

CHINESE AND GGNRA, 1849-1949:
GUESTS OF CHOICE, GUESTS OF NECESSITY*

by

L. Eve Armentrout-Ma

*The author would like to thank her husband, Jeong-Huei Ma, for the Chinese characters and some useful information. In addition, Him Mark Lai of the Chinese Historical Society of America provided some of the references on fishing. Diana Lorentz did the typing, the author's daughter, Lucy A. Armentrout-Ma helped with the proofreading, a number of people (whose names can be found in the footnotes) granted interviews, and both Lisa Woo and Katheryn M. Lang of GGNRA provided the names of a couple of people it was useful to contact.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
I. THE MARITIME ASPECT	7
A. Chinese Immigrants and Travelers Between China and San Francisco	8
B. Vessels and Cargo Consigned to Chinese, S.F.-China-S.F.	21
C. Miscellaneous	38
D. Chinese Fishermen off GGNRA	43
II. LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES	56
A. San Francisco	58
B. Angel Island and Marin County	80
Conclusion	91
Appendix: Annotated Bibliography	95

CHINESE AND GGNRA, 1849-1949:

Guests of Choice, Guests of Necessity.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area, created in 1972, embraces the headlands of the golden gate from San Francisco's Fort Funston in the south to the Marin County township of Olema in the north. As guardian of a major gateway to the Pacific, the park will always find part of its focus in maritime history. Through its portals have passed most of the nineteenth century's immigrants to California and many of those in the twentieth century. A major immigration station--Angel Island--lies within the park's boundaries. Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of goods have and currently do travel to and from San Francisco aboard ships that pass through the golden gate. Commercial fishermen work the waters off the shores now included in the park.

The park has a land-based history as well. Its territory was associated for centuries with the Coastanoan and Coast Miwok Indians and for decades with the Spanish, and then the Mexican ranchos.¹ Since the American take-over in 1849 and

¹Katheryn M. Lang's study, "Golden Gate National Recreation Area: The Indian and Hispanic Heritage of a Modern Urban Park," covers this aspect. In addition, Douglas Henry Daniels' "Afro-Americans, the San Francisco Bay Area and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area" deals with the park's history related to blacks.

even earlier, forts on the park's lands guarded San Francisco. In 1906, they also helped provide relief for the thousands made homeless by the great earthquake and fire of that year. Most of the several townships in the Marin County section of the park date back to the nineteenth century and are related to the dairying, logging, and tourist industries of that region. In the 1870s and later, railroads were built through the area to service these same industries. And on the San Francisco side, the park's territory is intimately linked with the great city which it borders and serves. In most of these varied aspects of history connected with the park, Chinese have been a crucial element.

No resident or tourist in San Francisco can be unaware of the long-time association of Chinese with this part of California. Chinatown is, after all, one of the earliest San Francisco neighborhoods, dating from about 1850. Furthermore, almost all Chinese who came to the United States prior to the end of the Korean War came on ships via San Francisco. They began coming in 1849 after news of the California gold rush had crossed the Pacific and by the following year, several thousand of them were arriving each year--at first mostly would-be miners along with a small leavening of merchants.²

²The best-known published general accounts of Chinese and Chinese Americans in the United States are Gunther Barth, Bitter Strength: A History of the Chinese in the United States, 1850-1870 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974); Thomas W. Chinn, H. Mark Lai, and Philip P. Choy (Eds.), A History of the Chinese in California: A Syllabus (San Francisco:

The Chinese immigration to the United States even at this early stage was a product of two factors: the positive attraction of this country and the harsh conditions which prevailed in certain parts of their native land. All throughout the 1850s, a civil war (the Taiping Rebellion) ravaged much of south and central China. Bureaucratic inefficiencies, natural disasters such as floods, and other factors produced frequent crop shortages. Overpopulation compounded the problem so that famine was not uncommon. Other problems included the high rate of tenantry in a country where 80% of the population consisted of farmers, and economic dislocations occasioned by foreign penetration of important domestic markets. In the face of these pressures, many Chinese were forced to emigrate.

Almost all of those who came to the United States were from south China, from an area within 200 miles of Canton and Hongkong. (In spite of this fact, these immigrants did not all speak the same dialect of Chinese, a situation which at one point led to violent conflict in this country.) Most of these immigrants were young men. It has frequently been asserted that Chinese did not immigrate as family units simply because they had no long-term interest in this country. This, however, is incorrect. Those who came between 1850 and 1870 hesitated to bring wives with them because the type of work most expected

Chinese Historical Society of America, 1969); and Stanford M. Lyman, Chinese Americans (New York: Random House, 1974). Of these three, Chinn, Lai, and Choy, although the shortest, possesses probably the most and the most accurate information.

to pursue--mining and later railroad building--involved constant moving and were not conducive to family life. After 1870, the rising tide of anti-Chinese feeling in this country led to frequent violent attacks on Chinese and laws designed to cut off Chinese immigration--including that of wives and fiancées. The most notorious of these laws was Chinese Exclusion, directed primarily against Chinese laborers (skilled and unskilled) and their families. Begun in 1882 as a treaty between China and the United States, it became embodied in the internal laws of this country and did not begin to be dismantled until 1943. Other important factors helped ensure that until recent times, much of the Chinese population in this country would consist of men without families: traditional Chinese disapproval of the wife leaving the native region, cultural stress on the parent-child relationship (suggesting that a son's, and his wife's, true home was where his parents resided), the relatively higher cost of living in this country as compared with China, and so forth. A few people, particularly the merchants, did bring wives to the United States and for this reason since the 1860s there has been a native-born Chinese-American population, though it has been small and slow growing until recent decades.

People who did have families in this country generally expected their stay in the United States to last for many years or to be permanent. Not so the first wave of young men from south China who poured into California at the time of the

gold rush. Some made a fortune, many a modest pile--and returned home again. Others, less fortunate, resolved to extend their stay and went into different pursuits, their ranks up until 1882 swelled by continuing immigration from China. Many of these immigrants would have been happy to accept United States citizenship and become permanent residents in this country, but the law and circumstances conspired against them. Still, a significant percentage of California's industries were built up through the means of Chinese labor. Chinese constructed most of the western half of the first transcontinental railroad and then proceeded to build the majority of the other railroads, large and small, that eventually united all of California. They worked as farmers and as farm laborers. They did the bulk of the early reclamation work along the Sacramento River, fished all along the Pacific coast, ran large import-export firms, and so forth.

Most of them settled in California. As already suggested, many non-Chinese Californians found them anathema. Their clothing seemed funny. They spoke a foreign language. Many loved to gamble. Their food and eating habits were different. More important, they were non-white--and hence, to the average nineteenth century Caucasian man in the street, racially inferior. Anxious to begin earning money as soon after arriving in this country as possible, most Chinese were satisfied to work for wages comparable to those paid to workers on the United States' east coast, which was far below what

white workers in California wanted. Generally diligent, suited by family and cultural background to working cooperatively in large groups, quick to learn new techniques and frequently of an inventive turn of mind, the Chinese seemed to be successful at anything they tried. Their success engendered jealousy, particularly on the part of immigrant whites such as the Irish, who felt Chinese were lowering wages and crowding others out of the labor market. White laborers also felt California's big capitalists were using Chinese labor to secure an economic and political stranglehold on the state.³

It was a combination of this jealousy, several business slumps, the immigration of too many laborers into California, and racism that produced the wave of anti-Chinese sentiment which swept the State from the 1870s to the 1890s. There was anti-Chinese violence and anti-Chinese legislation both before and after this period, but the movement of the 1870s-1890s made earlier and later anti-Chinese actions seem pale by comparison. Two important results of the movement were to cut off almost completely the Chinese immigration to this country and to force most Chinese either to return to China or move into large urban areas, particularly San Francisco. (In these urban areas, Chinese had been for the most part confined to ghettos--"Chinatowns"--since the 1860s.) Another outcome

³Alexander Saxton's The Indispensable Enemy: Labor and the Anti-Chinese Movement in California (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971) is the single best work in English that covers this whole topic.

was to limit Chinese to a very few areas of employment. They were thrown (sometimes literally) out of the factories and off the railroads, and relegated for the most part to work as servants for white families, jobs as peddlers, laundrymen, and agricultural laborers, or jobs available in Chinatown. Housing and employment restrictions did not really begin to break down until the 1940s and 1950s. It is against this background that we must view the accomplishments and history of Chinese related to what is now the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I. The Maritime Aspect

The most important way in which Chinese have been related to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is as immigrants. Not only have hundreds of thousands passed through the park's portals (many on vessels manned by Chinese sailors) but between 1910 and 1940 the United States government operated the Angel Island Immigration Station on what is now park land. This station was primarily intended to handle Chinese immigrants. The traffic in these immigrants went two ways: thousands made several trips between San Francisco and China, and other thousands, after spending a few years in this country, boarded ships in San Francisco to return permanently to their native land. For many years, hundreds of Chinese also passed through the golden gate on the way to and from the seasonal work in the Alaska fish canneries. Others went up

the north Pacific coast to the gold fields of Canada or to cities like Portland, Seattle, Vancouver and Victoria, which all had well-defined Chinatowns by the 1890s.

In addition to Chinese immigrants and travelers, a great deal of San Francisco's oceanic trade has been with China. Chinese were frequently the importers or exporters responsible for these cargoes, and sometimes owned or chartered the vessels as well. Finally, Chinese were the first to engage in salt water fishing in the ocean off San Francisco and Marin County. They pursued rockfish, smelt, shrimp, clams, prawns, and similar quarry on both the ocean and the bay side, and gathered abalone along the rocky coast.

A. Chinese immigrants and travelers
Between China and San Francisco

Exact figures on Chinese immigration to this country are impossible to obtain, particularly for the early years: records were kept carelessly, and those keeping them often had partisan reasons for making their estimates run high, or low. However, the general trends of the immigration are reasonably clear. In February of 1849, there were slightly over fifty Chinese in all of the United States. All but about two of them resided in San Francisco and had entered this country on ships via the golden gate.⁴ During the following ten months, several

⁴Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 22; and Corinne K. Hoexter, From Canton to California: The Epic of Chinese Immigration (New York: Four Winds Press, 1976), pp. 8-9.

hundred more arrived, and in the year 1850 another 500 to 3,000 disembarked, several score of whom were part of a Chinese dramatic troupe crossing the ocean to provide amusement for their fellow immigrants. In 1851, thousands more Chinese immigrants arrived along with a second dramatic troupe, and the year 1852 brought another 20,000.⁵ In 1853, the pace slackened somewhat, but in 1854, some 16,000 immigrants from China arrived in San Francisco. During that same year, the total immigration into California from all quarters was a little under 60,000. Chinese, in other words, made up almost one-third of all the people who entered the state.⁶

Frightened by this immigration, the California legislature passed a harsh, progressive Foreign Miners Tax to be levied primarily against Chinese. When news of this tax arrived back in South China, it discouraged many potential immigrants, and fewer than 3,500 Chinese arrived in San Francisco in 1855. At the same time, a steady stream of Chinese miners already in California began returning to their native

⁵Mary Roberts Collidge, Chinese Immigration (New York: Henry Holt, 1909), p. 498; Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 22; and Frank Soule, John H. Gibon, and James Nesbit, The Annals of San Francisco Together with the Continuation, Through 1855 (Palo Alto: Lewis Osborne Reprint, 1966), pp. 38-41. As an interesting side note, it seems that all of the actors in one of the dramatic troupes--probably the first one--ran off to the gold fields immediately after their arrival in San Francisco. See Chung Kun Ai, My Seventy-Nine Years in Hawaii (Hong Kong: Cosmorama Pictorial Publishers, 1960).

⁶Dorothy H. Huggins, Continuation of the Annals of San Francisco (June 1, 1854 to December 31, 1855) (San Francisco: California Historical Society, 1939), p. 29; and Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 22.

land. By the end of 1855, this stream had reached flood proportions. On November 20, 1855, for example, the Galatea left San Francisco for Hongkong with somewhere between 2,000 and 3,000 Chinese passengers crowded aboard, mostly former miners.⁷

Almost as soon as the progressive Foreign Miners Tax was passed, however, it was repealed--the state stood to lose too much revenue if all Chinese departed. The legislature enacted a more reasonable Foreign Miners Tax and in response, the rate of Chinese immigration began to pick up again. For the next decade, it stood at an average of 5,000 to 6,000 a year. Then, in 1867, the newly formed Pacific Mail Steamship Company, armed with a United States government subsidy, inaugurated regularly scheduled steamer service between Hongkong and San Francisco. These steamers made the crossing more reliable, shorter, and less fraught with hardship than had been the case in the clipper, bark and sailing brig days they laid to rest.⁸ At about the same time, the Big Four organizers of this country's first transcontinental railroad, then under

⁷Huggins, pp. 67-85; and Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 22.

⁸Theodore H. Hittell, History of California, v. 3 (San Francisco: H. J. Stone, 1897), p. 432; Coolidge, p. 498; and William J. Courtney, San Francisco Anti-Chinese Ordinances, 1850-1900 (San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1974), pp. 6-7. San Francisco newspapers of 1859 claimed the city had scheduled steamer service to Hongkong in that year, but the service evidently was extremely short lived. See Mrs. Harold David, Mrs. Oliver Kehrlein, Miss Dolores Cadell, and Edgar M. Kahn, "Some California Dates of 1859," in California Historical Society Quarterly, v. 38, no. 1 (March 1959), pp. 25-29.

construction, discovered that Chinese laborers were excellent at railroad building. They sent an agent to Canton and Hong-kong to solicit laborers, promising all who came a loan to cover the crossing plus a guaranteed job once in this country. The Burlingame Treaty of 1868 between China and the United States, which promised good treatment to Chinese in this country, served as an added inducement. As a result, in 1868 Chinese immigration jumped to about 11,000 and increased to 15,000 the following year.⁹

Between 1870 and 1883, Chinese immigration through the port of San Francisco averaged 12,000 a year, with two or three years of high immigration alternating with two or three years of low immigration. The tapering off that began in 1877 was due to the anti-Chinese movement which both cut down on employment opportunities and made living conditions extremely unpleasant. 1876 was the worst single year for Chinese here--the year when Dennis Kearney and his workingmen followers nearly razed San Francisco's Chinatown and murdered its inhabitants. (They were prevented from doing so by Chinatownners who armed and barricaded their quarter to repel the attack, and by white vigilantes, mostly men of substance, who took to the streets to maintain law and order in the city.)¹⁰

⁹Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 22; and Coolidge, p. 52.

¹⁰Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 22; and Charles Morley (trans.), "The Chinese in California as Reported by Henryk Sienkiewicz," in California Historical Society Quarterly, v. 34, no. 4 (December 1955), p. 312.

Things were so bad that San Francisco's influential Chinese Six Companies sent word to China that no further immigrants should come lest they inadvertantly fan the flames of violence. Matters improved somewhat in the following year, so the immigration did not completely stop, but at the end of the year 1882, Chinese Exclusion cut it off almost completely for the next fifty-nine years. Hurrying to get into the United States before the door was slammed closed, a record 39,579 Chinese entered the United States in the last few months before the Exclusion Act took effect.¹¹

Chinese Exclusion began as a treaty between the United States and China. It specifically denied Chinese laborers the right to enter the United States unless they were already in this country, or had been here and left armed with valid re-entry visas. Only four "classes" of Chinese were granted the right to come here: merchants, educators, diplomats, and students. Furthermore, in practice laborers were not allowed to bring their wives over, although in many cases merchants could. A handful of ports of entry were designated for Chinese desiring to come to this country (principally San Francisco, Seattle, and New York); entrance at any other place was illegal. And Chinese were formally denied the right to become naturalized United States citizens. This move was not surprising in view of the fact that since 1852 courts in

¹¹Coolidge, pp. 460 and 498.

this country had normally refused Chinese naturalization, anyway.¹²

The Chinese government acquiesced to this treaty as a result of carelessness and poor advice from her diplomatic staff located in Washington, D.C. It soon came to regret it and on several occasions requested that the treaty be revised. The United States refused any substantive revisions, responding instead by inserting the treaty provisions into the internal laws of this country. From time to time, modifications were made (such as the Scott Act of 1888 and the Geary Act of 1893) most of which were designed to make Chinese immigration to this country even more difficult. Chinese in this country fought these laws by bringing test cases before the courts to question their constitutionality, but the Chinese lost the most important of these cases. Finally, in 1943, when China and the United States found themselves to be wartime allies, the basic framework of Chinese Exclusion was abolished. Subsequent years saw further liberalization of American policy

¹²Courtney, pp. 35-36; Daily Alta California, December 30, 1852; J. S. Tow, The Real Chinese in America (San Francisco: R and E Research Associates Reprint, 1970), pp. 119-122; and Chinn, Lai, and Choy, pp. 26-27. In 1900, Chinese laborers in a court case won the right to bring their wives over but it was little exercised since United States immigration authorities treated the women harshly, suspecting them of prostitution and disease. Between one and two hundred wives did come each year, but many were the wives of merchants. In addition, native-born Chinese American men could marry Chinese wives and bring them over. Between 1924 and 1930, however, no Chinese women were allowed to enter this country; in 1930, this was liberalized very slightly. See Chinn, Lai, and Choy, pp. 27-29, and United States vs. Mrs. Gue Lim, 176 U.S. 459, 1900 (a 1900 Supreme Court case).

toward Chinese immigration and in 1965 it was finally put on the same footing as immigration from any other country.¹³

What did all this mean in terms of Chinese passing through GGNRA's waters to safe harbor in San Francisco Bay? In the first place, beginning in 1883, there was a tremendous and dramatic decrease in the number of Chinese immigrants. In the second place, many of those who did come had been here before; they were "return immigrants." By 1882, several thousand Chinese had come to this country and returned home again with the intention of perhaps making a second trip to America. We have seen that toward the end of 1855, for example, two or three thousand Chinese returned to China on one ship. That was an extreme case, but nonetheless, the traffic of Chinese between Asia and the New World was by no means one way. Beginning as early as 1852 and continuing right on until the Japanese invasion of southern China in 1938, almost every ship going to China carried a few tens or hundreds of Chinese back across the ocean. Fall and early winter were the favored times for the return trip because employment was harder to come by then and besides, everyone wanted to be home in time for the Chinese New Year's celebration.¹⁴

¹³Coolidge, pp. 186-188, pp. 195-219, and p. 295; Huggins, pp. 11-15; and Chinn, Lai, and Choy, pp. 28-29.

¹⁴Coolidge, p. 498; and United States Senate and House of Representatives, Report of the Joint Special Committee to Investigate Chinese Immigration, 1876 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1877), p. 449.

One group of immigrants returning to China were definitely not planning to come back to this country. This group consisted of Chinese who had died in the United States. They comprised a small but highly visible percentage of the passengers bound for Hongkong. According to Chinese tradition, a man should be buried in his native village,¹⁵ and organizations existed in this country whose function it was to see that any Chinese who died here would be shipped back to China. The bodies, usually in groups of ten or more, were first sent to San Francisco from the mining districts, railroad camps, or wherever it was that the deceased had met their end. Sometimes the bodies would be buried in San Francisco for a while prior to their trans-Pacific journey. Then, on an auspicious day, the appropriate Chinatown leaders would organize an impressive funeral procession after which the corpses would be properly packaged and taken down to the ships.¹⁶

Hoping to discourage Chinese immigration, around 1878 San Francisco authorities put an end to this practice by forbidding to permit corpses to be sent from the city to China. In response, Chinatown leaders developed the practice of burying the dead in San Francisco, leaving them interred for seven

¹⁵Since in China women were considered inferior to men, it was not important for them to be buried back in China; and in any case, once married, they were considered to have broken their ties to their native region, having adopted that of their husband.

¹⁶Huggins, pp. 43 and 80.

years, then digging up the bones and having them shipped back to China for final burial. For many years the cemetery at Lincoln Park, on GGNRA land, was used for this purpose, about which I shall have more to say later on.¹⁷

Most of those who returned to China, however, did so in a living state; and of these, a significant proportion came back to the United States after spending a few months or even several years with their families in China. In addition to these return immigrants, several other types of people came to this country from China in the years after 1882. There were, of course, the merchants, educators, diplomats, and students. Of these four groups, the merchants were the most numerous, followed by the students. Many wives of merchants also came. Only a few diplomats from China resided in this country with their staff, but every once in a while, a special mission from China arrived. Even fewer Chinese sought entrance as educators, but those who did were interesting and often influential people: political exiles, newspaper editors, and even Chinese dramatic troupes.¹⁸

¹⁷ Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration, Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration (Ottawa: Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration, 1885), p. 19; and Morley, p. 313. Before forbidding to permit the bodies to be sent back to China, San Francisco had attempted to harrass the Chinese community by levying a \$10 tax on each body shipped to Hong-kong. This law was in effect as early as 1870, and probably before. See Rev. A. W. Loomis to Henry W. Moulton, March 30, 1870.

¹⁸ The Oriental (華洋新報), March 24, 1893; Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 27; and L. Eve Armentrout-Ma, "Chinese Politics

Starting in 1900, however, probably the largest group of new immigrants consisted of a class not even mentioned by the Chinese Exclusion treaty or laws: the minor children of Chinese already here. The bulk of this group consisted of teen-age boys. They were able to enter the United States because in 1900, in one of the test cases to which I referred earlier, the Supreme Court handed down a decision in which it stated that Chinese in this country could bring their wives and minor children to the United States to reside here with them.¹⁹ In subsequent years, the courts decided minor children included those up to the age of fifteen and sometimes even those eighteen years and younger.²⁰ Chinese laborers-- the largest group of Chinese in this country--were pressed by economic necessity and usually sent back only for their teenage sons (although an average of 160 wives a year began arriving after 1900). The sons could help support themselves by taking a job such as houseboy for a wealthy American family, whereas in Chinese society it was felt that only in cases of dire necessity should

in the Western Hemisphere, 1893-1911: Rivalry Between Reformers and Revolutionaries in the Americas" (unpublished PhD thesis, University of California, Davis, 1977), Chapter I (pp. 17-62), "Chinese in the Americas: Immigration, Employment Conditions, and Relations with Americans." One of the more interesting of the political exiles who entered as educators was K'ang Yu-wei, the founder of a political party which at the turn of the century demanded major reform in the Chinese government. K'ang and his party were outlawed in China.

¹⁹Tow, pp. 121-122; and U.S. vs. Mrs. Eve Lim, 176 U.S. 459, 1900.

²⁰Coolidge, p. 286; and Tow, pp. 121-122.

one ask wives and daughters to go to work outside of the household.

In addition to being able to help support themselves, once in this country the teenage sons were frequently able to enroll in public school. The California school system was segregated at this time, but both the fathers and the sons still valued the system of free education here, something not available in China. Besides, on reaching their majority, the sons often managed to secure the right to continue living in the United States.²¹

By the 1920s, a second group of sons had begun arriving in this country as well: the China-born sons of native Chinese Americans. Since Chinese women were in short supply in the United States, some young Chinese American men returned to their parents' homeland to find a wife. If at all possible, they brought their wives back to America with them but in 1924, a new immigration law denied entrance to all Chinese women, no matter what the circumstances.²² This law was liberalized slightly but not significantly in 1930; it was not until 1943 that Chinese Americans were once again truly free to bring their China-born wives into the United States.²³

²¹Interview with Mr. Lim, September 28, 1977; interview with Rev. Mar, October 16, 1978; and Fong Wan, Herb Lore (Oakland: Fong Wan Co., 1950), pp. 1-11.

²²Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 27.

²³Ibid., pp. 27-28.

In the intervening years, many young Chinese American men found they had to establish their families on the other side of the Pacific although they themselves usually made their permanent residence in the United States. Their China-born children were considered native Americans by virtue of their father's citizenship, and once again, the fathers usually asked their sons to join them in the United States once the sons were twelve or fourteen.²⁴

A final group of sons to make the crossing were the so-called "paper sons." Many families in southern China desired to see their sons go to America, where they imagined better economic and possibly also educational opportunities awaited them. On the whole, Chinese here and in China felt that Chinese Exclusion was completely unjust, and they did not feel under any real moral obligation to honor it. Accordingly, the practice developed of locating a sponsor in the United States who, for a certain sum of money, would declare such-and-such, a young boy in China to be his son, thereby enabling the boy to surreptitiously enter this country.²⁵

American officials early became aware of the fact that a number of the teenage boys entering this country were adopting this extra-legal fashion to do so, and became even more

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 15-16 and 27-28; interview with Mr. Gee, August 18, 1978; and interview with Mr. Chew, April 10, 1979.

suspicious of Chinese immigrants and Chinese character. In retrospect, it is impossible to know what proportion of the sons who came over were real sons and what proportion were "paper sons." In the late 1950s, this country began to realize that little was served by hunting down and deporting those who had entered as "paper sons," many of whom had by then lived in this country for twenty, thirty, forty and more years. Accordingly, laws were passed to help them obtain the legal right to remain in the United States and become naturalized citizens, which they did in large numbers.²⁶

Taking together all the merchants, students, educators, diplomats, wives, and several varieties of sons, Chinese immigration to this country between 1883 and 1943 was still very small. Between 1882 and the turn of the century, probably fewer than 500 a year came. By 1900, when more wives were allowed over, the number increased slightly and after 1906, it increased again. By 1910, an average of 1,000 a year were coming over, reflecting an increase in the number of sons. The immigration stayed at approximately this level for the next decade and even beyond.²⁷ In addition to these people, all of whom were new immigrants, several thousand return immigrants entered each year (much as several thousand immigrants, some planning to return, left the country for China each year).²⁸

²⁶ Ibid. (in entirety).

²⁷ Tow, pp. 39-40.

²⁸ Anna Coxie Toogood, "A Civilian History of GGNRA" (unpublished manuscript, Archives of the Golden Gate National

It was not until World War II that Chinese immigration to the United States began slowly to increase again. Repeal of Chinese Exclusion in 1943 only allotted Chinese an annual quota of 105, but two laws passed between 1945 and 1947 made it possible for several thousand Chinese women, married or engaged to United States citizens, to enter the country and in 1948, many refugees from the advancing Communist armies were permitted to come as well. More such laws were passed after 1949, but they are beyond the scope of this study.²⁹ The effect of all of them was to increase the number of Chinese passing over the park's waters to take up residence in the United States.

B. Vessels and Cargo Consigned
to Chinese, S.F.-China-S.F.

The majority of these immigrants as well as those returning to China made the trip to and from San Francisco on American owned ships. By far the most important carriers in this trade were the steamers of the Pacific Mail Steamship

Recreation Area), pp. 458-459. Her figures only include the number of immigrants given a physical exam at the Angel Island Immigration Station. Since all Chinese entering this country were given some sort of physical exam--see letter from K'ang Yu-wei to President Theodore Roosevelt, January 30, 1906--all Chinese, new and returning, would be included in her figures. Furthermore, some non-Chinese also entered at Angel Island and were examined such as East Indians (by 1914) and Japanese "picture brides" (by 1912); Toogood, pp. 459-463.

²⁹Chinn, Lai, and Choy, pp. 28-29.

Company, followed by those of the Occidental and Oriental Steamship Company.³⁰ In the years prior to 1867, however, ships of many nationalities made the trans-Pacific crossing and in the 1850s, British bottoms were dominant while French, German, and Norwegian ships were not uncommon.³¹ Even a few Chinese vessels arrived carrying immigrants, such as the junk the Whang Ho and two Chinese lorchas, all three of which arrived in 1849. Another junk came from China in 1850.³²

Vessels owned by Chinese in these early days were definitely in the minority, but they still performed an important function. In addition to the above-mentioned Chinese-made vessels, in the 1850s Chinese both in San Francisco and Hongkong bought Western-made ships to take goods and Chinese passengers across the Pacific. For example, on June 1, 1853, the San Francisco Daily Alta (ignoring the earlier craft I already mentioned) reported that the first Chinese-owned ship had just arrived in San Francisco harbor. She was probably American-built. Named the Hamilton, her owner was Ton Key and her master, Captain Keller.³³

³⁰Theodore Hittell, p. 432; and Hubert Howe Bancroft, The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft, v. 24 (Santa Barbara: Wallace Heberd, 1970), pp. 128-129.

³¹Barth, pp. 60-62.

³²Hubert Howe Bancroft, The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft, v. 23 (Santa Barbara: Wallace Heberd, 1970), p. 167; and Felix Riesenberd, Jr., Golden Gate: The Story of San Francisco Harbor (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1940), p. 81.

³³Barth, p. 60.

In September of the same year, a Chinese merchant who resided in San Francisco purchased the 450-ton Potomac for \$5,000, then spent another \$10,000 making her thoroughly seaworthy. He hired a captain and crew to sail her to Hongkong, where he sold her for the disappointing sum of \$15,000. Her new owners, also Chinese, used her to bring Chinese immigrants to San Francisco; on one voyage, more than 500 were aboard.³⁴

Some Chinese, rather than lay out the large sum of money needed to purchase a ship, adopted the practice of chartering one instead. In October of 1853, A Choo of San Francisco chartered the Gazelle, hired an American captain and crew, and booked 350 Chinese passengers aboard her for the San Francisco-Hongkong run. Two years later, one of San Francisco's Chinese companies chartered a French ship, the St. Germain, to take other laborers back to Hongkong.³⁵

Conditions on these and all other non-steam craft, no matter who owned, operated, or chartered them, were very rough. The passage could take up to three months (although in the case of clippers, it was more often a case of three or four weeks). As a rule on all ships, clipper or otherwise, Chinese laborers were crowded into the steerage with a minimum of sanitation facilities and practically no privacy. The food was coarse and not always nourishing, although the Chinese-owned and

³⁴ Ibid., p. 61.

³⁵ Ibid.; and San Francisco Herald, October 18, 1855.

chartered ships were probably best in this respect. Arrival in San Francisco did not necessarily improve the situation. Take, for example, the case of the bark Libertad, which arrived in San Francisco from Hongkong in July of 1854.

The Libertad brought with it over 500 Chinese passengers in its steerage section. The crossing had been particularly arduous: because of the length of the voyage and inadequate nourishment, a large proportion of the Chinese passengers had contracted scurvy. One hundred people died before the ship put into San Francisco harbor. At this time, doctors still had fears that scurvy was contagious and on hearing of the deaths on board, they ordered the ship quarantined. For two weeks, the ship stood at anchor off San Francisco and at least forty-six more of her Chinese passengers died. There is no indication from local newspaper sources that any medical supplies or personnel were sent out to her, or even that residents of San Francisco were concerned with the passengers' plight beyond fears that they might pose some kind of health menace to the city. Instead, when the passengers were finally permitted to land, the United States District Court charged the captain of the vessel with bringing too many Chinese immigrants into San Francisco, and the ship was confiscated.³⁶

A few days after the termination of this incident, it was virtually repeated when Chinese steerage passengers on

³⁶Huggins, pp. 6-14.

board the Exchange, which arrived from China on August 11, 1854, were also found to suffer from scurvy. While quarantined in San Francisco Bay, at least thirty-two of her passengers died (sixty-odd had died during the crossing). Once again, after the passengers were allowed to disembark, officials went to the United States District Court, charging the captain with bringing too many Chinese into the city, but the suit was later dropped.³⁷

For many decades, the inhabitants of San Francisco labored under the fear that Chinese immigrants had an inherited tendency toward loathsome diseases. Beginning in 1873, this fear found expression in detailed and humiliating physical exams of all Chinese steerage passengers prior to their leaving ship. By the 1880s, Chinese no longer had to fear quarantine aboard ship. However, all of them were required to stay in the crowded, uncomfortable dock-side shed of the Pacific Mail until they were cleared for entrance into the United States.³⁸ Some passengers were detained in the shed for as long as three months,³⁹ but at least quarantines, if required, could be effected on land. And between 1890 and 1910, first quarantine

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 9-14.

³⁸ Joan B. Trauner, "The Chinese as Medical Scapegoats in San Francisco, 1870-1905," in California History, v. 62, no. 1 (Spring 1978), pp. 75-77; H. M. Lai, "Island of Immortals: Chinese Immigrants and the Angel Island Immigration Station," in California History, v. 62, no. 1 (Spring 1978), p. 90; and Toogood, pp. 396-398.

³⁹ Coolidge, pp. 186 and 295.

then all immigration facilities related to Chinese on the West Coast were shifted to Angel Island, about which I shall have more to say later on.

Just as the Pacific Mail Steamship Company shed represented some kind of a step forward, so regular steamship service was of great benefit to Chinese immigrants. Even after its inauguration in 1867, San Francisco-based Chinese continued to be involved in shipping the immigrants to San Francisco and back. Following the trend of the times, they began chartering steam vessels, usually through the agency of Cornelius Koopmanschap and Macondary and Company. More often than not, they chartered ships to go from San Francisco to Hongkong rather than the other way around, and the cargoes they consigned to these ships were economically just as important as the Chinese passengers they carried.⁴⁰

Other important ways in which Chinese merchants in San Francisco were involved in the immigrant trade from China, especially in the period before 1883, was as the creditors or the agents of creditors who lent many Chinese the money to pay their passage to the United States. In addition, leaders in San Francisco's Chinatown acted as a conduit through which the need for large number of workmen could be relayed back to China, and as the guarantors here in American that Chinese

⁴⁰Barth, pp. 59-60 and 249; and L. Eve Armentrout-Ma, "Big and Medium Businesses of Chinese Immigrants in the United States, 1850-1890: An Outline," in Bulletin (of the Chinese Historical Society of America), v. 13, no. 7 (September 1978), pp. 1-3.

desiring to return to China from San Francisco had paid all their debts in this country. Without a certificate to this effect from San Francisco's Chinese Six Companies, the Pacific Mail Steamship Company and even the later Oriental and Occidental Steamship Company were loath to sell a return ticket to China.⁴¹

Chinese Exclusion in 1882, by drastically reducing the number of Chinese immigrants, also cut down on Chinese businessmen's involvement in chartering ships to carry the immigrants, although it seems likely that for a while, the ships they chartered to take goods back to China continued to carry returning Chinese as passengers. In 1918, however, a number of Chinese and Chinese American entrepreneurs in this country, including Liu Hsing (Lew Hing), Look Tin Eli, and Fong Wing, organized the China Mail Steamship Corporation, which operated three large ocean liners between San Francisco and Hongkong with a stop-off in Hawaii. In the year 1922 alone, it carried several thousand Chinese between this country and China.⁴² The Depression that began in 1929 put an end to this concern, however, and also to any significant involvement by Chinese in providing the shipping

⁴¹Coolidge, p. 410; and Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 15.

⁴²Tow, pp. 86-87, 158; Hart H. North, "Chinese High-binder Societies in California," in California Historical Society Quarterly, v. 27, no. 1 (March 1948), p. 21; Archives of Incorporation of China Mail Steamship Corporation, May 25, 1918; and Certificate of Increase of Bonded Indebtedness of China Mail Steamship Corporation, September 24, 1920. The China Mail Steamship Corporations ships were the S.S. China, Nanking, and Nile.

facilities for Chinese immigrants and return passengers.

As already suggested above, Chinese merchants were at least as deeply involved in the transfer of goods between San Francisco and Hongkong as they were in the transportation of Chinese. Prior to the turn of the century, there were twenty to thirty Chinese import-export firms in San Francisco, some of which were worth \$500,000. They registered on the San Francisco Merchants Exchange and were highly respected by local merchants.⁴³ A lively trade existed between San Francisco and Hongkong-Canton; in fact, up until at least 1880 China was the third largest foreign market for San Francisco. Around the turn of the century, the construction of the Panama Canal, growth of other Pacific Coast ports, and other factors reduced the volume of this trade. Still, the goods that passed through the golden gate on their way to and from China were worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, and some of the trade was still handled by Chinese and Chinese Americans.

In financial terms, the most important products to enter the port of San Francisco from China between 1850 and 1880 were tea, silks, rice, opium, and sugar. The most important

⁴³Armentrout-Ma, "Big and Medium," pp. 2-3; and Coolidge, p. 411. Four of these big import-export firms were the Chi-lung hao (濟隆號), Te-hsiang hao (德祥號), the Szu-ho hao (泗和號), and the Yung ho-sheng hao (永和生號). See Ow Yuk, Him Mark Lai, and P. Choy (Eds.), A History of the Sam Yup Benevolent Association in the United States, 1850-1971 (Lü-Mei San-i tsung hui-kuan chien-shih) (San Francisco: Sam Yup Benevolent Ass'n., 1975), p. 143.

exports from San Francisco to China were treasure (gold and silver), flour, ginseng, mercury, and dried seafood (fish, squid, abalone, shrimp and the like).⁴⁴ Most of the silk was contracted by Americans here and sold to Americans. Much of the tea was as well (imported at the rate of \$1,500,000 annually in 1873), although Chinese merchants in San Francisco brought in a reasonable proportion of it to sell to their fellow immigrants in this country.⁴⁵

The rice, on the other hand, was intended primarily as food for Chinese in America, and its import was handled almost exclusively by Chinese merchants here. In the 1850s, some \$348,000 of rice came into San Francisco from China each year. It was the single largest import into California at that time. By 1875, it had risen to over a million dollars annually.⁴⁶ Opium, the smoking of which did not become illegal in California until 1881, was imported by both Chinese and Americans. At first, its principal market was the Chinese community but gradually, more Caucasians acquired the taste, a state of affairs which led lawmakers and police to take drastic action

⁴⁴ Armentrout-Ma, "Big and Medium," pp. 1-4; Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1147; and George Brown Goode (ed.), The Fisheries and Fishery Industries of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1887), see 5, v. 2, pp. 622-626 and 807-810.

⁴⁵ Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1147.

⁴⁶ Armentrout-Ma, "Big and Medium," p. 2; and Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1147.

against it.⁴⁷ In 1873, some \$858,073 worth of opium entered the port of San Francisco from China.⁴⁸

Many writers and nineteenth-century politicians have commented on the huge amounts of treasure shipped from the United States to China through the port of San Francisco.⁴⁹ Treasure was, indeed, the leading export from about 1851 through the mid-1880s, roughly the period in which California was a big center for gold and silver mining. In 1873 and 1874, for example, over \$6,000,000 of treasure left San Francisco for Hongkong. However, it has erroneously been assumed that all this treasure came from Chinese miners and that the amount of treasure shipped to China was disproportionately large when compared to that shipped to other countries--in other words, Chinese miners in California have long been portrayed as steadily draining the state of its real wealth, its gold and silver.

In fact, in addition to China, tens of thousands of dollars of treasure was sent to the eastern United States, to Europe, and to other places. Furthermore, much of that which went to China was not sent by Chinese. Some simply passed

⁴⁷ Senate of the State of California, Chinese Immigration: The Social, Moral, and Political Effect: Testimony (1876) (Sacramento: Government Printing Office, 1976), pp. 46-49.

⁴⁸ Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1147. I might also mention that Chinese prostitutes in a state of bondage were illegally imported from China, but not at a level to characterize it as "big business."

⁴⁹ See Barth, Saxton, and William B. Farwell, The Chinese at Home and Abroad (San Francisco: William B. Farwell, 1885).

through Hongkong on its way to India and Japan--but in the records kept in San Francisco, its destination was listed as "China." In addition, large quantities of treasure were exported by banks.

To give an example for which the figures are readily available, toward the end of the year 1885, the steamer Rio de Janeiro left San Francisco for Hongkong on a regularly scheduled run. She carried \$438,818.44 in treasure aboard bound for "China." Of this \$438,818.44, only \$23,125.40--or about 5%--was sent by Chinese. Most of the rest belonged to three large banks: Comptoir L'Escompte de Paris, the English concern called the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank, and the Anglo California Bank. Furthermore, of the total amount of treasure aboard the ship listed as being bound for China, almost half was for re-shipment to Yokohama or Bombay once it had arrived in Hongkong.⁵⁰

A significant proportion of the treasure that Chinese miners sent to San Francisco for their families back in south China never crossed the Pacific. This is not because it was stolen, but because the community leaders to whom the miners entrusted its care and trans-Pacific transportation discovered they could use the treasure to purchase wheat flour, have the flour shipped to China, sell it there at a profit and use the miners' share of the profit to purchase silver. The silver

⁵⁰ Fred A. Bee, The Other Side of the Chinese Question: Testimony of California's Leading Citizens: Read and Judge (San Francisco: Woodward, 1886), pp. 68-70, 75.

would then be delivered to the miners' families; and since China was then on the silver standard, this was satisfactory to everyone. In this fashion, the miners' families got what was their due, the Chinese community leaders in San Francisco earned some money, and California wheat acquired a profitable new market.⁵¹ In the 1870s, about \$700,000 worth of wheat annually left San Francisco for Hongkong as part of this transaction.⁵²

Two other products exported to China in large quantity from San Francisco were ginseng and mercury. Ginseng is a root that grows wild in North America. Most Chinese believe it improves the health, promotes longer life, and increases virility. In the 1870s, on the average of \$400,000-\$500,000 worth of ginseng went to China from San Francisco, most of which was handled by Chinese import-export houses in San Francisco. The mercury exported to China, much of which came from the New Almaden Quicksilver Mines near San Jose (a mine heavily reliant on Chinese labor), rose from about \$90,000 in value in 1873 to \$900,000 in 1975. Here again, the exporters were primarily Chinese merchants in San Francisco.⁵³

⁵¹Armentrout-Ma, "Big and Medium," pp. 2-4.

⁵²Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1147; and Chinese Six Companies, Memorial: An Address to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States (San Francisco: Chinese Six Companies, 1877), pp. 26 and 41-42.

⁵³Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1147; and Armentrout-Ma, "Big and Medium," pp. 1-4.

A final major export to China that passed through San Francisco in the years prior to 1880 was dried seafood. Beginning in 1852, Chinese in California caught tons of fish and by 1860 they were also bringing in shrimp, abalone, and the like. Most of their catch had no local market, so the fishermen dried it. Almost all of the dried product was exported to China via San Francisco through the agency of Chinese import-export firms. No very exact figures are available for the value of this export. Between 1875 and 1880, it seems to have run between \$400,000 (the figure given in 1876 by a customs official in San Francisco) and \$4 to \$5 million (1879 figures derived from federal and state fish and game officials).⁵⁴ Following only the federal fish and game department estimates, we would get a figure of about \$1.5 million.⁵⁵

Between 1880 and the turn of the century, the import-export picture changed somewhat. Mining activity in the United States began to decline (including not only gold and silver, but also mercury from the New Almaden Quicksilver Mines). This helped cut off the treasure flow to China as well as the business in mercury. California made opium smoking illegal, which cut down on opium as an import. Chinese immigration plummeted in 1883 and in subsequent years a steady stream of

⁵⁴ Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1147; Goode, see 5, v. 2, pp. 622-626, 807-810; and Coolidge, p. 73.

⁵⁵ Goode, see 5, v. 2, pp. 622-626, 807-810.

Chinese left this country to return to their native land, lessening the demand for rice. In the meantime, the export of dried seafood to China out of San Francisco increased, as the catch increased. To the seafood was added abalone shells, used in jewelry and inlay work, but most of these were exported by American firms.⁵⁶

Not surprisingly in view of the above, San Francisco's Chinese import-export houses lost much of their share of the China trade during these years. Obstacles to travel imposed by Chinese Exclusion and a major social and economic conflict in America's Chinese community cut further into the ability of the large Chinese firms to retain their earlier dominant position. The export of textiles to China replaced and far surpassed the position that treasure had once occupied, but most of these textiles were handled by Americans and did not even pass through San Francisco.⁵⁷ Until 1885, Chinese firms continued to be responsible for almost 90% of the exports to China that passed through the golden gate, but after that their share declined steadily. The Chinese firms continued to import rice, tea, and other foodstuffs (in smaller quantities than before) and exported dried seafood and ginseng (ginseng to the tune of \$1 million in 1885). In addition, some opium was imported and

⁵⁶ Armentrout-Ma, "Big and Medium," pp. 1-4; and Armentrout-Ma, "Chinese in California's Fishing," pp. 8-11.

⁵⁷ Coolidge, pp. 481-482.

some salt exported on the black market.⁵⁸

Between the turn of the century and 1937, the picture changed yet again. Almost all of the former items of import and export which had been connected with Chinese here and had passed through GGNRA's waters disappeared from the market. In 1905, California disallowed the exporting to China of dried shrimp and between 1890 and 1910 instituted other laws that drove Chinese out of abalone fishing.⁵⁹ This eliminated the exporting of dried seafood. A campaign against opium smoking in the Chinese community virtually eliminated the market for that product.⁶⁰ As the size of the Chinese community shrank--it reached its lowest level around 1920, by which time 40% of it consisted of native-born Americans⁶¹--the demand for rice continued to decline, and Texas and Louisiana rice gradually took over the remaining market.

The "new" exports--textiles, other manufactures articles and, increasingly, machinery for a modernizing nation--were handled by Americans. Another major "export" from America to China became capital: loans from American banks to the

⁵⁸Bee, p. 75; interview with Ben Hoang, June 16, 1978; and Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 67.

⁵⁹Robert Nash, "The Chinese Shrimp Fishery of California" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973), pp. 133-139.

⁶⁰Kwok Won Yat Po (國語日報), April 22, 1908; and Armentrout-Ma, "Chinese Politics," p. 422.

⁶¹Tow, p. 44; and Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 23.

various governments that came and went in north China. The lending activity centered in New York, however, and was not handled by Chinese.

The principal imports from China during this period, tea and silks, were also largely in the hands of Americans. Having lost their old markets without acquiring new ones, most of San Francisco's older Chinese-owned import-export firms died out. A few new ones were organized after the turn of the century, but these were for the most part located in the eastern United States. San Francisco had probably less than half a dozen. None of these new firms operated on as grand a scale as had their predecessors.⁶² Indirectly, Chinese here still played a role in the import-export business. Many American firms hired Chinese here to be managers and agents for the China trade, Chinese businessmen in San Francisco and New York organized companies to underwrite goods bound for China, and the China Mail Steamship Company acted as a principal carrier of goods and passengers between San Francisco and China between 1918 and 1929.⁶³ However, Chinese lost the direct role they formerly played in the San Francisco-China trade.

The final ten-odd years under consideration (1937-1949) was a time of war in China. Ever since 1911, first the

⁶²Tow, pp. 157-158. Two of the largest of these new firms, both located in San Francisco, were the Chinese Trading Company and the Oriental Company.

⁶³Tow, pp. 83-88, 158.

Chinese revolution of 1911, then the Warlord Period in China (1915-1927), and finally the Japanese take-over of Manchuria and harrassment of northern China beginning in 1931 occasioned periodic armed conflict. In 1937, war broke out on a much larger scale when Japan launched a full-scale attack on China. This was the beginning of World War II for China. Almost as soon as the latter conflict ended in 1945, China was thrown into a bloody civil war between the Communists and the Nationalists, which led to the Communist take-over of mainland China in 1949 when the Nationalists retreated to Taiwan.

During this war-time period from 1937 to 1949, the chief exports from the United States to China were war materiel and war relief supplies. (Imports were minimal during this period.) Much of the war materiel and relief supplies passed through the golden gate, but only the war relief had a direct connection to Chinese here and hence, to Chinese in GGNRA. In 1973, when Japan launched her full-scale attack on China, the Chinese community in the United States organized a society called the China War Relief Association (Chiu-kuo hui), whose aim was to funnel aid to China. Headquarters of this organization were in San Francisco, and members included all the Chinatown associations as well as the Chinese churches and Chinese American Citizens Association. Some parts of the China War Relief Association concentrated on instructing the American public as to the severity of China's plight and persuading the United States to render aid to China. (For part of this effort,

thousands of Chinese and Chinese Americans picketed ships docked in San Francisco which were loading scrap iron to sell to Japan.)⁶⁴ Other parts of the association made direct contributions to the war effort.

The Chinese American Citizens Association dedicated their greatest efforts for the China War Relief Association toward providing medical relief supplies to China. They also arranged for foodstuffs to be sent to the war-torn areas. They were responsible for shipping hundreds of pounds of medicine, bandages, and the like from San Francisco to China.⁶⁵

C. Miscellaneous

In addition to their involvement in San Francisco's shipping and in travel between San Francisco and China, there are other important ways in which Chinese have been connected with the maritime aspect of GGNRA's history. Tens of thousands of Chinese--possibly as many as 100,000 over the years--worked on the steamships involved in San Francisco's coastal and China trade. Most of them hired out of Hongkong although a few came from San Francisco. They worked as boatswains, seamen,

⁶⁴Interview with Ira Lee, January 16, 1978. (Mr. Lee is a former officer of the China War Relief Association.)

⁶⁵Ibid. In gratitude for this and other forms of help provided by the Chinese community in the United States, the Chinese government worked diligently to persuade this country to end Chinese Exclusion, which was effected in 1943.

firemen, porters, bakers--almost all the posts on the ships except in the officer rank. They were reputed to be excellent crewmembers, and coming straight from Hongkong would accept wages lower than what was demanded by white sailors in the United States--hence, their desirability.⁶⁶

The Pacific Mail Steamship Company relied exclusively on these Chinese crews for their trans-Pacific passage from 1867 when it inaugurated steam service to China until 1915. The company also used many Chinese in their coastal runs from Panama to Alaska. The Oriental and Occidental Steamship Company relied on Chinese at least up until 1883. After 1815, legislation discouraged shipping companies from using Chinese, even if they were resident in the United States. For the most part, after that date, any Chinese or Chinese Americans hired were used as ship's cook, or steward, especially on the Dollar Lines.⁶⁷ Even the largely Chinese-owned China Mail Steamship Company did not use Chinese crews,⁶⁸ both because of the legislation and because the seaman's and longshoreman's unions in San Francisco (home port of the China Mail ships) were strong enough to prevent it.

⁶⁶ Robert J. Schwendinger, "Chinese Sailors: America's Invisible Merchant Marine, 1876-1906," in California History, v. 62, no. 1 (Spring 1978), pp. 58-69.

⁶⁷ Ibid., and interview with Robert J. Schwendinger, November 10, 1979.

⁶⁸ The only crew lists remaining from the China Mail ships are three from the S.S. Nanking. There is every reason

I have several times mentioned the Pacific Mail Steamship Company's coastal service from Panama to Alaska. One of the most lucrative of these runs was the one from San Francisco to Oregon, Washington, British Columbia, and Alaska in the beginning of April; and from Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon to San Francisco at the end of August. This was when the Pacific Mail took Chinese workers to and from the great salmon canning centers of the north Pacific.⁶⁹

Chinese were first engaged as canners in this important industry in 1871. Thousands were employed each year--over 3,000 just for the Columbia River canneries in 1881. With the passage of Chinese Exclusion their numbers began to decrease but in 1907, one third of the salmon cannery workers in Alaska (or about 2,200) were still Chinese. After this date, the work force in Alaska continued to grow while the number of Chinese employed continued to decrease, so that by 1934, there were only 872 Chinese out of a total of 13,716 employed.⁷⁰

Over the years, Chinese canners were employed as fish cutters and foremen (relatively high-paying jobs) and as ordinary canners (a low-paying job drawing \$1.00 for a 10-11 hour work day in 1880). Most of the Chinese workers found

to believe these crew lists were typical, and they did not include any Chinese. See National Archives and Records Service, San Bruno branch (information supplied by the archivist, Robyn Gottfried).

⁶⁹Chinn, Lai, and Choy, pp. 41-42.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 42.

their jobs through a Chinese contractor in San Francisco. Some came out of Portland, Seattle, or Vancouver. They were housed on company land and fed with company food--both of which were often of poor quality--and bought their supplies at the often expensive company store. Unionization of the salmon canning industry in the mid-1930s resulted in the final exclusion of Chinese workers from the canneries.⁷¹

In addition to these thousands of cannery workers going out of San Francisco on the Pacific Mail ships in the spring and returning in the late summer, ordinary Chinese travelers passed the golden gate bound for various points along the west coast. Most of the west coast's Chinatowns were built up by Chinese travelers out of San Francisco. In at least one case, a Chinatown was depleted in this fashion: at the height of the anti-Chinese movement, the Chinese living in Eureka were driven out by an angry white mob. To escape the wrath of the mob, the Chinese boarded ships bound for San Francisco.⁷²

Another even more depressing case involves Chinese who never were able to set foot in this country, passing into and out of the golden gate on their way from China to Peru. For many decades, Peru imported Chinese to be slaves in the guano beds, and in 1865, one of these slave ships put into San Francisco harbor. A local Chinatown merchant had gotten word that

⁷¹Ibid.

⁷²Wing Hing vs. City of Eureka, March 1889 (case #3948 in U.S. District Court, San Francisco).

his brothers were among those kidnapped in Hongkong and put aboard the slaver. This merchant, along with several other prominent Chinatown merchants, hired lawyers and obtained a writ of habeus corpus to search the slave ship, the Theresa Terry. They were not able to locate the missing brothers in their search but were so appalled by conditions on board and the plight of their fellow countrymen that when they returned to shore, they raised more money to pay the lawyers to obtain an arrest warrant against the captain of the Theresa Terry. By the time they got back to the docks with the arrest warrant, the Theresa Terry had put to sea and a tugboat sent in pursuit was not able to catch her.⁷³

A more cheerful but indirect way in which Chinese have been associated with GGNRA's maritime history is as ship smantlers in the 1850s. Between 1849 and the mid-1850s, thousands of people from all nations took ship for California to join in the gold rush. When the vessels arrived, the passengers almost to a man took off for the mines, and often the sailors as well. By June of 1850, over 300 vessels of all sizes lay abandoned in San Francisco's harbor. Many of these craft were unseaworthy, having been commissioned in the excitement of the moment without too much regard to suitability.⁷⁴

The city of San Francisco, in the meantime, was growing

⁷³Riesenberg, p. 164.

⁷⁴Bancroft, v. 23, p. 167.

by leaps and bounds. Wood was in short supply, as was refined metal. An American named Charles Hare conceived of the idea of stripping down abandoned ships for their wood and metal. The ships came either free of charge or for a very low sum. The stripping down took place at Rincon Point (then technically speaking a United States government reservation). The workmen were Chinese.⁷⁵

By 1885, stripping down these ships had become big business. It took a Chinese crew only a few days to demolish one vessel. In some cases, Chinese entrepreneurs would purchase the ship and make the profits, but most often Caucasians were the ones on the business end, especially Charles Hare. Toward the end of the 1850s, however, the lack of abandoned and worthless ships put an end to the whole operation.⁷⁶

D. Chinese Fishermen off GGNRA

Almost all of what I have recounted so far has been related to people and goods in transit into and out of San Francisco who during their travels crossed over GGNRA territory. Chinese fishermen resident in California had what can perhaps be termed a more stable relationship with the park's land and coastal waters. Chinese have fished or gathered

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 168; and Robert E. and Nancy L. Olmstead, San Francisco's Waterfront: Report on Historical Cultural Resources (San Francisco: Techni Graphics, 1977), pp. 282-28311.

⁷⁶Ibid. (both of the above).

seafood from GGNRA waters almost continuously from 1851 until the early 1940s. While no major Chinese fishing villages were located on the park's land, quite a number were located within one or two miles of the park.⁷⁷

One of the large and lucrative fisheries with which Chinese have been closely associated is the abalone fishery. Chinese were the first people in California to take abalone on a commercial basis and were the only ones to do so until about 1880. The earliest recorded instance of their gathering abalone in this state was in 1856.⁷⁸ By the mid-1870s, they were taking them off the rocky coast of southern Marin County and elsewhere along the park's shore. Chinese continued to fish for abalone in GGNRA's territory until about 1890.⁷⁹

Prior to 1880 or thereabouts, Chinese fished for abalone only in order to obtain the meat, but by 1881 they had discovered a ready market for the shells existed as well. The meat, of course, was eaten, although prior to the turn of the century few people in California, outside of Chinese and

⁷⁷ Three of the largest fishing village complexes in the San Francisco Bay Area were located at Point San Pedro in eastern Marin County (today's China Camp and McNear's Beach), Hunter's Point off South San Francisco, and Rincon Point under today's Bay Bridge.

⁷⁸ Letter from John Bautista Rogers Cooper to Thomas Oliver Larkin, June 22, 1856, in George P. Hammond (Ed.), The Larkin Papers, v. 10 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964), p. 283.

⁷⁹ Goode, sec. 5, v. 2, pp. 622-626; and Philip L. Weaver, Jr., "Salt Water Fisheries of the Pacific Coast," in Overland Monthly, v. 20 (1892), pp. 149-163.

Indians, had learned the delights of eating it. As a result, most of what the Chinese fishermen caught could not be marketed fresh. Instead, the fishermen dried and salted it. Some of the dried, salted product went to Chinese settlements in the interior of the United States and to the many camps of Chinese railroad builders in California and elsewhere. The rest was shipped through San Francisco's Chinese wholesalers to Chinese communities in British Columbia and Hawaii, and especially to China itself. All of the abalone shell gathered around San Francisco seems to have been exported as well, usually through American firms who sold it to the three big markets of China, Europe, and the eastern United States. Eventually, the shell wound up as jewelry or inlay work.⁸⁰

Abalone were very plentiful on the rocky sections of the park's coast and even on some beaches. In the early 1870s, for example, the builder of the nearby North Pacific Coast Railroad noted that abalone of all kinds and sizes covered the beaches at Tomales Bay, just north of the park's boundaries.⁸¹ A tiny colony of Chinese abalone fishermen had set themselves up at Tomales Bay by 1877 to take advantage of this situation. There were only four fishermen at the time the colony gained the attention of Americans, and they all lived together in a

⁸⁰Goode, sec. 5, v. 2, pp. 622-626; and Armentrout-Ma, "Chinese in California's Fishing," pp. 8-11.

⁸¹Gilbert H. Kniess, Redwood Railways (Berkeley: Howell-North, 1956), pp. 68-72.

single cabin. Their notoriety stemmed from a quarrel between two of the fishermen, Chung Hing-Hoot and Lew Wong. In July of 1877, Chung and Wong exchanged words over the fishing, but apologies were made and the matter seemed to have come to an end. A few days later, however, without any warning Chung took out a pistol and shot Lew. Lew died instantly and Chung buried him secretly, but the third fisherman observed the murder and reported it, with the result that Chung was brought to trial, convicted, and executed in January of 1878.⁸²

Since these abalone fishermen only came to the attention of Americans because of the murder, it is fair to assume that other, less sanguinary colonies of Chinese abalone fisherman existed within the park's Marin County boundaries and possibly on the San Francisco side as well without having excited written comment. In partial support of this contention we have the 1880 federal fish and game report that Chinese collected "much" abalone on the rocks near San Francisco. In addition, Chinese fishermen with ocean-going junks visited rocky islands all up and down the coast of California (including those off San Francisco and Marin counties) taking abalone. Chinese junks also brought some of the abalone they had caught off southern California directly to San Francisco through the golden gate to sell to wholesalers involved in the import-export

⁸²J. P. Munro-Fraser (Ed.), History of Marin County, California (Petaluma: Charmaina Burdell Veronda, 1972 reprint), pp. 249-250.

business. (More of the abalone was brought to San Francisco by American coastal vessels.)⁸³

It may seem a simple matter to collect abalone from coastal rocks and beaches, but in fact it is not. Abalone are very strong, and if they grab tightly onto the rocks, it is next to impossible to remove them. To gather them, the fisherman must approach them when they are in a relaxed condition and scoop them up before they have time to react. Even then, it is tricky work since the abalone have fast reflexes. To illustrate this, there is a tale (perhaps apocraphal) about a Chinese fisherman who came up behind an unsuspecting abalone and tried to pick it up with his bare hands before the abalone could grab onto the rocks. Before he could get the abalone up, the animal anchored itself down, holding onto the fisherman as well as the rock. The fisherman was unable to free himself and the abalone held him there for the next six hours, until the tide came in and drowned the fisherman. To circumvent this kind of problem, the Chinese abalone fishermen devised a special hook with which to pry the abalone up.⁸⁴

In addition to abalone, Chinese fishermen off GGNRA territory caught fish. Some of this fish was caught by fishermen on ocean-going junks. These junks had shore headquarters from San Diego up the coast to near San Simeon and on several

⁸³Goode, sec. 5, v. 2, pp. 622-626..

⁸⁴Ibid.

of the Santa Barbara Islands. The San Francisco area was the northern limit of these fishermen. Oral tradition holds that they had an anchorage at Phelan Beach (once popularly known as China Beach). This same tradition says the fishermen lit large bonfires at night on the beaches, exciting much comment from shore observers, who thought perhaps they were pirates.⁸⁵

Other Chinese fishermen off GGNRA were the crews on sampans and bay fishing junks who regularly exploited San Francisco and San Pablo bays. These fishermen, especially prior to the bay shrimping boom which began around 1870, fished both the bay and the golden gate headlands on the ocean side. Chinese were the first to engage in commercial fishing in this area, starting with a fishing village they constructed no later than 1851 at Rincon Point directly underneath today's Bay Bridge. By January of 1852, this village boasted 150 fishermen and had twenty-five fishing craft ranging from dinghies to sampans. The fishermen built both the village and the craft themselves out of local redwood. In 1852, they were catching 3,000 pounds of fish daily, principally smelt, herring, sturgeon, rays, and sharks.⁸⁶

It would be well at this point to say a few words

⁸⁵Weaver, pp. 162 and 149; and Gladys Hansen (ed.), San Francisco: The Bay and Its Cities (New York: Hastings House, 1973), p. 291.

⁸⁶Chambers' Journal, v. 1, no. 4 (January 21, 1852), p. 48.

concerning the craft used by the Chinese fishermen over the years. They were of two principal types: junks and sampans. In addition, the largest craft had dinghies to take the fishermen from their anchorage to shore. The craft were modeled after what the fishermen had known in China. The junks were the largest, ranging from thirty to sixty feet in length, and having anywhere from one to three masts. One of the distinguishing features of the junks were their high decks. In addition, they had deep keels and anchored center-boards for stability.⁸⁷ In China they traditionally have squared bows and sterns as well, but in this country the qualities of the redwood of which they were built led the fishermen to make the bows and sterns more pointed. The junks had massive rudders which could be hauled up on deck when the craft were moored in shallow water. The fishermen carved triangular holes in these rudders to guard the sailors against evil spirits. The sides of the junks were invariably painted black (the decks were unpainted) and had eyes painted on the prow to enable the craft to see where it was going. They were powered by lanteen sails hung on masts made of iron-wood imported from China, and used stone anchors carved in the shape of a doughnut; the rope went through the "doughnut hole." The largest of these craft were fast, sturdy, and very seaworthy. They were quite capable of crossing the Pacific, and on occasion did so.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ Interview with Donald Cho (former junk builder), November 8, 1979.

⁸⁸ Armentrout-Ma, "Chinese in California's Fishing," p. 9.

In California, these junks were put to two kinds of uses: some were fishing vessels and others were used for transport. The fishing vessels were normally either two or three masted. Home villages for the junk fishermen using these craft were located in several villages between San Diego and San Simeon, on California's off-shore islands, and along the Sacramento/San Joaquin Rivers. There were also semi-permanent fishing camps located in the same general area, but the fishermen spent much of their time actually living on the junks. The ocean off San Francisco was part of their fishing grounds, and the city's Chinese community provided an important marketing outlet.⁸⁹

Transport junks were usually smaller than the fishing junks. They rarely had more than two masts and often had only one. In addition, the above-water portion of the craft looked almost barge-like, the prow and stern being raised hardly at all. These transport junks were extensively used in the shrimp fishery of the San Francisco Bay area. Shrimp wholesalers took the transport junks to the various shrimp camps to make their purchases, and used the junks to take what they had bought back to San Francisco for shipment to China.⁹⁰ At

⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 8-17.

⁹⁰ Interview with Ben Hoang. There were some periods in which Chinese were denied the right of carrying cargo on the bay weighing more than a certain amount. At these times, American vessels were used to take the biggest catches to market in San Francisco. See "China Camp: Historical Overview,"

various times, Chinese shrimpers sailed from San Francisco Bay out the golden gate to Tomales Bay in order to shrimp in the latter, as I shall discuss below. It is only reasonable to suppose, then, that the transport junks also went out the golden gate from time to time in order to make purchases from the Tomales Bay fishermen.

In addition to junks and dinghies, Chinese fishermen employed great numbers of sampans around San Francisco. Fishermen engaged in bay fishing relied heavily on these sampans. In the 1880s, for example, there were at least fifty operating on San Francisco/San Pablo bays and Chinese shrimpers on Tomales Bay in the late nineteenth century probably worked from sampans as well, rather than junks. Sampans ranged from about ten to twenty-five feet in length. Some had one mast, others had none; a two-masted sampan was a rarity. Those with no mast were propelled by a sculling oar agitated out of the stern of the vessel.⁹¹

As in the case of the junks, the fishermen constructed their own sampans using California redwood. Both junks and sampans, when they used sail, employed the traditional Chinese lanteen sail. At first, the sails with their bamboo stays were

in the California State Department of Parks and Recreation study of China Camp. See also George Epidendio, "The Death of China Camp," in San Francisco Magazine, October 1962, pp. 17-19, and 34.

⁹¹Interview with Ben Hoang; interview with Donald Cho; and Nash, p. 136.

imported from China just as were the masts; later, canvas sails came into general use. The sampans had neither the high decks nor the massive rudders of the junks. Their keels were shallow and their center-boards were movable instead of anchored. They did not have living quarters either, since they were neither suited nor intended for long voyages. Smaller and less sturdy than the junks, they were used on the bays, rivers, and close to the coast, and were not taken on the open sea. Normally, the sampans were not painted, nor did they sport eyes on the prow. For anchors, they used an unworked stone with a rope tied around it; later, they used ordinary iron anchors.⁹²

The fishermen in the Rincon Point village of 1851 only had sampans and dinghies, and the later fishing villages of the San Francisco Bay relied mainly on the same kind of craft. There were, however, a few fishing junks headquartered on the bay as well whose operators lived in the fishing villages. Prior to 1870, the fishermen who lived in these villages were mainly interested in pursuing fish but between 1870 and 1875 they began to devote increasing attention to shrimp. Even at the height of the shrimping, however, they continued to take tons of fish. In addition, some went after large prawns both in the bay and in the ocean between Point Reyes and the Farallones.⁹³

⁹² Interview with Ben Hoang; interview with Donald Cho; and interview with Frank Quan (shrimper at China Camp), January 27, 1979.

⁹³ Goode, sec. 5, v. 2, pp. 807-810.

The shrimp beds, located closer to shore, were fairly well defined. The three closest to GGNRA were a huge one off Point San Pedro in Marin County, a large one off Hunter's Point, and a medium to small one in Tomales Bay. The principal shrimp season was April to September. Within that period, there was a 28-day cycle related to the tides and the phases of the moon. In pursuing the shrimp, the Chinese relied on a long, sock-like net known as the "Chinese bag net," which they anchored to the bottom of the bay. Tide action swept the shrimp--and also many fish--into the net.⁹⁴

The Tomales Bay shrimp grounds is of most interest to us since the sampans had to cross over GGNRA waters in order to reach it. Chinese began shrimping there no later than 1879 and continued until in 1905 legislation forced them to give up use of the "Chinese bag net." Both the laws and the fishing methods later changed, so that in the 1930s and 1940s, Chinese and Chinese American fishermen (by this time using motorized trawlers instead of the traditional sampan and bag net) once again worked Tomales Bay, although they went there mainly when the Point San Pedro shrimping grounds were not producing top catches.⁹⁵

In addition to abalone, fish, and shrimp, Chinese in or near GGNRA obtained clams and crab. They began taking clams

⁹⁴Ibid.; and Nash, pp. 112-115, 237-238.

⁹⁵Interview with Frank Quan; and Nash, pp. 139, 251-252.

in the area no later than 1879 and continued up through the 1940s. A few people became full-time clammers, but in many cases fishermen and shrimpers and their children went clamming during the off-season or during their free time. The principal clam beds were in the southern half of San Francisco Bay, but there were smaller ones around Point Reyes, in Tomales Bay, off Point San Pedro, and the like. The professional clammers developed a "mud-scooter," a redwood board or series of planks which would permit them to scoot along over the mud. These "mud-scooters" were capable of holding up a full-grown man and a hundred-pound sack of clams. Some of the clams were eaten in the fishing camps, but most were sold to other nearby Chinese (such as the railroad workers in Marin County and the inhabitants of San Francisco's Chinatown), peddled door to door, and sold to restaurants in San Francisco and elsewhere around the bay.⁹⁶

Chinese took crabs in much smaller numbers, and they were marketed primarily in the Chinese community. Chinese were almost the only people to take purple and yellow crabs, which they caught in crab nets off the various docks and piers around San Francisco such as Meigg's Wharf, just a few yards beyond GGNRA's boundaries at the Maritime Museum end. In addition, Chinese took some rock crabs along the Pacific coast

⁹⁶ Interview with Frank Quan; and United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries, Report of the Commissioner for 1888 (Part XVI) (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1892), map #16.

in San Francisco and Marin Counties, and would probably have caught a small quantity of the big Dungeness crab in their fishing nets.⁹⁷

At one point, Chinese were very conspicuous on the waters off the golden gate. Take the year 1880: Over 10,000 Chinese immigrants entered San Francisco on steamers from China, a high proportion of all the people who entered California in that year. Other thousands of Chinese boarded ships in San Francisco and passed out of the golden gate on their way back to China, or up to the northern salmon canneries, or as travelers to other ports. Hundreds of Chinese sailors manned these vessels, particularly those involved in the China trade. A large proportion of the valuable cargoes on the ships bound to and from China were consigned to Chinese merchants living in San Francisco (who in turn marketed the cargoes through large Chinese and American firms in this country). Chinese abalone fishermen worked the beaches, rocks, and islands off the GGNRA searching for their quarry, most of which was dried and exported to China through the golden gate. Chinese fishermen (including shrimpers, clammers, and crabbers) in sampans and junks or along the shore and on the wharves were engaged in a similar task.

⁹⁷Goode, sec. 5, v. 2, p. 657; and John S. Hittell, The Commerce of the Pacific Coast of North America (San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft, 1882), pp. 366-367.

Some of these activities continued undiminished on or near GGNRA territory until the mid- or late 1940s, but most had either disappeared altogether or greatly declined. The park's Angel Island became the immigration station, but immigration declined drastically (although there was a slight increase after 1943). Changing markets, the anti-Chinese movement, and intra-community strife cut deeply into the volume and value of the cargoes under consignment to Chinese or Chinese Americans, although the Chinese War Relief Association reversed this trend to a certain extent. Chinese were driven out of the salmon canning industry and Chinese sailors were no longer able to get jobs on vessels that went to the United States. The importance of Chinese fishermen declined drastically in 1905, but there was a revival in the 1930s. Within a decade, however, the gradual disappearance of the shrimp once again lessened Chinese involvement in the fishing industry. In the final analysis, then, the involvement of Chinese in the maritime aspect of GGNRA's history was significant, but temporary.

II. Land-Based Activities

Chinese are perhaps most conspicuous for what they did not do with respect to land-based activities on GGNRA territory. They did not help build the forts, they were not involved in the Panama Pacific International Exposition out by the Great Highway between 1913 and 1917, and they were not dairymen in western Marin County. None settled permanently

on GGNRA land, either, although many lived there temporarily while involved in construction projects and the like.

As laborers and also as marketers and producers of foodstuffs, however, Chinese played a significant role around the land now included in the park's boundaries. On the San Francisco side, Chinese farmed in the countryside next to GGNRA land from the 1850s until about the 1880s, when they were squeezed out. Chinese peddlers sold fish, fruit and vegetables, and dry goods to householders out at Black Point and to other residents in and around GGNRA land, probably including the army installations. Furthermore, they did all the pork wholesaling in San Francisco at a certain period so even the pork bound for residents on the park's land passed through their hands. Hundreds of Chinese worked at Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills, right across the street from today's National Maritime Museum. Others washed clothes at Washerwoman's Lagoon near GGNRA, or worked as cooks and servants at Cliff House and private residences within the park's boundaries.

In addition, one Chinese cemetery was located within the park's boundaries and another was less than a mile away. Chinese as well as others took refuge on Fort Mason directly after the 1906 earthquake and fire. Chinese American soldiers may have passed through the fort on the way to duty in World War II, but this is not certain as I shall discuss below. Some Chinese were imprisoned from time to time on Alcatraz, and thousands of immigrants from China passed through the Angel

Island station. In western Marin County, within or near GGNRA, Chinese worked as butter-makers, and as laborers in Pioneer Paper Mill. More than 1,000 constructed Marin County's North Pacific Coast Railroad in the 1870s, a railroad that at several points crossed into GGNRA territory. Finally, Chinese built wagon roads on and near the park's land, may have worked in the explosive factory near Olema, may have constructed the tunnel out to the Point Bonita Lighthouse, and so forth.

A. San Francisco

When California first became part of the United States, the rapid increase in her population far outstripped the local food supply. Few of the new arrivals took up farming because of the lure of quicker riches in the gold country. As a result, with the exception of beef, California had to import most of her food. These imports tended to be very expensive and of poor quality. Seeing this, some Americans took up grain farming but it was left to the Chinese to launch truck farms. By 1860, Chinese were growing vegetables and small fruit around most of California's towns and cities.⁹⁸ They had by that time been joined by Portuguese and Italians,⁹⁹ but the Chinese were acknowledged to be the most skillful, teaching a number of

⁹⁸John Hittell, p. 236; and Ping Chiu, Chinese Labor in California, 1850-1880 (Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967), pp. 72-78.

⁹⁹Ibid.

farming techniques (such as irrigation and double cropping) to growers of other nationalities.¹⁰⁰ In addition, Chinese farmers seem to have been the most numerous around San Francisco up until the 1880s and their farms were by far the most productive.¹⁰¹

Up until nearly the turn of the century, almost the whole southwestern half of what is now San Francisco was countryside. There were several residences in the Black Point area up until the early 1860s, when the army asserted its control and turned the buildings over to Fort Mason. There was also the expanding garrison at the Presidio. For industry, the area boasted a tannery, a woolen factory at Black Point, Washerwoman's Lagoon around what is now Gough and Filbert Streets, and some dairy farms. The rest was mostly sand dunes and scrub brush, and small farms carved out of reclaimed sand dunes.¹⁰²

Most of the farmers on the latter were Chinese. Since they either leased the land or were tenant farmers, we cannot give the exact location of any of the farms. However, contemporary newspaper accounts and the Polish traveler Henryk

¹⁰⁰ Joseph E. Baker, Past and Present of Alameda County, California, v. 1 (Chicago: S. J. Clarke, 1914), p. 181; and Jack London, The Valley of the Moon (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1916).

¹⁰¹ John Hittell, p. 236; Morley, p. 308; San Francisco Evening Post, September 6, 1877, p. 1.

¹⁰² Morley, p. 308; San Francisco Evening Post, September 6, 1877, p. 1.

Sienkiewicz (author of Quo Vadis) give good descriptions of the methods and results of these farmers' labors. Sienkiewicz noted in 1878 that Chinese farms encircled San Francisco "with one belt of greenness. The . . . labor of the Chinese has transformed the sterile sand into the most fertile black earth. . . . Fruits and vegetables, raspberries and strawberries, under the care of Chinese gardeners grow to a fabulous size. I have seen strawberries as large as small pears, heads of cabbage four times the size of European heads, and pumpkins the size of our wash tub. . . . the whole of San Francisco lives on the fruits and vegetables bought from the Chinese."¹⁰³ By the turn of the century, however, the Chinese farmers had largely disappeared from the countryside around GGNRA, forced out by advancing urbanization and by a determination on the part of white landowners to cease leasing to Chinese. In some cases, they were replaced by Italian and Portuguese farmers.¹⁰⁴

In 1877, a reporter from the San Francisco Evening Post visited a Chinese farm between Twentieth and Twenty-Second Streets near the city hospital to find out how all these small farms were operated. He reported the Chinese farmers raised several crops a year. In addition to farming, they kept

¹⁰³Morley, p. 308.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., and John Hittell, p. 236. Sienciewicz notes that whites in the vicinity of Sacramento had already started refusing leases to Chinese as early as 1873.

ducks and chickens primarily for their own use. For irrigation, they relied on creek water if that were available and if not, they dug wells. Often, they constructed windmills to pump the water through the irrigation channels. A principal source of fertilizer was "night soil."¹⁰⁵ Others have noted that rent for the Chinese could run as high as \$25-\$30 an acre, or one half of the proceeds from the sale of the crops. The average value of these truck farms was \$500.¹⁰⁶

The farmers, consisting of several owner-operators, lived in cabins they constructed in the fields they leased. Normally, they would all live in the same cabin. Their diet consisted of imported rice, the fruit and vegetables they grew, the fowl--and eggs--they raised, fish such as sturgeon that they bought from local Chinese fishermen, and about one hog a month, purchased from a Chinese pork butcher.¹⁰⁷ By 1865, most were selling their crops on the Chinese or white whole-sale markets; occasionally, they sold directly to Chinese vegetable peddlers or retailed the fruit and vegetables themselves.¹⁰⁸

Chinese peddlers appeared in San Francisco in the

¹⁰⁵ San Francisco Evening Post, September 6, 1877, p. 1; and John Hittell, p. 236.

¹⁰⁶ Chiu, pp. 73-79.

¹⁰⁷ Evening Post, September 6, 1877, p. 1.

¹⁰⁸ Chiu, pp. 75-79.

1850s. Originally, the farmers themselves acted as peddlers but by the mid-1860s, peddling had become a full-time business. These peddlers were an important part of San Francisco's marketing structure. In 1870, there were probably nearly 100 and a decade later, 300 specializing in fruit and vegetables. Several hundred more peddled fish and dry goods. They served the entire city, including the area in and near today's GGNRA. They supplied private residences, restaurants, hotels, boarding schools and factories such as Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills (out at Black Point) which boarded their employees.¹⁰⁹ In the early days, they may even have supplied Fort Mason and the Presidio.

In the 1850s and early 1860s, the peddlers and farmers acting as peddlers carried their produce in burlap bags which they slung over their shoulders. Later, some switched to wooden collars which had a wicket basket attached at each end. A decade or so prior to the turn of the century, peddlers who could afford to do so purchased horses and carts. And in the 1920s, many turned to pick-up trucks. During most of the nineteenth century, however, the most common method of transporting the produce was by means of a "ye-hoe" pole: a long bamboo pole balanced on the peddler's shoulders with a basket at each end.¹¹⁰ Each basket could contain about

¹⁰⁹ Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1168; Chiu, pp. 76-77; and interview with Chew Long.

¹¹⁰ Interview with Chew Long; interview with Ethyl Kerns; and London, p. 423.

one hundred pounds of produce.¹¹¹ A nineteenth-century description gives a good idea of the impression they created: "Through residence neighborhoods of the old city passed the colorful figure of the Chinese vegetable vendor in blue cotton blouse and trousers, padded slippers, and a broad hat like an inverted tray of woven bamboo. Over his shoulder he carried a flexible pole, and slung on either end of it, a huge basket overflowing with fresh greens and glowing fruits that bobbed rhythmically to his swinging gate."¹¹²

In addition to fruit and vegetables, Chinese peddlers in San Francisco retailed all of the fish for many decades during the nineteenth century. Chinese dry-goods peddlers, carrying their wares in large wooden cases tied with huge squares of yellow cotton, sold jade, silks, brocades, and carved ivory door to door in the city's wealthiest neighborhoods. Others sold matches, cigars, lace, needles, pins, and even wigs to San Francisco residents of more modest means.¹¹³ At a certain period, Chinese even wholesaled all of the pork in the city.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹Baker, p. 378.

¹¹²Oscar Lewis, San Francisco: Mission to Metropolis (Berkeley: Howell-North Books, 1966), pp. 138-139.

¹¹³Ibid., and Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1168.

¹¹⁴Report of the Joint Committee, p. 228. Chinese wholesale dealers in fruit and vegetables were also important to the city and to a lesser extent to the entire San Francisco Bay Area. They wholesaled fish and other seafood as well, but

As suggested by the above, the peddling business enjoyed some specialization. Peddlers who sold fish did not handle dry goods, those who sold dry goods did not deal in vegetables, and so forth. Routes were worked out by agreement between all the peddlers in one line of goods and were generally not subject to further negotiation. Because of this, the peddler could be sure of earning a decent living and still have money to send back to his family in China and even enough left over for an occasional trip to China. In addition to routes, even the right to peddle might be regulated. For example, from the turn of the century onward (and possibly earlier as well), all of San Francisco's Chinese vegetable peddlers were men surnamed Chao (Chew) who came from the same village in the Hsin-hui (Sunwui) district of southern China; no one else was allowed in the business.¹¹⁵

Fish peddlers probably enjoyed the same kind of organization. They generally visited residential neighborhoods only once a week, usually on Fridays. Business establishments such as Cliff House and Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills would have received more frequent calls. The fish peddlers carried scales with them on their rounds and weighed out the fish for each customer. Some of the fish they sold, of course, came

most of this was for the export market. Chinese also manufactured most of the cigars, shoes, and underclothes in San Francisco in the 1870s and 1880s.

¹¹⁵ Interview with Chew Long.

from local Chinese fishermen via the Chinese wholesale market, but much also came from Italian and other fishermen who worked San Francisco Bay and the golden gate headlands.¹¹⁶

The Chinese fish peddlers were not always allowed to pursue their business in peace. In 1864, for example, Caucasian fish wholesalers pressured the city government into requiring a very stiff licensing fee of Chinese fish peddlers. The fee drove the peddlers out of business, which hurt the Italian and Chinese fishermen as much as the peddlers. Since the city was disinclined to listen to complaints by Chinese, Italian fishermen went on strike and even tried to blockade the port of San Francisco.¹¹⁷ Eventually, the licensing regulation was either ignored or changed so as to permit the peddlers to resume their rounds, and the fishermen's strike was brought to a close.¹¹⁸

Later, city ordinances outlawing "ye-hoe" poles forced Chinese peddlers of all products to turn to wooden collars or to horse-drawn carts, depending on which they could afford. And shortly after the turn of the century, Chinese peddlers began to have competition first from peddlers of

¹¹⁶Lewis, pp. 138-139; Daily Alta, October 7 and 9, 1864, p. 1; Weaver, pp. 149-163; and Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 38.

¹¹⁷Daily Alta, October 7 and 9, 1864, p. 1.

¹¹⁸The California Historical Society has a photograph in its archives showing one of these Chinese fish peddlers (using a horse-drawn cart) dating from the year 1900.

other ethnic backgrounds, then from neighborhood stores, so that after about 1910, we cannot be certain who brought fish, fruit and vegetables, and dry goods to those with residences or businesses on or near GGNRA land.

In addition to the farmers and peddlers, some Chinese were involved in laundry work in or near GGNRA. Chinese men along with Spanish and Indian women washed clothes on a commercial basis at Washerwoman's Lagoon in the 1850s, a lagoon now filled but then located in the area around today's Gough and Filbert Streets.¹¹⁹ And in the twentieth century, Chinese prisoners in Alcatraz were put to work in the prison laundry. The government clothes they laundered were loaded and unloaded on Pier #4 in Fort Mason.¹²⁰ Other Chinese worked as cook, houseboy, gardener, and laundryman for the wealthy families who by the turn of the century had begun establishing residences out by the ocean, on Sutro Heights and the like, next to GGNRA land.¹²¹

More important both numerically and economically,

¹¹⁹Olmstead, plate 3; and Theodore Hittell, v. 3, pp. 425-426.

¹²⁰Steve Heath, "History of Pier #4, Fort Mason, San Francisco, California," in Boathouse Mural (San Francisco: Alvarado School Art Workshop, Inc., 1974); and Helen Bingham, In Tamal Land (San Francisco: Calkins Publishing House, 1906), p. 69, which also tells us Chinese prisoners in San Quentin were put to work in that prison laundry, as well.

¹²¹Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 64; and interview with Chew Long.

hundreds of Chinese worked in Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills located out by Black Point in today's Ghirardelli Square, directly across the street from the National Maritime Museum in San Francisco. Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills was an outgrowth of Pioneer Wollen Mills, California's first, established in 1858 by Herman Heynemann.¹²² From the day it opened its doors, it employed mainly Chinese.¹²³ By 1861, the factory was housed in a brick building and employed over 200 Chinese with an annual payroll of \$100,000;¹²⁴ hourly wages ran from ninety cents to about one dollar, fifty cents.¹²⁵ The employees lived on company property in a dormitory built by the company.¹²⁶ They worked six days a week, usually coming into San Francisco on their day off to spend some time in Chinatown.¹²⁷

Heynemann thought highly of his employees, noting that they were both good workers and peaceable: in 1876, he reported that he had never heard of a fight breaking out in the dormitory, a record he said could not be equalled by factories employing and housing whites. Heynemann was also delighted to find his Chinese employees were good customers of the mill's

¹²²Toogood, p. 133; Olmstead, plate 13; and Six Companies, Memorial, p. 21.

¹²³Six Companies, Memorial, p. 21.

¹²⁴Toogood, p. 133.

¹²⁵Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1211.

¹²⁶Six Companies, Memorial, p. 121.

¹²⁷Senate of . . . California, pp. 46-49.

products, particularly of the woolen blankets that were one of his specialties.¹²⁸ By 1876, Pioneer Mills employed 400 Chinese. At about that time, Heynemann bought out his major competitor, Mission Woolen Mills, a San Francisco factory which employed 300 Chinese and some 250 whites. Heynemann moved Mission Mills out to Black Point, renaming his whole operation Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills. The combined operation was the largest woolen mill in California, with an annual payroll and expenses of \$350,000. In 1878, it had 700 Chinese employees and Heynemann soon added more, replacing most of Mission Woolen Mills' whites with Chinese.¹²⁹ In the early 1880s, however, anti-Chinese forces pressured him into firing all his Chinese employees a few hundred at a time and replacing them with whites.¹³⁰ Then in 1889 the company went broke, undercut by the low prices of east coast workers.¹³¹

The woolen mills was the only major employer of Chinese near GGNRA's San Francisco territory; indeed, it was the only factory in the area for many decades. However, there was one thing which involved even more Chinese in the San Francisco part of GGNRA, and that was a cemetery. In the

¹²⁸Six Companies, Memorial, p. 21.

¹²⁹Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1211; Six Companies, Memorial, p. 25; and John Hittell, pp. 440-441.

¹³⁰Coolidge, p. 274; Royal Commission, p. xxxiii; and John Hittell, pp. 440-441.

¹³¹Toogood, pp. 133-135.

early 1850s, Chinese were buried in an unofficial cemetery near GGNRA in what was then called North Beach. The cemetery, bordered by Powell, Stockton, Chestnut, and Lombard Streets, was dug up on orders of the city fathers in 1854 and turned into residential property.¹³²

Between 1854 and 1870, Chinese were buried along with everyone else in Lone Mountain Cemetery but in 1868, the city decided to build a new city hall on this latter property. Accordingly, other cemeteries were established, one of which, called Golden Gate Cemetery, was run by the city. Originally intended only for the indigent dead, it was located out on the coastal headlands. More cemeteries, located south of the city, catered to the wealthy and the ordinary deceased. Chinese burial practices, however, had long antagonized other San Franciscans, and by 1870 the city fathers decided the Chinese should use Golden Gate Cemetery along with the paupers. From 1870 until 1900, all Chinese who died in San Francisco and many who died elsewhere in California were buried there. In 1900, however, the cemetery was closed on orders of the city fathers. Between 1900 and 1910, the graves and bodies were removed and the area became Lincoln Park, part of today's GGNRA.¹³³

For the thirty-odd years of its existence, the over-

¹³²Theodore Hittell, p. 429 and pp. 434-436.

¹³³Toogood, pp. 632-637.

whelming majority of the people buried in Golden Gate Cemetery were Chinese: some 2,500 by 1876.¹³⁴ Anna Coxie Toogood reports that of the 512 people buried there in the year 1880, 480 were Chinese.¹³⁵ As was usual in their official dealings with Chinese, city officials were not overly concerned with the quality of the service they provided, and the cemetery was poorly maintained. The Chinese Six Companies graded and macadamized a road through the cemetery from the front gates around the whole of the Chinese burial area, but the city never even paved the approach road that led up to the gates. The city let its part of the fencing rot away, although the Chinese kept their fences in good condition and spent considerable sums on other improvements. The city's neglect was such that in 1890 the City Cemetery Keeper reported the cemetery was a civic disgrace.¹³⁶

It was not the totally inadequate maintenance provided by the city that led to the abandonment of the cemetery, however. Instead, it was anti-Chinese sentiment--specifically, Adolph Sutro objected to the proximity of the cemetery to his Cliff House and Sutro Heights. What most disturbed him were the Chinese funerary rites. They were said to be unsanitary, unsightly, disgusting, a health menace, and of course, heathen.¹³⁷

¹³⁴Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1215.

¹³⁵Toogood, p. 633.

¹³⁶Ibid., pp. 633-634.

¹³⁷Ibid., pp. 634-635.

Accordingly, beginning in 1891, Sutro launched a campaign to have the cemetery closed. The army purchased much of the cemetery's land in 1891 and six years later, partly as a result of Sutro's efforts, the city passed an ordinance forbidding further burials in the cemetery. In 1908, the city fathers required that any remaining bodies be disinterred, and in 1910 the land became Lincoln Park.¹³⁸

Before it became a park, the Chinese section of the cemetery was run by some twenty-six Chinatown organizations, each of which had its own plot. There were three major kinds of organizations in Chinatown at that time: regional (or district) associations, clan (or family) associations, and secret society tongs. These organizations cut across each others boundaries, so that a member of a regional association might also belong to both a clan association and a tong, but in general the regional associations were then much larger than either of the other two types. In 1876 there were seven regional associations, loosely joined together by a federation called the Chung-hua tsung hui-kuan; its English name was the Chinese Six Companies.¹³⁹

The Chinese burial grounds as a whole were contracted from the San Francisco city government by the Chinese Six Companies, and major projects involving the whole plot such as

¹³⁸Ibid., pp. 636-638.

¹³⁹Chinn, Lai, and Choy, pp. 64-68.

paving the roadway were carried out under its auspices. Beyond that, however, the Six Companies had little to do with the cemetery. Most of the twenty-six organizations which had burial plots within the Chinese cemetery were divisions of the regional associations, and at least two-thirds of the bodies were buried in regional association plots. Most of the others were interred in family association or tong plots, but a few, either unidentified bodies or the bodies of people who did not belong to any association, were buried in unmarked graves, probably at the Six Companies' expense. Finally, an even smaller number of people were buried in the Chinese Christian plot (located either within or right next to the general Chinese cemetery).¹⁴⁰

In addition to roads and fences, the Chinatown associations which had plots in the cemetery often erected a large shrine or monument on their plot where mourners could conduct part of the funeral ceremony. When the cemetery was turned into a park, most of these were torn down but one still remains: the shrine of the Kang-chow hui-kuan (Kong Chow Benevolent Association) located near the main road not far from today's golf course headquarters building. Although it is not completely

¹⁴⁰ Report of the Joint Committee, p. 1215; Toogood, p. 637; Ow, Lai, and Choy, pp. 126-127, 83, 252-254. When the Joint Committee's informant got out to the Chinese cemetery, some of the markers for the plots had been removed by vandals but most were intact. Markers for individual graves were frequently removed by unfriendly whites. See Ow, Lai, and Choy, pp. 253-254.

intact, what remains is large and imposing (see photo), and the association still has a caretaker for it.¹⁴¹ The association itself is one of the oldest of the Chinese organizations in North America, and for these reasons the shrine is worthy of attention.¹⁴²

The organizations which had burial plots in the Chinese part of Golden Gate Cemetery assigned a committee to maintain their plot and see to the burial of association members with no living relatives in the San Francisco area. Most of the regional associations even spawned sub-organizations whose main function was to see to the burials and cemetery plot. They were also in charge of the removal of bones (ordinarily done after several years of interment) and their transportation back to the proper village in China, where they would find their final resting place.¹⁴³ As we recall,

¹⁴¹Interview with Chingwah Lee, September 1979. The author has visited this shrine.

¹⁴²The Kang-chou hui-kuan was founded in 1852. See L. Eve Armentrout-Ma, "A Question of Defense: Social Organizations in United States' Chinatowns, 1849-1913," (unpublished paper delivered to the national conference of the Association for Asian Studies, March-April 1979), pp. 7-8. The hemlocks around the shrine were also planted by the Kang-chou hui-kuan in the nineteenth century.

¹⁴³This was a very expensive proposition, particularly since those in charge were also expected to travel over the whole of the United States collecting the bodies/bones of association members for reinterment in China. Prior to 1870, a ship was often purchased or leased to take the bodies back. After that date, the bones were placed in trunks which were sent on regularly scheduled ships. Before commencing the operation, association officials would consult a geomancer, who

up until about 1870 the entire body of the deceased was sent back to China (usually after having been buried for a while first), but after that date, San Francisco ordinances required the bodies to be buried and only the bones could later be disinterred and sent back. The cleaning of the bones and their shipment back to China was done quietly and in compliance with city health regulations.¹⁴⁴

The Chinese funerals that led to burial in Golden Gate Cemetery, however, were not necessarily quiet, particularly if the deceased were wealthy and influential. In all cases, the funeral would begin in Chinatown, and the body would go from there out to the cemetery accompanied by a funeral procession. If the deceased were poor, only relatives and close friends would be in the procession. If he lacked even these in the United States, someone from the association would accompany his body. The coffin would be flimsy, it would be carried to the cemetery on a plain, inexpensive horse-cart, and after burying the coffin the mourners would burn a few pieces of funerary "spirit money" and then return to Chinatown.¹⁴⁵

would find an auspicious day for the affair to begin. See Ow, Lai, and Choy, pp. 83, 252-254.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.; and Toogood, pp. 635-636.

¹⁴⁵ Interview with Jeong-Huei Ma (son of a former owner of a funeral home in China), December 3, 1979; interview with Jaw Huan Hsiung, December 3, 1979; Richard H. Dillon, The Hatchet Men: San Francisco's Chinatown in the Days of the Tong Wars, 1880-1906 (New York: Ballantine Books, 1962), pp. 245-248; Pardee Lowe, Father and Glorious Descendant (Boston: Little, Brown, 1943), pp. 267-271; and Betty Lee Sung, Chinese in America (New York: Macmillan, 1972), pp. 88-89.

If the deceased were wealthy and influential, however, almost the whole of Chinatown would show up for the funeral as well, perhaps, as a few Americans. Close relatives of the deceased, especially female relatives (if there were any in the United States) were expected to wail loudly on the way to and from the cemetery. Other women in the funeral procession might also weep. The body, of course, would be in a beautiful coffin surrounded by flowers and travel in a proper hearse. It would often be draped with "blankets" of fine cloth, donated by friends of the deceased.¹⁴⁶

The hearse with the coffin was not at the head of the procession, however. Instead, the first thing would be one or even two Chinese orchestras playing funerary music. Next would come banners in honor of the deceased, contributed by friends (and carried by hired men). After the banners there would be a horse-cart (later, automobile) which displayed a large painting or photograph of the deceased. Buddhist monks or Taoist priests (when available) would walk along beside the cart which had the photograph, chanting sutras and prayers. Next came the hearse and then the relatives, all on foot: male relatives first, then female. After the relatives came the close friends, and after them, everybody else.¹⁴⁷

American onlookers complained of the noise at these funerals. The noise came from the chants of the monks, the

¹⁴⁶Ibid. ¹⁴⁷Ibid.

crying of male relatives and wailing of the women, and from the orchestras, which played music both to and from the cemetery. There might even be firecrackers: if the deceased were very elderly, the firecrackers would honor him. If he were not, they would indicate he was not well liked by all.¹⁴⁸

At the cemetery, the coffin would be buried amid further chants and the mourners would burn "spirit money" and paper figures; the smoke from the burning was supposed to go into the afterlife and provide the deceased with money to spend and servants to wait upon him in the hereafter. (By the same token, after the funeral was over an elaborate, three-dimensional paper mansion and paper horse were often burned for the deceased at his home, to provide him with transportation to the spirit world and a home once he arrived there.) The graveside ceremonies performed, the procession would wend its way back to Chinatown.¹⁴⁹

In addition to funerals, several other ceremonies were performed at the Chinese cemetery. One took place on the anniversary of the person's death for the first few years after he died. Close relatives would go out to the grave to burn "spirit money" and incense, and to bring roast meat and

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. A second often even more elaborate funeral would be performed for the deceased after his bones arrived back in his native village in China. It is obvious that these ceremonies were very expensive. Friends, distant relatives of the deceased, and others would help with the funeral expenses as a token of respect by presenting the bereaved family with a white envelope containing money.

fruit for the spirit to eat. (The meat and fruit, after being offered before the grave, would be taken home and consumed by the survivors since it was reasoned a spirit would only eat the "spirit" of the fruit, and not its mortal flesh.)¹⁵⁰

In addition, every year between the nineteenth day of the second month and the third day of the third month of the Chinese lunar calendar, there was a festival called "Ch'ing-ming." The function of this festival was to get the living to visit with the departed. It was not considered a time of melancholy or dread, but of joy. Living relatives as well as the officials of the funerary associations went out to the grave of the deceased, bringing food, incense, wine, and "spirit money." They would sweep and clean the graves, burn the incense and money, pour three cups of wine out before the foot of each grave, and offer up the food (which later would be eaten in the cemetery.) Occasionally they would also set off firecrackers. And finally, on "Ch'ung-yang chieh" (the ninth day of the ninth month, according to the lunar calendar), association officials went out once again to offer wine and burn incense before the graves.¹⁵¹ These, then, are the practices Adolph Sutro and other San Franciscans found so disturbing, leading to the closure of the cemetery.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.; Ow, Lai, and Choy, p. 83; Sung, Chinese in America, p. 80; and Calvin Lee, Chinatown, U.S.A. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965), p. 67.

Several years after the cemetery was closed, a disaster struck the city which once again brought a fair number of Chinese onto GGNRA's San Francisco territory. In 1906, the great San Francisco earthquake and fire struck. Within hours, most of the city was destroyed, including all of Chinatown. Thousands of people from all quarters of the city took temporary refuge on Fort Mason and the Presidio, including 35,000 on the golf course at Lincoln Park. To facilitate the exodus from the city, the army arranged for free ferry service directly from Fort Mason to Oakland.¹⁵² Some Chinese would have been among the hundreds that took advantage of the service, although most escaped by taking the regular ferry to Oakland that left from the Ferry Building downtown.¹⁵³

For people who were left behind in the city of San Francisco, parts of the Presidio and Golden Gate Park were turned into hospitals. Fort Mason became the relief headquarters, and the army helped provide food, tents, and blankets to the homeless on government lands. Here again, some Chinese were among the thousands who took advantage of this aid, but they did not stay long. Within a day or two of the earthquake, they had departed, most for Oakland and the rest for other Chinese communities throughout California.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵²San Francisco Examiner, April 20, 1906, p. 4.

¹⁵³Chung Sai Yat Po, April 20 and 26, 1906; Hoexter, pp. 203-209; and interview with Ben Hoang.

¹⁵⁴Ibid.; San Francisco Examiner, April 20, 21, and

Many decades later, during World War II, thousands of Americans of all ethnic backgrounds passed through Fort Mason on the way to army duty in the Pacific theater. During August of 1945 alone, some 100,000 young men passed through the fort, as well as a much smaller number of women. Sixty-five percent of all the United States Army personnel sent to fight in the Pacific were routed through Fort Mason as well as vast quantities of war materiel.¹⁵⁵

As several thousand young Chinese Americans as well as Chinese nationals living in the United States were among those drafted or who had enlisted, and as most of these came from California and were sent into the Pacific theater,¹⁵⁶ we would expect to find that hundreds if not thousands of them had passed through Fort Mason, but sources available in California¹⁵⁷ seem to indicate this was not the case. I have consulted a number of Chinese American veterans of World War II

22, 1906; San Francisco Chronicle, April 21, 1906, pp. 1-4; G. A. Cummings and E. S. Pladwell, Oakland . . . a History (Oakland: Grant D. Miller Mortuaries, Inc., 1942), pp. 83-84; and Hoexter, pp. 206-210.

¹⁵⁵ Lawrence Kinnad, History of the Greater San Francisco Bay Region, v. 3 (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing, 1966), p. 413.

¹⁵⁶ LaVerne Bradley, "San Francisco: Gibraltar of the West Coast," in National Geographic, v. 83, no. 3 (March 1943), p. 295.

¹⁵⁷ The San Bruno branch of the federal archives does not have detailed information on the troops passing through Fort Mason in World War II; these records are in Washington, D.C. The museum on the Presidio also does not have any specific information.

including people who are officers in Chinese American chapters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.¹⁵⁸ All say they, and other Chinese Americans about whom they know anything, were not sent through Fort Mason but rather routed through the army base at Monterey. By World War II, the army no longer had segregated units, so these Chinese Americans were mixed in with other Americans (although certain units had more Chinese Americans than others), but there seems to be a definite possibility that as a matter of army policy, Chinese and Chinese Americans were assigned Fort Ord as a point of debarkation for war duty.

B. Angel Island and Marin County

The importance of Chinese to the immigration station on Angel Island is covered in Toogood's study¹⁵⁹ and I have already referred to it several times in this work. In addition, Him Mark Lai,¹⁶⁰ the California State Department of Parks and Recreation, and others either have or are doing more work on the subject. For our purposes here, then, I shall only give a brief outline.

¹⁵⁸I consulted Erwin Chew (officer of Oakland's Chinese American chapter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and a World War II veteran), Him Mark Lai (of the Chinese Historical Society of America), and Rev. Frank Mar (another World War II veteran), and others.

¹⁵⁹Toogood, pp. 391-515.

¹⁶⁰Lai, "Island of Immortals."

In August of 1888, Congress authorized the Treasury Department to build a quarantine and immigration station on Angel Island to handle Chinese immigrants. (The station was not used for processing immigrants until 1910, but prior to that it was used as a medical facility for quarantined Chinese immigrants.) San Francisco's Chinese community vigorously objected to the station in spite of which it was used for thirty years, until 1940. Not long after its opening, other Asians trying to enter this country also began to be processed on Angel Island. Quarters were cramped, wives were separated from husbands, the examining process was arduous and could take months, the food was unappetizing, and in general the station suffered from the lack of respect the immigration officials and general populace felt for Asians. Several thousand Chinese passed through it, many of whom were denied entrance to the United States and sent back to China. Few involved with the station have regretted its passing.¹⁶¹

As for Marin County, there do not seem to have been any significant number of Chinese in or near GGNRA's territory there prior to 1865. In fact, there were probably none at all. But between 1865 and 1870,¹⁶² Chinese began to appear in the region only to pass out of it again around the 1890s. What probably first brought them there were jobs as agricultural

¹⁶¹Ibid.; and Toogood, pp. 391-515.

¹⁶²Toogood, p. 200.

laborers. The fishing and abalone along the coast soon became an added attraction. In the 1870s, hundreds found work constructing the North Pacific Coast Railroad, building carriage roads, and similar projects. A handful worked in Samuel P. Taylor's Pioneer Paper Mill three miles outside of Olema and others found jobs as butter makers in the Point Reyes area. A few more found jobs as domestics for wealthy residents such as the Shafters. In the 1880s, the construction projects were brought to an end and anti-Chinese clubs sprang up to force Chinese out of the county.¹⁶³ By about 1890, there were no more Chinese in the western portion of the county except for occasional fishermen and clammers offshore, and even more occasional Chinese workmen repairing the railroad. After the turn of the century, the railroad repairmen had also disappeared, being replaced with people of other nationalities.

We know almost nothing about Chinese agricultural laborers in western Marin County except their probable presence: general works and contemporary observers all agree that prior to the 1890s, agriculture in California depended almost exclusively on Chinese labor and the Marin County Journal in 1873 confirmed that "every large ranch" of which there were several in western Marin County employed them.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶³ Jack Mason, Point Reyes, the Solemn Land (Inverness, Calif.: North Shore Books, 1972), p. 60; and Marin County Journal, December 24, 1885, p. 3, and February 26 and March 4, 1886, p. 3.

¹⁶⁴ Marin County Journal, March 27, 1873, p. 2; and

Jack Mason tells us that the milkers on Charles W. Howards' dairy ranch--one of the large, well-known butter making ranches on Point Reyes--were Chinese.¹⁶⁵ Presumably they worked on other dairies as well. And Toogood notes that the coastal valley below Olema supported potatoe, barley, and wheat farms which employed several hundred laborers.¹⁶⁶ We would expect some of these laborers to have been Chinese, especially in the case of wheat and barley.¹⁶⁷ Finally, I have already noted that some of those employed as butter makers in the region were Chinese.¹⁶⁸

The largest project in western Marin County in which Chinese were involved, however, was construction of the North Pacific Coast Railroad. This railroad ran from Sausalito up to the Russian River and as its name implies, much of its route followed the coast. Most or all of the track has been torn up now, but highways follow approximately the same route as the railroad once took: Sausalito to San Anselmo going through Corte Madera and Ross, San Anselmo through Samuel P. Taylor State Park (the road there is now called Sir Francis Drake Boulevard), then Lagunitas Creek (called "Paper

Chiu, pp. 79-88.

¹⁶⁵Mason, p. 60.

¹⁶⁶Toogood, pp. 235-240.

¹⁶⁷Most of the potato farmers were Irish, and they preferred to employ other Irish.

¹⁶⁸Toogood, p. 201. Butter making was one of the most

Mill Creek" in those days) to Point Reyes Station. At Point Reyes Station, the railroad followed the coast along what is now Highway 1 at least as far as Ocean Roar. At a certain point, it headed slightly inland and continued on to the Russian River. A spur line going off at San Anselmo brought the city of San Rafael into the system, and a ferry between Sausalito and San Francisco completed the line. Part of the railroad's route along Lagunitas Creek marks the northernmost boundary of GGNRA.¹⁶⁹

The North Pacific Coast Railroad, on which construction began early in 1873, was built to carry tourists, lumber, and butter: lumber from the Russian River area, butter from Point Reyes and its vicinity, and tourists from San Francisco. It was not completely successful in its objectives but did help link the county together, being perhaps of most benefit to the relatively inaccessible western portion of the same. The railroad continued in operation for several decades, well up into the twentieth century.¹⁷⁰

notable industries in the region, especially for Point Reyes. For an interesting description of how it was done, see Toogood, p. 202; Munro-Fraser, pp. 297-301; John Hittell, p. 264; and so forth. On dairying, see Warren, pp. 27-31.

¹⁶⁹ Kneiss, Redwood, pp. 41-54; and California State Automobile Association and Automobile Club of Southern California map of Marin County, no. 2038 (May 1979); and Mason, pp. 73-76, 91, 111-113.

¹⁷⁰ Kneiss, Redwood, pp. 71-78, 41-54. A. Bray Dickenson, Narrow Gauge to the Redwoods (Los Angeles: Trans-Anglo Books, 1970), pp. 66-69, however, notes that the railroad acquired new owners and a new name (North Shore R.R.) in 1902.

It took about 1,300 laborers to build the railroad; all but the supervisors were Chinese. The owners (W. H. Tillinghast and others--by 1875 including Milton Latham) let out the construction contract to a Mr. Grimm, who in turn sub-contracted with Mr. Lemon for the Sausalito to White's Hill (near Fairfax) section, and J. H. Bugbee and Mr. White for the rest.¹⁷¹ These, in turn, hired the laborers and supervisors. The laborers were divided into gangs, each led by a Chinese foreman and overseen by a white supervisor.¹⁷² The general superintendent in charge of construction, a Mr. Low, noted that the laborers were to be accorded decent treatment: an unsatisfactory laborer was to be fired, not beaten. Any supervisor found beating one of the Chinese laborers would be fired. (Several did, and were.) This was in contrast to the policy which prevailed on the Central Pacific's transcontinental railroad, which allowed its supervisors to whip the Chinese workers.¹⁷³

The Chinese laborers were brought to the construction site by covered wagon through San Rafael, and by steamer to Ross Landing (on the bay side) and Ocean Roar (on the ocean side). Many had worked on the transcontinental railroad before hiring out for the North Pacific Coast Railroad. By the

¹⁷¹Marin County Journal, February 20, 1873, p. 3.

¹⁷²Marin County Journal, March 20, 1873, p. 3.

¹⁷³Marin County Journal, October 2, 1873, p. 3.

end of February, 1873, 300 of them were at work on the railroad and in mid-March of the same year, their numbers had grown to 1,050, of which 450 were laboring on the section nearest GGNRA, between White's Hill and the Russian River.¹⁷⁴ By September, the work force totaled 1,300 and thirty miles of the route had been completely graded. Work was stopped a month later except for the tunnel through White's Hill, because the owners had run low on funds and the rainy season was beginning.¹⁷⁵

The following spring, however, the laborers were re-hired and work began again. By early summer, they were laying track at the rate of one mile a day. In June, a construction train was added to the work force, speeding things up considerably. On July 15 of 1874, the spur line to San Rafael reached the outskirts of that city and in early January of 1875, the line officially opened for business, although it was not completed until a little more than a year later.¹⁷⁶

In order to build the railroad, the laborers had to blast four tunnels and construct many trestles. It was said that going over the mountains, they had to lay three miles of track to advance one mile of distance. The two largest tunnels were the one through White's Hill and the one just out of

¹⁷⁴Marin County Journal, February 20, 1873, p. 3; March 20, 1873, p. 3; and October 2, 1873, pp. 1-3; and Kneiss, Redwood, pp. 44-46.

¹⁷⁵Kneiss, Redwood, pp. 44-46.

¹⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 44-50; and Marin County Journal, November 1, 1877, p. 3.

Tomales.¹⁷⁷ The White's Hill tunnel (now bricked up) was 1,250 feet long when completed! Work on it began in February of 1873, but it was not until March of 1874 that they "holed through." For much of the time, work on the tunnel went on for twenty-four hours a day in three eight-hour shifts.¹⁷⁸ The White's Hill and other tunnels were blasted with Giant Powder (manufactured across the bay in a company which depended upon Chinese explosives workers to turn out their product). The white supervisors laid the charges and set off the explosives, contrary to the practice on the transcontinental railroad, where Chinese were assigned these tasks.¹⁷⁹

The working conditions on the North Pacific Coast Railroad appear to have been noticeably better for the Chinese laborers than work on many of the other railway lines. It is hard to be certain that the eight-hour a day shifts for the work on the White's Hill tunnel was also applied to the other workers, but it seems evident that their workday was significantly shorter than the twelve hours expected of Chinese laborers blasting through Donner Pass for the transcontinental railroad.¹⁸⁰ In addition, we have already noted that the laborers were not subject to beatings. I would also presume

¹⁷⁷ Kneiss, Redwood, pp. 45-48; and Marin County Journal, September 18, 1873, p. 2.

¹⁷⁸ Kneiss, Redwood, pp. 44-46.

¹⁷⁹ Kneiss, Redwood, p. 46; Marin County Journal, March 20 and September 25, 1873, p. 3; Hoexter, pp. 74-79; Bancroft, v. 24, p. 99; and John Hittell, p. 709.

¹⁸⁰ Hoexter, pp. 78-79.

that their wages would have been the standard thirty to thirty-five dollars a month then offered by most companies who hired Chinese railroad workers.¹⁸¹ Their diet was good, consisting mostly of imported tea and rice (evidently provided by their employer)¹⁸² and the products of their fellow countrymen: vegetables, chickens, pork, and fish and seafood, which they purchased themselves.¹⁸³ Finally, the employers provided tents for them to live in.

From the point of view of the construction, there were only two factors which marred the peace and progress of the work. One involved a dispute between some of the workmen. The Chinese foreman for each gang was in charge of translating instructions and handling the pay of the others in the gang. One of these foremen was known in English as Ah Sin. When Ah Sin's gang was working along Lagunitas Creek on GGNRA's border, he ran off with the entire payroll for his gang. In revenge, the other laborers hung his brother. (The brother evidently was one of their fellow workers.)¹⁸⁴

The other problem was a more lasting one from the

¹⁸¹Ibid., p. 79; and Chinn, Lai, and Choy, p. 44.

¹⁸²Kneiss, Redwood, p. 46.

¹⁸³Chinn, Lai, and Choy, pp. 44-45; and Robert F. G. Spier, "Food Habits of Nineteenth-Century California Chinese," part 2 in California Historical Society Quarterly, v. 37, no. 2 (June 1958), p. 130.

¹⁸⁴Kneiss, Redwood, p. 45.

point of view of the railroad. The steepness of the terrain, the torrential winter rains, and the frangibility of some of the rock made for frequent washouts and cave-ins. There are no reports of disasters during the construction period, but one week after its official opening, the railroad had to be shut down for one month for repairs and throughout its history, a tremendous amount of upkeep had to be done to keep the track in operating condition.¹⁸⁵ Up until the mid-1890s, the railroad frequently employed Chinese to accomplish the repairs.¹⁸⁶

The railroad was of course the major employer of Chinese around GGNRA's Marin County territory, but in addition to railroad work and agricultural labor, Chinese worked at Pioneer Paper Mill near Olema for several years. I have no definite data on when Chinese first began finding employment at the paper mill, but it would seem likely that from 1873 on, some of the Chinese at the mill were railroad workers hired by the North Pacific Coast Railroad who had been laid off for one reason or another.

Pioneer Paper Mill itself was founded in 1856 by Samuel P. Taylor and a Mr. Post; Taylor soon took over the whole operation. The company made brown wrapping paper,

¹⁸⁵Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁸⁶See, for example, 1898 photo of Chinese repairmen on the line in California Historical Society archives.

newsprint, bookstock, and especially manila paper. In 1867, the total value of its product was \$64,800.¹⁷⁸ The paper mill was important enough that the creek on which it stood, formerly called San Geronimo Creek, was dubbed Paper Mill Creek by the 1870s. (Today, it is called Lagunitas Creek.) A small village even grew up around the mill,¹⁸⁸ and business from its landing helped give rise to the present town of Olema.¹⁸⁹

The mill employed twenty people; by 1877 and undoubtedly earlier as well, all of these were Chinese. Wages ranged from thirty to fifty dollars a month. The mill used water power during the rainy season and steam in the dry season. Materials for the mill and its finished product traveled by flat-bottom boat via the coast and Tomales Bay to and from Taylor's landing in Olema until the railroad came; then, Taylor used the railroad.¹⁹⁰ From Olema and later the train station at Point Reyes station, the materials reached

¹⁸⁷Munro-Fraser, pp. 279-281; and John Hittell, p. 637. A good description of the paper-making process can be found in Munro-Fraser, pp. 279-280.

¹⁸⁸John Hittell, p. 637; and Marin County Journal, November 22, 1877, p. 3.

¹⁸⁹*Ibid.* Its landing was located on the creek at the junction of today's Highway 1 and Sir Francis Drake Blvd.

¹⁹⁰John Hittell, p. 637; Munro-Fraser, pp. 279-281; and Louise Teather, Discovering Marin (Fairfax, Calif.: The Tamal Land Press, 1974), p. 110.

the mill by ox-cart (the trails for which are still visible). In 1884, the mill expanded and moved into a larger building down the creek a little way from its original site, but nine years later, the depression of 1893 bankrupted it.¹⁹¹

There was one other manufacturing establishment in the area which probably employed Chinese, and that was Captain Allen's powder mill in Olema.¹⁹² Chinese laborers dominated the explosives industry in nineteenth-century California because of their skill and courage in handling the materials involved.¹⁹³ It seems likely, then, that they would have come to the attention of Captain Allen and been employed by him. The mill was short-lived, however. Founded in 1866, in 1873 it was closed for three years because of pressure from "monopolists." After re-opening in 1876, an explosion which killed three of the workers shut down the works again in 1877. Allen rebuilt, but in 1880 he closed his doors for good.¹⁹⁴

We are not, of course, positive that Allen employed Chinese, but we do know for certain that a number of carriage

¹⁹¹Plaque placed on the site of the original mill by the Native Sons and Daughters of the Golden West of Marin County, in cooperation with California State Park Commission, October 21, 1956.

¹⁹²Marin County Journal, October 2, 1873, p. 2.

¹⁹³Bancroft, v. 24, p. 99.

¹⁹⁴Munro-Fraser, p. 281; and Marin County Journal, October 2, 1873, p. 3. I examined all the issues of the Marin County Journal for November 1 through December 27, 1877, but could find no report of the explosion.

roads in western Marin County were built by Chinese. In 1873, for example, Judge Waite of San Rafael hired Chinese to build a road from the head of Tomales Bay out to the end of Point Reyes, and Chinese also built the carriage road from San Rafael to Bolinas in 1878.¹⁹⁵ Quite possibly, many of these construction workers had originally come to the county to work on the North Pacific Coast Railroad. Finally, there are several indications (such as the way the tunnel was carved and faced) that suggest the 1873 tunnel out to the lighthouse in Point Bonita was constructed by Chinese.¹⁹⁶ Evidence to substantiate this has been requested of various agencies in Washington, D.C., and should later be tracked down.¹⁹⁷

On the whole, the role of Chinese in and near GGNRA's Marin County territory was limited by two major factors. One was anti-Chinese sentiment, which by the 1880s had produced large and active anti-Chinese clubs in the county, with branches in Tomales, San Rafael, and Sausalito. These clubs used economic and political pressures, and sometimes the

¹⁹⁵ Marin County Journal, October 2, 1872, p. 2; and Marin Chinese Cultural Group, "Marin County's China Camp State Park--Preserving the Legacy of the Chinese in California" (unpublished manuscript).

¹⁹⁶ The tunnel was dug some time between 1879 and 1883. The type of work is similar to that on other tunnels dug by Chinese and dissimilar to east-coast Irish-dug tunnels. The army did not like to employ minorities in those days, but may have found none but Chinese who would perform the work in Marin County. See interview with Chief Boatswain's Mate Jack Dusch, Officer in Charge, Point Bonita Station, January 22, 1980.

¹⁹⁷ Interview with David Forgang, Park Ranger, National Park Service, Western Regional Office, December 20, 1979.

threat of violence, to force people to fire their Chinese employees. They also wanted Congress to forbid Chinese the right to come to this country and to throw out all Chinese already here. In 1886 they obtained a promise from the North Pacific Coast Railroad that it would fire its Chinese employees, and generally were responsible for driving most remaining Chinese out of the western part of the county.¹⁹⁸

The other factor was the relatively low level of commercial and industrial development of the area, and the small population. Most of the land was turned to dairying. Chinese had not encountered much dairying in China but quickly learned the techniques necessary to be reliable employees. They themselves had little interest in launching dairies. They established no truck farms in western Marin County either, because it was too far away from a population center. Besides, whites were not anxious to lease to them. Chinese did for a while predominate in the area's major construction projects and in its manufacturing, but as we have seen they were unable to establish themselves as a permanent part of the labor force.

¹⁹⁸ Marin County Journal, December 17, 1885, p. 3, and February 26 and March 4, 1886, p. 3; and Mason, p. 60.

Conclusion

Taking into account all of GGNRA, both the maritime and entire land aspect of the park, three salient facts emerge with respect to the Chinese. One is that most came to the area of their own free will, seeking to better their economic condition. Almost without exception, their involvement with the park was related either to earning a living or to immigration and emigration. (Even the cemetery represents a form of emigration, especially in view of the later transfer of the bones back to China.)

Secondly, although Chinese in the park's territory were able for a while to pursue their various occupations in relative peace, they were ultimately driven off both the land and the waters off the park's boundaries. In other words, they remained "guests" in the park's territory, prevented by outsiders from establishing permanent roots in it. Finally, Chinese (along with people of other ethnic groups) do indeed occupy an important place in the park's historical background. Tens of thousands of them have been directly involved in the park's territory, contributing thereto material sustenance, some of the largest construction projects, the labor force for most of the factories, and a variety of other things of both economic and cultural value.

Appendix

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ai, Chung Kun. My Seventy-Nine Years in Hawaii. Hongkong: Cosmorama Pictorial Publishers, 1960.

This is the memoir of someone who immigrated from China to Hawaii in the second half of the nineteenth century. He visited San Francisco twice prior to the turn of the century and one of his relatives brought over one of the earliest Chinese dramatic troupes to come to San Francisco and the continental United States. Most of the memoir, however, is related to the author's life in Hawaii.

Armentrout-Ma, L. Eve. "Big and Medium Businesses of Chinese Immigrants to the United States, 1850-1980: An Outline." In Bulletin [of the Chinese Historical Society of America], vol. 13, no. 7 (September 1978), pp. 1-5.

A short article using some Chinese-language sources and interviews as well as English-language sources which attempts to acquaint the reader with the outlines of this neglected field of study. About half of the article is devoted to the import-export trade.

Armentrout-Ma, L. Eve. "Chinese in California's Fishing Industry, 1850-1950." Unpublished article submitted to Amerasia Journal, September 1979.

This article, written at the request of the journal to which it was submitted, covers the Chinese involvement in abalone fishing, in shrimping, in catching squid, fish, rock lobsters, and so forth. It also examines Chinese involvement in the marketing of fish, and in the salmon canning industry. Similar to the booklet written for the exhibition in the National Maritime Museum, it is about twice as long and is fully documented. Geographically, it deals principally with San Diego, the Monterey area, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Rivers, and the San Francisco Bay Area.

Armentrout-Ma, L. Eve McIver Ballard. "Chinese Politics in the Western Hemisphere, 1893-1911: Rivalry Between Reformers and Revolutionaries in the Americas." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Davis, 1977.

Concerned primarily with Chinese political parties in North America, this thesis also outlines the history of Chinese in America and describes Chinatown social organizations.

Armentrout-Ma, L. Eve. "A Question of Defense: Social Organizations in United States' Chinatowns, 1849-1913" (unpublished paper delivered to the National Conference of the Association for Asian Studies, March-April 1979).

This paper studies the three major kinds of social organizations in American Chinatowns in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with special reference to the

historical and sociological background. It is currently being rewritten for publication.

Baker, Joseph E. Past and Present of Alameda County, California. Chicago: S. J. Clarke, 1914), v. 1.

A general history, this work is focused on Oakland. There is a little here on Chinese, including a brief discussion of Chinese farmers in the Bay area and their contributions to farmers of other ethnic backgrounds.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft,

v. 23. Santa Barbara: Wallace Heberd, 1970.

This well-known work is indispensable for the study of nineteenth- and early twentieth century California history. Complete with footnotes, it covers history, politics, the economy, and various asides of a sociological character. Bancroft was both well read and a participant or observer of much that he deals with. He is not always completely accurate in his facts, but the overall quality of the work is very high. This volume covers the history of San Francisco from 1849 through 1854 (and other matters).

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. The Works of Hubert How Bancroft, v.

24. Santa Barbara: Wallace Heberd, 1970.

This volume covers California's industries up to about 1880 and also discusses the anti-Chinese movement, particularly as it affected San Francisco.

Barth, Gunther. Bitter Strength: A History of the Chinese in

the United States, 1850-1870. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

A history with a sociological bent, this work is best when it deals with the anti-Chinese movement as it affected Americans. It is weakest in its discussions of the realities of Chinatown, or America as seen by the Chinese. The book also contains useful information on the general history of the early Chinese immigration to the United States, California's gold rush, and the like.

Bee, Fred A. The Other Side of the Chinese Question: Testimony of California's Leading Citizens: Read and Judge. San Francisco: Woodward, 1886.

Bee was hired by the Chinese Six Companies for many years to act as their representative to Americans. This work is one outcome of this relationship. Bee culled the California and federal government's hearings on Chinese and extracted those that showed Chinese in a positive and constructive light. He also helped compose the introduction, in which the Six Companies presented their own defense. The reason for the work was to counter a virulently anti-Chinese work recently composed and sent to Congress to urge Congress to approve more harsh anti-Chinese legislation. Much of the testimony Bee included in this work relates to San Francisco and to Chinese involvement in GGNRA.

Bingham, Helen. In Tamal Land. San Francisco: Calkins, 1906.

A short, general work on Marin County, this is not a scholarly piece. There is a tiny bit of information on Chinese in or near GGNRA.

Bradley, LaVerne. "San Francisco: Gibraltar of the West Coast." In National Geographic, v. 83, no. 3 (March 1943), pp. 279-308.

Focusing on the strength of the Presidio's defenses, this patriotic article also mentions the drafting of Chinese Americans (giving some figures) and a colorful Chinese American army doctor (female).

Chambers' Journal, v. 1, no. 4 (January 21, 1852), p. 48.

This brief notice gives the earliest specific contemporary reference to a Chinese fishing village in California. The village in question is the one on Rincon Point in San Francisco.

Chinese Six Companies. Memorial: An Address to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States. San Francisco: Chinese Six Companies, 1877.

This work, similar to the later one prepared by Fred A. Bee, was composed for a similar reason: to counteract the vast quantities of anti-Chinese material being sent to Congress. Once again, much of the testimony relates to San Francisco and GGNRA (including testimony by the owner of Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills on Black Point in San Francisco). The actual author of this one may have been Fred A. Bee.

Chinn, Thomas W., Lai, H. Mark, and Choy, Philip P. (eds.) A History of the Chinese in California: A Syllabus. San Francisco: Chinese Historical Society of America, 1969.

An excellent introduction to the history of Chinese in California, this short but scholarly work presents information on a variety of different topics, many of which relate to Chinese in GGNRA: immigration, railroads, fishermen, the anti-Chinese movement and so forth.

Chiu, Ping. Chinese Labor in California, 1850-1880. Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967.

Another rather short but very scholarly work, this book gives us more information on Chinese farmers around San Francisco (as well as in California generally). It also mentions Chinese in the explosives industry, in woolen mills such as Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills, in railroads, and the like.

Chung Sai Yat Po (中西日報)

A major Chinese-language daily published in San Francisco, this newspaper spans the period 1900-1949. Among other things, it contains contemporary information on the 1906 earthquake in San Francisco.

Coolidge, Mary Roberts. Chinese Immigration. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1909.

Coolidge's turn-of-the-century work tries to be exhaustive. Her data are well documented. She discusses law cases, the anti-Chinese movement (and the Chinese reaction to it), trade figures, the employment picture, Chinatown organizations, and economic conditions as they relate to Chinese in the United States between 1850 and 1905. Her primary focus is all of the United States; her secondary focus is San Francisco and the west (where most Chinese then resided). (Over 500 pages)

Cooper, John Bautista, to Thomas Oliver Larkin, June 22, 1856. In George P. Hammond (ed.), The Larkin Papers, v. 10. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964).

This letter from one of California's leading citizens

of the day gives the first known reference to Chinese catching abalone in California waters..

Courtney, William J. San Francisco Anti-Chinese Ordinances, 1850-1900. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1974.

This is a fairly detailed study of anti-Chinese ordinances in San Francisco and at the state level for the period in question. It discusses the laws/ordinances passed, whether or not they were later overturned by the courts, anti-Chinese laws that did not pass, and the like. The ones that relate most closely to GGNRA are those restricting immigration and that applied to fishermen, peddlers, and construction workers.

Cummings, G. A., and Pladwell, E. S. Oakland . . . A History. Oakland: Grant D. Miller Mortuaries, Inc. 1942.

A general history of Oakland, this says little about Chinese anywhere but does devote two pages to telling of Chinese refugees from San Francisco's 1906 earthquake and fire arriving in Oakland.

David, Mrs. Harold; Kehrlein, Mrs. Oliver; Cadell, Miss Dolores; and Kahn, Edgar M. "Some California Dates of 1859." In California Historical Society Quarterly, v. 38, no. 1 (March 1959), pp. 25-29.

A list of dates relative to San Francisco and Chinatown, the authors provide no commentary. The dates were culled from contemporary newspapers and a few relate to Chinese.

Dickenson, A. Bray. Narrow Gauge to the Redwoods. Los Angeles: Trans-Anglo Books, 1970.

This work contains a good, fairly long history of the North Pacific Coast Railway (in Marin County). There are a few references to Chinese. The book is illustrated.

Dillon, Richard H. The Hatchet Men: San Francisco's Chinatown in the Days of the Tong Wars, 1880-1906. New York: Ballantine Books, 1962.

A rather journalistic, highly colored and frequently inaccurate account of San Francisco's Chinatown up to the 1906 earthquake. The work does contain a contemporary journalist's account of the 1893 funeral for an important tong leader.

Goode, George Brown (ed.). The Fisheries and Fishery Industries of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1887, sec. 5, vol. 2.

An immense and voluminous study, this work covers Chinese fishermen in separate and often brief articles. Much of the material on Chinese comes from David Starr Jordan (later president of Stanford University). There is much useful information, although one could wish for more.

Hansen, Gladys (ed.). San Francisco: The Bay and Its Cities. New York: Hastings House, 1973.

Hansen has edited a W.P.A. project on San Francisco which is a cross between a tourist guide and an historical survey. Unfortunately, the book contains no footnotes and

no one seems to know the sources used by the original authors. This book gives the only known written reference to say that today's Phelan Beach used to be called China Beach, and that Chinese fishermen formerly anchored their vessels offshore.

Heath, Steve. "History of Pier #4, Fort Mason, San Francisco, California." In Boathouse Mural. San Francisco: Alvarado School Art Workshop, Inc., 1974.

The very brief written part of this essentially photographic work simply tells us where the laundry from Alcatraz was unloaded.

Hittell, John S. The Commerce and Industries of the Pacific Coast of North America. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft, 1882.

Hittell's valuable account provides information about Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills, about Chinese fishermen, and the like. It provides some statistics and a little historical background for each of the industries discussed.

Hittell, Theodore H. History of California, vol. 3. San Francisco: N. J. Stone, 1897.

Theodore Hittell had long been a resident of California when he wrote this. Like Bancroft, he witnessed and/or participated in many of the events of which he writes. His work, however, tends to be gossipy and sometimes misleading. Furthermore, there are no footnotes. This volume concentrates on San Francisco.

Hoexter, Corinne K. From Canton to California: The Epic of Chinese Immigration. New York: Four Winds Press, 1976.

This book is divided into two parts, the first concerned generally with Chinese in the United States and the second with publicist Rev. Ng Poon Chew. It provides some useful general information as well as the personal reminiscences of Rev. Ng Poon Chew and his family on major events such as the 1906 earthquake in San Francisco.

Huggins, Dorothy H. Continuation of the Annals of San Francisco (June 1, 1854 to December 31, 1955). San Francisco: California Historical Society, 1939.

This is a detailed and highly competent collection of data on San Francisco culled from contemporary newspapers. It is arrayed chronologically without comment. Proving that hindsight can often be better than foresight (since it is superior in many respects to the Annals it supplements), it contains quite a bit of information related to Chinese in GGNRA.

Kinnad, Lawrence. History of the Greater San Francisco Bay Region. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1966), vol. 3.

This is a very general history of the Bay Area. It contains some useful information on the number of troops who passed through Fort Mason in World War II.

Kneiss, Gilbert H. Redwood Railways. Berkeley: Howell-North, 1956.

This gives a history of the North Pacific Coast Railroad, including some details concerning its construction. It makes a number of references to the Chinese laborers. Although it does not have footnotes, the author gives his sources at the end of the work, and it appears fairly competent. The book is illustrated.

Kwok Won Yat Po (國魂日報), April 22, 1908.

One of the few issues of this particular newspaper (a Chinese language newspaper published in the United States), this gives a contemporary view of Chinese in San Francisco (and the United States).

Lai, H. M. "Island of Immortals: Chinese Immigrants and the Angel Island Immigration Station." In California History, v. 62, no. 1 (Spring 1978), pp. 88-103.

Written for the California History's (of the California Historical Society) special issue on Chinese, this article gives the history of the Angel Island Immigration Station with special attention to conditions on the island. Lai also provides a translation of two of the poems carved in the wall there by Chinese awaiting entrance to the United States.

Lee, Calvin. Chinatown, U.S.A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965.

A general work on American Chinatowns, this book provides a little information on funerals and celebrations associated with cemeteries.

Lewis, Oscar. San Francisco: Mission to Metropolis. Berkeley:
Howell-North Books, 1966.

Another general work on San Francisco without foot-
notes and with little attention to Chinese outside of
Chinatown, this book does contain a nice quote from
a nineteenth-century work describing Chinese peddlers in
San Francisco.

London, Jack. The Valley of the Moon. New York: Grosset and
Dunlap, 1916.

Although a novel, London's work is set in Oakland and
central California. It gives some good, descriptive
views of the operation of Chinese farms around the
turn of the century and refers specifically to some of
the more successful of these farmers.

Loomis, Rev. A. W., to Henry W. Moulton, March 30, 1870.
In Archives of the California Historical Society.

This short letter from the chief white Christian
missionary to San Francisco's Chinatown lists a few anti-
Chinese measures propounded by the city.

Lowe, Pardee. Father and Glorious Descendant. Boston:
Little, Brown, 1943.

An autobiography by a fairly prominent Chinese Amer-
ican, this book gives some information on funerals as
well, of course, as on the author's life. The author was
raised in Oakland and his father ran a business in San
Francisco.

Lyman, Stanford M. Chinese Americans. New York: Random House, 1974.

A sociological study, this is a rather general work. It provides general background information on Chinese Americans and is geared to the present.

Marin County Journal, 1870s and 1880s.

During the period under question, this was a weekly published in San Rafael and is a reasonable source of information about Marin County. It concentrates on the eastern part of the county but does give some coverage to the western part.

Mason, Jack. Point Reyes, the Solemn Land. Inverness, Calif.: North Shore Books, 1972.

Mason's general history of Point Reyes and the great butter ranches has a little to say concerning Chinese. It mentions Chinese with reference to the North Pacific Coast Railroad, Chinese milkers, and Marin County's Anti-Chinese League of 1886.

Morley, Charles (trans.). "The Chinese in California as Reported by Henryk Sienkiewicz." In California Historical Society Quarterly, v. 34, no. 4 (December 1955), pp. 301-316.

This article is an abridged translation of Sienkiewicz's California journal plus a short introduction by the translator. Sienciewicz (author of Quo Vadis) spent several months in California in the 1870s and had a friend who was San Francisco's Chinese Inspector. He has a number

of interesting descriptions of Chinese, particularly of Chinese truck farmers around San Francisco.

Munro-Fraser, J. P. (ed.). History of Marin County, California.

Petaluma: Charmaina Burdell Veronda, 1972; reprint.

One of the most complete histories of Marin County up to the time of its completion in 1880, this work unfortunately has no footnotes and is not always accurate. It does, however, have information on Chinese abalone fishermen, on Pioneer Paper Mill, on Captain Allen's explosives mill, and other topics related to Chinese in GGNRA. On the whole, it is a valuable work.

Nash, Robert. "The Chinese Shrimp Fishery of California." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of California at Los Angeles, 1973.

This thesis deals primarily with Chinese shrimpers on San Francisco Bay, but it also discusses Chinese abalone fishers and the like and also mentions non-Chinese fishermen. It contains a great deal of technical data, and is generally accurate and thorough, particularly with respect to its main topic.

North, Hart H. "Chinese Highbinder Societies in California." In California Historical Society Quarterly, v. 27, no. 1 (March 1948), pp. 19-30.

The author was for many years United States Commissioner of Immigration for California and Nevada. In his official capacity, in 1898 he obtained a statement on

Chinese tongs from the San Francisco police officer who had led the forces assigned to destroy these tongs in the 1890s, which statement is reproduced in this article. There is a little information in North's own statement here which has bearing on the China Merchants Steamship Company.

Olmstead, Roger E., and Olmstead, Nancy L. San Francisco's Waterfront: Report on Historical Cultural Resources. San Francisco: TechniGraphics, 1977.

This very detailed and valuable work covers part of the GGNRA territory and hence is relevant for our study. Of interest to us is its discussion of the Black Point area and the ocean front south of Black Point. It does not itself mention Chinese, but gives the location of Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills and other buildings, making it easier to trace the history of Chinese in the area.

The Oriental (華洋新報), March 24, 1893.

This is one of the few issues of this newspaper still in existence. The paper was published in San Francisco and contains some information related to immigration-emigration as well as Chinatown, United States, and world news.

Riesenberg, Felix, Jr. Golden Gate: The Story of San Francisco Harbor. New York: Knopf, 1940.

Although not a scholarly work, this book includes

several anecdotes related to Chinese in GGNRA including what Chinese vessels anchored in San Francisco harbor in 1849, and the Theresa Terry incident. The work appears to be generally accurate.

Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration. Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration. Ottawa: Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration, 1885.

Most of this report deals with Canada, but the introduction and first few pages of the text cover San Francisco. This part consists of a short summary of the situation of Chinese in San Francisco plus the testimony of more than eight presumably well-informed people in San Francisco. Included among these eight was the Chinese Consul in San Francisco, the San Francisco Chief of Police, and the president of the Immigration Association of California. Although the part related to San Francisco is short, since the authors were not caught up in America's anti-Chinese movement it is valuable and some relates to GGNRA.

San Francisco Evening Post, September 6, 1877, p. 1.

This article consists primarily of a lengthy description of a particular Chinese truck farm in the then-countryside just south of San Francisco. The author was quite observant. He was also horrified by the Chinese use of "night soil" as a fertilizer, and recommended against eating Chinese-grown vegetables.

Schwendinger, Robert J. "Chinese Sailors: America's Invisible Merchant Marine, 1876-1906." In California History, vol. 62, no. 1 (Spring 1978), pp. 58-69.

Another of the articles written for California History's special issue dedicated to Chinese, this piece gives the outlines of a heretofore unexplored area: Chinese sailors on American vessels. Schwendinger concludes

that there were thousands of them, particularly on Pacific Mail ships traveling between Hongkong and San Francisco in the nineteenth century.

Senate of the State of California. Chinese Immigration: The Social, Moral, and Political Effect: Testimony (1876). Sacramento: Government Printing Office, 1876.

This consists of the full testimony (involving questions and cross-examination) of the more than forty witnesses called by the California State Senate committee in question when it met in San Francisco in 1876. The function of the committee was to examine whether or not Chinese were ruining California and to provide evidence to send to the Congress of the United States to convince that body to exclude Chinese from the United States. Very few Chinese were asked to testify, whereas many policemen and anti-Chinese leaders were. If read with knowledge of the bias and some awareness of Chinese American history, the testimony can provide valuable information.

Soulé, Frank, Gibon, John H., and Nesbit, James. The Annals of San Francisco Together with the Continuation, Through 1885. Palo Alto, Calif.: Lewis Osborne, 1966, reprint.

This is a general narrative history of San Francisco during the first few years after it became part of the United States. The authors were deeply involved in the developing political and cultural life of the city. Its sections on Chinese are rather superficial and not

altogether friendly, but it does describe Chinatown, Chinese participation in certain city-wide functions such as parades, and the like.

Spier, Robert F. G. "Food Habits of Nineteenth-Century California Chinese," Part 2 in California Historical Society Quarterly, v. 37, no. 2 (June 1958), pp. 128-136.

Shows an early painting of the Chinese fishing village at Rincon Point in San Francisco. Spier's article gives some useful information on working conditions of Chinese in California, on the origins of San Luis Obispo's Chinese colony, and of course on the diet of Chinese laborers. What is of particular interest to us is the diet of Chinese railway workers, since that is another way to tie the railway workers of the North Pacific Coast Railroad into the Californian (and Chinese) economy.

Sung, Betty Lee. Chinese in America. New York: Macmillan, 1972.

A competent, general overview of American Chinatowns in the second half of the twentieth century, this book's section on history is too brief and general to be of use to us. It does give more information on funerals and related matters.

Teather, Louise. Discovering Marin. Fairfax, Calif.: Tamal Land Press, 1974.

A very general history, rather short and with no footnotes. It does give the exact location of the former landing in Olema for Taylor's Pioneer Paper Mill.

Toogood, Anna Coxie. "A Civilian History of GGNRA." Unpublished manuscript, archives of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

This voluminous and well-documented history of GGNRA needs no introduction. The sections of particular use for this study were the ones on Angel Island (which, in fact, I have made no attempt to supplement, as Toogood's treatment is really adequate), and Golden Gate Cemetery. It also gives some information on Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills, Chinese butter makers on Point Reyes, and the North Pacific Coast Railroad.

Tow, J. S. The Real Chinese in America. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1970, reprint.

This work was written and originally published in the early 1920s. The author was a member of the staff of the Chinese consul in New York. Much of his material is contemporary with the time of writing. He gives figures on population, occupation, and businesses of Chinese and Chinese Americans. He also discusses a number of the Chinatown social organizations as well as incidents of discrimination against Chinese. On the whole, he presents somewhat more information related to the east coast (especially the New York area) than to the west. (approx. 170 pages)

Trauner, Joan B. "The Chinese as Medical Scapegoats in San Francisco, 1870-1905." In California History, v. 62, no. 1 (Spring 1978), pp. 70-87.

Perhaps the only real shortcoming of Toogood's treatment of Angel Island are her lack of access to Chinese sources, and her too-ready acceptance of medical reports holding that Chinese were liable to bring almost every type of communicable disease into the United States. Trauner's article provides a counterbalance to the latter tendency. She also provides further information related to disease and Chinese entering this country in the nineteenth century.

United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries. Report of the Commissioner for 1888 (Part XVI). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1892.

Another exhaustive study, this work provides valuable information on Chinese fishermen in California. It includes a map of the San Francisco Bay Area, showing major Chinese fishing villages as well as some of the clamming grounds.

United States Senate and House of Representatives. Report of the Joint Special Committee to Investigate Chinese Immigration, 1876. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1877.

A massive (over 1,000 pages) document, this consists of the testimony given to the Congressional committee

called into being by the outcry over Chinese immigration. Hundreds of witnesses were called and cross-examined, including the owner of Pioneer and Mission Woolen Mills (located in San Francisco at Black Point), customs officials, Caucasian friends of the Chinese, diplomats, missionaries, anti-Chinese leaders, and a few Chinese. This volume is full of information on Chinese in the U.S., on Chinese in San Francisco, on crime, trade, immigration, and employment.

Weaver, Philip L., Jr. "Salt Water Fisheries of the Pacific Coast." In Overland Monthly, v. 20 (1892), pp. 149-163.

Weaver was one of the government's fishing investigators. In this article, he gives an overview of the situation, including much data of both a general and technical nature on Chinese fishermen in California. This is a valuable summary.

Yuk, Ow, Lai, Him Mark, and Choy, P. (eds.) (區寵賜, 麥禮謙, and 胡垣坤) A History of the Sam Yup Benevolent Association in the United States, 1850-1974 (Lü-Mei San-i tsung hui-kuan chien-shih). San Francisco: San Yup Benevolent Association, 1975.

This Chinese-language work focuses on one of the oldest Chinese organizations in North America. It chronicles the history of the organization, gives biographical data on many of its leaders, and has sections on the sub-organizations that sprang up over the years. What concerns

us most here is the account by the heads of the three funeral and charitable associations under the general purview of the Sam Yup. These give us more information on funerals and related matters.

CURRICULUM VITAE

L. Eve Armentrout-Ma

Modern China; Pre-modern
China; Asian; United
States since 1867; Asian
American

Address: 4453 Fran Way
Richmond, Ca., 94803

Phone: (415) 222-2977

Place of Birth: South Carolina

Date: December 28, 1943

Family Situation: one husband, two children

Educational Background:

BA	San Francisco State College (English literature/creative writing)	August, 1968
MA	California State University, Hayward (United States history)	June, 1972
PhD	University of California, Davis (modern Chinese history)	Dec., 1977

Academic Experience and Teaching Fields:

University of California, Davis (Teaching Assistant, 1973-1976)
Survey of Asian History (pre-modern and modern); Modern
Chinese history; United States history (reconstruction
to the present)
(Post Graduate Research Associate, 1977) Chinese American
history (organizing and helping to run the Chinese American
History Project, funded by the Kellogg Foundation)
(Post Doctoral Researcher, 1978 to present) Chinese
American history (the Chinese American History Project)

Historical Fields of Interest:

Modern China, Studies with Dr. Frederic Wakeman (U.C. Berkeley),
and Dr. K.C. Liu and Dr. Don Price (U.C. Davis)
Pre-modern China, Studies with Dr. Wei-ming Tu and Dr. Frederic
Wakeman (U.C.B.), and Dr. Jung-pang Lo (U.C.D.)
United States since 1867, Studies with Dr. David Brody and
Dr. Roland Marchand (U.C.D.)

Special Interests:

China: Chinese Revolution of 1911; Chinese Social History;
Ming-Ch'ing Interregnum; Chinese Secret Societies
(especially Triads); Overseas Chinese.
United States: Chinese in the Americas; United States Inter-
national Relations; Progressives.

Languages:

Chinese (Mandarin), French, some Japanese, some German.

Dissertations, Publications, and Papers Delivered:

Dissertations: Doctoral: "Chinese Politics in the Western Hemisphere,
1893-1911: Rivalry between Reformers and Revo-
lutionaries in the Americas," 1977.
Masters: "American Involvement in Chinese Revolutionary
Activities, 1898-1913," 1972.

- Articles:
- "The Canton Rising of 1902-1903: Reformers, Revolutionaries, and the Second Taiping," in Modern Asian Studies, vol. 10, no.1 (January, 1976).
- "Conflict and Contact between the Chinese and Indigenous Communities in San Francisco, 1900-1911," in The Life, Influence and the Role of the Chinese in the United States, 1776-1960 (San Francisco: Chinese Historical Society of America, 1976), pp.55-70.
- "The Contribution of Overseas Chinese in the Americas to the Chinese Revolution of 1911" in Bulletin of the Chinese Historical Society of America, vol. 12, no. 1 (January, 1977).
- "The Big and Medium Businesses of Chinese Immigrants to the United States, 1850-1890," in Bulletin of the Chinese Historical Society of America, vol. 13, no.7 (September, 1978)
- "A Chinese Association in North America: the Pao-huang Hui from 1899 to 1904," in Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i, vol. 3, no.9 (November, 1978).

Book-length Manuscripts:

Chinese Politics Abroad: Competition between Reformers and Revolutionaries in the Americas, 1893-1911, submitted to University of California Press, March, 1979.

Chinese in Oakland: the Unsung Builders, written jointly with Jeong-Huei Ma, to be published by the Oakland Chinese History Research Committee/Berkeley Unified School District.

Papers:

"The Canton Coup of 1903: Ideology, or, a Solution to All Problems," delivered to the Western Conference of the Association for Asian Studies, December, 1974.

"Conflict and Contact between the Chinese and Indigenous Communities in San Francisco, 1900-1911," delivered to the National Conference on the Life, Influence and the Role of the Chinese in the United States, 1776-1960 (sponsored by the Chinese Historical Society of America), July, 1975.

"The Early Pao-huang Hui in the Americas, 1899-1904," delivered to the Pacific Coast Conference of the Association for Asian Studies, June, 1976.

"The Contribution of Overseas Chinese in the Americas to the Chinese Revolution of 1911," delivered to the Chinese Historical Society of America, November, 1976.

"A Question of Defense: Social Organizations in United States Chinatowns, 1850-1913," delivered to the National

Conference of the Association for Asian Studies, Mar.-Ap., 1979.

Related Activities:

Discussant for panel at the Chinese Historical Society's National Conference, July, 1975.

Discussant for East Asian Studies Colloquium at U.C., Davis, November, 1976.

Speaker, East Asian Studies Colloquium at U.C., Davis, January, 1979.

Speaker, Institute of Asian Research Seminar at University of British Columbia (Vancouver), February, 1979.

Organizer of panel for National Convention of the Association for Asian Studies, Mar.-Ap., 1979 ("Chinese at the Sinitic Frontier: Adjustments to Life Overseas").

Organizer of projected exhibit sponsored by the Chinese American History Project of U.C. Davis, the National Maritime Museum at San Francisco, and the Chinese Historical Society of America, for June-July, 1979 ("Sampan, Junks, and Chinese Fishermen in the Golden State").

Letters of Reference from Professors K.C. Liu, Don C. Price, David Brody, Roland Marchand, Richard Miller, and Benjamin E. Wallacker (U.C. Davis). Also from Professor Frederic Wakeman (U.C. Berkeley).

Dossier:

Available from Office of Placement Services, Building T-6, University of California, Berkeley; Berkeley, California, 94720.

Phone: (415) 642-1147.