*, vol. 2 (May 1871), p. 67; Leland Stanford, quoted in Saxton, *Indispensable Enemy*, p. 62.
26. Robert L. Harris, "The Pacific Railroad—Unopen," *Overland Monthly*, vol. 3 (September 1869), p. 252.
27. Loomis, "How Our Chinamen Are Employed," pp. 23-36; Reverend O. Gibson, *Chinaman or White Man, Which?* (San Francisco, 1873), p. 10; R. G. McClellan, quoted in Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration*, p. 357. See also Saxton, *Indispensable Enemy*, p. 4; Brooks, "Chinese Labor Problem," p. 408; Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration*, p. 359; *San Francisco Morning Call*, May 27, 1873, reprinted in Henry J. West, *The Chinese Invasion* (San Francisco, 1873); Ping Chiu, *Chinese Labor in California*, pp. 24-5, 32, 29, 64; *Report of the Committee to Investigate Chinese Immigration*, p. 252. The process of Chinese/white competition involved the expulsion of Chinese labor rather than of white. For example, in 1870 ninety percent of the cigarmakers in San Francisco were Chinese; a decade later, they constituted only thirty percent. See Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration*, p. 370.
28. For the full discussion of the North Adams event, see Rudolph's excellent article, "Chinamen in Yankeedom," pp. 1-29. See also Miller, *Unwelcome Immigrant*, pp. 175-84; Gunther Barth, *Bitter Strength: A History of the Chinese in the United States, 1850-1870* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), pp. 197-202.
29. *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (December 1870), p. 138; Rudolph, "Chinamen in Yankeedom," pp. 3, 4.
30. William Shanks, "Chinese Skilled Labor," *Scribner's Monthly*, vol. 2 (September 1871), p. 495; Washington Gladden, *From the Hub to the Hudson* (Greenfield, Wis., 1870), p. 107; *North Adams* (Mass.) *Transcript*, quoted in Rudolph, "Chinamen in Yankeedom," pp. 4, 8, 9; Shanks, "Chinese Skilled Labor," p. 495; Rudolph, "Chinamen in Yankeedom," p. 9; Marx, *Capital*, pp. 693, 696.
31. See Rudolph, "Chinamen in Yankeedom," pp. 10-5; Shanks, "Chinese Skilled Labor," p. 495.
32. See Rudolph, "Chinamen in Yankeedom," p. 14; *The Nation*, vol. 10 (June 23, 1870) and vol. 11 (July 14, 1870); *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (December 1870), p. 138; Shanks, "Chinese Skilled Labor," pp. 495-6.
33. *The Nation*, vol. 10 (June 23, 1870), p. 397; *Boston Commonwealth*, June 25, 1870, and *Springfield* (Mass.) *Republican*, June 17, 1870, reprinted in Commons, *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, vol. 9, pp. 84-6.
34. *The Nation*, vol. 10 (June 23, 1870), p. 397; *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (December 1870), p. 138; Shanks, "Chinese Skilled Labor," pp. 495-6.
35. See Barth, *Bitter Strength*, pp. 202-9.
36. Samuel Bowles, *Our New West* (Hartford, Conn., 1869), p. 414.