‘John Chinaman’ and The New York Times

What was the position of The New York Times during the debate on the Chinese immigration to the United States from 1851 until 1882 and why did they take this position?

Joris Germs
0459615
MA American History

Contents

Introduction

"It's the negro question all over again".[1] The editor of the New York Times came to this conclusion after spending an article about the fears in the western part of the country about a "Chinese Supremacy" in 1869. This article would be one of many spent on the Chinese in the United States. The discovery of gold in California at the end of the forties had attracted many Chinese men to the state. Only 46 Chinese had officially been recorded as admitted to the United States until 1850. This number grew to 61,397 within the next ten years.[2] The Chinese had found their way to the United States. In the meantime on the other side of the continent, New York City, by far the largest city in the United States[3] in 1850, had already been dealing with immigrants for two centuries. It was in this city that Henry J. Raymond and George Jones founded The New York Times. The first edition was published on the 18th of September 1851.[4] The New York Times would soon become a respected newspaper in New York and would eventually become the third largest newspaper of the United States.[5]

As we can see, both the Chinese and the New York Times found their place in American society at the same time. But where the New York Times would become a respected part of society, the Chinese had to deal with much opposition to their role in society. This opposition would eventually lead to the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. Several opinions on the place of the Chinese in society were discussed in the newspapers. This research will deal with the question: what was the position of The New York Times during the debate on the Chinese immigration to the United States from 1851 until 1882 and why did they take this position? The results of the research can be interesting because they'll show how developments at a newspaper and developments in a country can influence the way editors write about a certain subject. Next to that, debates about immigration regulations are still an important topic in society and therefore it is interesting to know how a newspaper treated this topic in the decades up to the first immigration restriction, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. After this first immigration law, there would be many other immigration

[1] John Chinaman – What Shall We do with Him? (1869, 29-6) *The New York Times*
[2] R.H. Lee, The Chinese in the United States of America (Oxford 1960) 21
[3] http://www.census.gov/, Population of the 100 Largest Cities and Other Urban Places in the United States: 1790 to 1990 (1998)
[4] E. Davis, History of the New York Times 1851-1921 (New York 1969) 6
[5] http://abcas3.accessabc.com/, ACCESS ABC: eCirc for US Newspapers (2011)

laws to come and the results of this research could be used in a further research on the position of The New York Times' editors in other anti-immigration debates in the United States.

Hundred ninety-six editorials were written in the New York Times about the Chinese in the United States between 1852 and 1882 and these were all studied. To be able to see the editorials in perspective, several books on the topics were studied. These books are necessary to have an overview of the history of The New York Times and the history of the Chinese in America. After studying the primary sources from the newspaper itself and the secondary sources for the background information on the subject, it must be possible to give an answer to the question: what was the position of The New York Times during the debate on the Chinese immigration to the United States from 1851 until 1882 and why did they take this position?

The arrival of the Chinese in San Francisco

The first Chinese woman recorded in the United States was Afong May in New York in 1834. She was exhibited at several museums in New York and Brooklyn and she was subjected to scientific research. Especially her small bound feet were an interesting subject for researchers. In the following years more Chinese entered the country, often primarily meant for entertainment purposes, like Afong May. The circus of Barnum had a Chinese dwarf and the Siamese twins Chang and Eng were conquering the hearts of the American public. This didn't improve the image of Chinese in America, because it reconfirmed the already existing prejudice that most Asians were freaks.[6] In total a number of 758 Chinese were recorded in the United States during the period of 1841-1850.[7]

The number of Chinese recorded in the United States would change dramatically in the next decades. There were several reasons for this change in the number of immigrants coming from China, but the main reason was gold. It wasn't solemnly gold which caused the Chinese to cross the Pacific. The attitude towards emigration from China had changed in the last decades. In the 15th century, China had been an exploring country. They were adventurous and exploring the world. But due to several reasons this changed towards a policy of non-emigration. This non-emigration policy was also reflected in the way Chinese officials (in 1852) cared for their fellow citizens abroad: "The Emperor's wealth is beyond computation; why should he care for those of his subjects who have left there home, or for the sands they scraped together".[8] Although their confidence was still very high, the once mighty Chinese empire had deteriorated, as it couldn't prevent the European powers from gaining influence in China in the 18th and 19th century. The Chinese economy fell into the hands of European powers and "the deterioration of the standard of living"[9] became another reason why the Chinese crossed the Pacific.

Although it may have been a large step to cross the Pacific, most Chinese weren't afraid of leaving their beloved country. They were certain to return to China one day and most of them did. And so, with rumors about the 'gold mountain' in

[6] I. Chang, The Chinese in America (New York 2004) 26-29
[7] Lee, The Chinese, 21
[8] R. Daniels, Asian America (Washington 1988) 11
[9] Ibidem, 12

California and the conviction to return one day, many Chinese went to the United States.[10]

After the discovery of gold, the city of San Francisco grew from 500 inhabitants in 1848 to more than 30,000 in 1850. These new inhabitants came from all over the world. San Francisco was the most important port for Chinese immigrants to arrive after their journey from China. This journey took one or two months and started at ports like Canton, Macao and Hong Kong. Advertisements in Chinese port cities promoted the emigration to the United States and many Chinese found their way to the ships which would bring them across the ocean. After a long journey, full of death and disease, the Chinese who made it to San Francisco Bay, experienced a new world in a booming city. San Francisco had turned into one of the biggest cities of the U.S. within several years. From being a small town just years before, with the city and their officials unprepared for such a growth, San Francisco had become a man-driven city, which was being ruled by force and anarchy. Half of the inhabitants were foreign born and the main reason for living there was gold.

At first the Chinese were accepted as among the many searching for gold, but within a few years the sentiments turned against the Chinese. [11] The Chinese were concentrated as a group and lived within their own society. It was cheaper to live like this and they simply liked to live among each other. And although every nationality acted like this, the Chinese would become known for it and were blamed for it. The work they did was purely driven by what was needed. Just like most other uneducated immigrants in California, the Chinese found their jobs in the agricultural and mining sector, as they were the largest sectors in California.[12] But in a man-driven, racist, workers society, the Chinese, although they were known for their good manners, became unwanted competitors in the eyes of many. This would lead to robbery and theft by mobs and would soon lead to the first local political interferences.[13]

On the other side of the continent, people were already dealing with large numbers of immigrants for decades. New York was the main port for new immigrants coming

[10] Ibidem, 11-17
[11] Chang, The Chinese, 33-37
[12] Daniels, Asian America, 18-19
[13] Chang, The Chinese, 38

from Europe. The effect was that the city had grown from a small city with 60,000 citizens in 1800 to by far the largest city of the country in 1850, with more than 500,000 citizens.[14] In this city, The New York Times was founded by Henry Jarvis Raymond and George Jones. Raymond and Jones are seen as the founding fathers of the New York Times. The first edition of The Times appeared on the 18th of September 1851 and its main principles were: "excellence in news service, avoidance of fantastic extremes in editorial opinion, and a general sobriety in manner", "that it would give all the news free from the morbid and the scandalous", and "that it would try to avoid the common fault of the mid-Nineteenth Century editors scratching at one another with their pens in bitter personal feuds." [15]

After years of experience at newspapers in New York, Raymond knew what kind of newspaper the city was missing. His career as a journalist started in 1841 at The Tribune in New York. This newspaper was recently founded by Horace Greeley and Raymond became his assistant chief-editor. During the foundation of The Tribune, Greeley had already approached George Jones to help him setting up the newspaper. Jones refused, but he did take a seat in the business office of The Tribune. It was in this period that Raymond and Jones were introduced to each other and they would never get out of touch.[16] Raymond only stayed for two years at The Tribune. He and Greeley differed too much in character and in 1843, Raymond switched to The Courier and Enquirer, which was edited by James Watson Webb. In the forthcoming years, Raymond evolved into a talented writer who could handle fierce debates in his editorials. He also developed his political skills, as he became an active figure within the Whig Party.

His influence within the Whig party grew after he got elected to the New York State Assembly in 1849. This growing influence within the Whig Party wasn't unnoticed by his chief Webb, who tried to convince Raymond to promote him at the Whig Party, so he could become a Whig senator. Raymond refused and resigned at the newspaper in 1851.[17] In the meantime, Jones had started his own business in Albany as a banker and had made a fortune. In the mid-forties, he got his first opportunity to take over a newspaper in Albany, but, after consulting Raymond, he

[14] http://www.census.gov/, Population of the 100 Largest Cities and Other Urban Places in the United States: 1790 to 1990 (1998)
[15] Davis, History, 6; M. Berger, The story of The New York Times 1851-1951 (New York 1951) 7
[16] Davis, History, 3-4
[17] Berger, The story, 12

refused at that time, having other concerns. In 1850, the idea of starting a newspaper had not died. Raymond had always been interested in starting a newspaper on his own and after a few years of experience, he saw an opportunity in the newspaper market.[18]

All the newspapers in New York had their qualities, but also their weaknesses. The Herald (since 1835), which was edited by Bennett and the largest newspaper at the time, "was the inventor of almost everything, good and bad, in modern journalism"[19]. The criticism was that it was leaning too much to sensation, spending much attention to crime and scandals. The Sun (since 1833) wasn't a quality newspaper at all and, like The Herald, supporting the Democrats. Greeley's Tribune was an "excellent news sheet", but it was too much in favor of using its editorials to defend "some isms"[20]. Especially Fourieristic Socialism was favored by Greeley and he was a fierce opponent of Tammany Hall in New York. Although The Herald and The Tribune were successful, many people missed a newspaper which wasn't as sensational as The Herald and not as idealistic as The Tribune. Raymond felt that his newspaper could fill up that place. [21]

In the summer of 1851, Raymond and Jones got together and decided that the time had come to set up a new newspaper. In the prospectus, written by Raymond to attract advertisers, he described the newspaper as followed: ""The Times" is not established for the advancement of any party, sect or person…It will be under the editorial management and control of Henry J. Raymond, and while it will maintain firmly and zealously those principles which he may deem essential to the public good, and which are held by the great Whig Party of the United States more nearly than by any other political organization, its columns will be free from bigoted devotion to narrow interests."[22] Raymond wanted to explain that his newspaper would be a politically independent newspaper, although he was known to be a Whig Party member. Further on he also declared that, "In its political and social discussions, The Times will seek to be conservative, in such a way as shall best promote needful reform", and that "its main reliance for all improvement, personal,

[18] Davis, History, 4-6
[19] Ibidem, 8
[20] Ibidem, 10
[21] Davis, History, 7-13 ; Berger, The story, 7
[22] Davis, History, 18

social, and political, will be upon Christianity and Republicanism."[23] No prejudices or sensationalism, but a balanced view on matters was Raymond's ideal.

Having shared their thoughts on their new paper with their public and advertisers, the men were ready to launch their paper. The first edition of the New-York Daily Times became the product of Editor-in-chief Raymond and George Jones, and was released on the 18th of September 1851. It was welcomed by the public and other newspapers with respect. Especially the latter was special, as "it was tradition…for the established newspapers to meet fresh rivals with hostility, as bullies greet new boys at school."[24] Greeley thought it to be "by far the best paper published in New York for ONE cent a copy"[25], and Bennett decided to ignore the new paper.[26] The New-York Daily Times was founded and a success from the start. After one year, the newspaper had an average circulation of more than 24,000 copies a day, and was read from the east coast to the west coast and in Europe. Its main topics were the news from Europe, NY City and California, where the gold rush was at its peak.

Governor Bigler and the Chinese

Raymond and his editors started to spend their editorial articles on the Chinese in California from 1852 onwards. As mentioned before, The Times paid much attention to California, because the state was in the middle of the gold rush. This gold rush attracted many men from all around the world, and California had become an interesting place looking for news.

Next to the events in California, developments in and opportunities from China reached the American shores. The ports of China were opened by force by the British a decade before, and the opportunity for the whole world had come to share the spoils. These two developments found each other at the arrival of the Chinese in California. They received the attention of the editors from the moment Governor Bigler of California became the first state official to support the anti-Chinese immigration feelings. These anti-Chinese immigration feelings had come up slowly

[23] Berger, The story, 13-14
[24] Ibidem, 4
[25] Ibidem, 7
[26] Ibidem, 5-8

with the arrival of the Chinese. At first, they seemed to be accepted, but from the moment it became clear that there were more of them coming, the mood changed.

The main argument mentioned by the anti-Chinese immigration supporters was based on labor. The anti-Chinese leaders felt that the Chinese were unfair competitors as they worked harder for less money. Next to this argument, it must be understood that there was much racism in the country. People saw the Chinese as less human, and they were not the only ones who suffered from this prejudice. "Although the Declaration of Independence had insisted that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by the creator with certain inalienable rights" Jefferson and most of his fellow white Americans assigned somewhat less than human status to Africans and American Indians." [27] Anti-Chinese immigration supporters and organizations were nothing new, as most of the newcomers had been welcomed with negative reactions. Nativism and anti-Catholicism were already present in the eastern states in the thirties and forties and it had many supporters. It had even led to the formation of the Know Nothing Party. While moving to California in the search for gold, many of these supporters took their opinions with them. At first, they focused their anger on the Californian Native Americans and Mexicans, because they were people of a different color, but soon they came to the conclusion that the Chinese were the same and they would become the next victims of their racism.[28]

Although the anti-Chinese sentiment was already spreading throughout the state, the first editorial in The New-York Daily Times about the Chinese in the United States was about the developments of the Chinese in the market. The editor noticed that the Chinese and Native Americans were slowly spreading throughout the world to replace the blacks as slaves, because they worked harder and were more familiar with the working conditions. Next to that fact, the editor said about the Chinese that, "they are always found industrious and ambitious; capable of bearing an unparalleled amount of toil without fatigue; willing to do whatever their hands find, and able to do it cunningly and well." Continuing the article, Raymond showed in The Times that he wasn't an outspoken abolitionist[29], as he discussed the future of the black slaves. He stated that the costs of a black slave were about as much as a 'coolie', but the

[27] Daniels, Asian America, 31
[28] Daniels, Asian America, 29-33
[29] Davis, History, 5

'coolies' do "the larger sum of work". The editor wandered what would happen when the Cubans would decide to replace all the black slaves by Chinese. "What shall be the value of Slave capital in the Southern States, when the Slave population of Cuba, now numbering 323,847 souls, shall be flung into the labor market!" The near future might be interesting for the black slaves and the 'coolies': "Who underbids the other? and shall we take the lowest bidder?"[30]

That the Chinese were merely seen as opportunity than as a burden by the editor becomes clear in the next article. Two weeks after publishing the possibilities to replace the blacks by Chinese, the editor felt that China could mean a lot to the United States. As the relationship between China and the most Europeans countries wasn't quite good, the editor felt the time had come to get to know the Chinese better. "The presence of so many of the nation in California" would be an advantage.[31] After spending two articles on the opportunities the Chinese could offer to the country in the form of trade and 'coolies', Governor Bigler's views on the 'supposed coolies' in California arrived in New York.

In *Gov. Bigler and the Coolies,* on the 4th of June 1852, the views of Governor Bigler were shared with the readers of The Times. Bigler feared that "all the wealth of the soil will be carried away to the Celestial Empire, if means be not taken to check the immigration." The Chinese workers were "not independent workmen", but they work for Chinese companies who pay them a "nominal sum per annum; support their families at home; and engage upon the return of the peon, a lion share of the profits." After accusing the Chinese of being slaves, the governor had two other objections against the Chinese. The first was the fact that they didn't add anything to the society and the wealth of California. "Chinaman go thither simply to fill their jobs with dust, and deprive the country of its inherent strengths." They were not "domicile", "no wise to the support of government" and were "moderate consumers". The second fact was that "the Chinaman's skin is a sort of neutral tint – it might be called ultra marine, in consideration of the over-sea transit – that is not recognized by the constitution. That instrument was designed for Caucasians." Therefore "the Mongolian cannot, according to the Governor, acquire rights of citizenship." After stating that this latter opinion could be interesting for the "present

[30] Orientals in America (1852, 14-4) *The New-York Daily Times*
[31] Relations with China (1852, 30-4) *The New-York Daily Times*

stage of ethnological science.", the editor thought the time had come to "light up the subject with some little common sense."

He disagreed with Bigler on the number of Chinese that were in the country, as the editor thought, surprisingly enough, that there were more Chinese in the country. In the rest of his editorial, he responded in some sort of patronizing manner to the problems which Bigler mentioned. Responding to Bigler's argument that the Chinese "carry of the gold", the editor is said: "Let them." He thought it would develop the Chinese economy, which would be useful to the United States in a latter stage. He also reminded Bigler that "no laborer ever leaves California, supposing his labor to have been honest and legitimate, without leaving precisely his costs behind him." Concluding the editorial, he stated that if Governor Bigler wanted to stop "peonage" and "transient stay"; and an "immaculate veracity" had to be a condition, than everyone who lived and had moved to California had to be punished or removed. [32] The editor seemed to laugh about it.

The next day, he spent an editorial on the response of some Chinese merchants. In this response, they withstand the allegations made by Governor Bigler about the Chinese stealing gold, fibbing and "being hirelings of Chinese capitalists." The editor is so impressed by the "first manifesto issued by the Asiatics in America" that he thinks they "prove that the Orientals are fully entitled to equality of citizenship".[33]

A few days after the Bigler news, the fact that the editor seemed to favor the Chinese, at least more than his fellow citizens at the west coast, was proved. In *China-men in America*, he wrote with joy about all the opportunities that had come, because of the fact that the British had opened the ports, and now that there was contact between the west coast of the United States and China. "The surge of the same ocean rolls in on the beach of China and California. They are separated but by a few days of time – months are almost crowded into days." The time had come to get to know the Chinese better, and not only "by their tea-boxes". "America and China begin to mingle and socialize." About the Chinese in California, he was very positive: "Criminal law finds nothing to take hold of…as the Chinese emigration does not increase the tenants of prison, hospital, or insane asylum." "But each man works, economizes and augments his shining heap."

[32] Gov. Bigler and the Coolies (1852, 4-6) *The New-York Daily Times*
[33] A Chinese Puzzler (1852, 5-6) *The New-York Daily Times*

The whole editorial was an indictment towards Governor Bigler, who showed the "jealousy of the Yankee miner" For them "the Celestials are an exception. All other nations may freely come and freely work. Irish, Scotch, and English – French, German…even the Sandwich Islanders, the Patagonian, and the Terra del Fuegan, - may rock their mud-filled cradles in search for gold. But the Chinaman is not known for the Constitution." The neat response of the Chinese, some days before, showed an "altogether effect as completion demolition as ever Governor suffered." The country had to be glad with the trade with China and shouldn't listen to Governor Bigler and his anti-Chinese supporters. "No one can estimate the importance of the trade that is now opening between these two great countries." [34]

In the last in a series of four articles, the editor was disappointed that the legislatures of the state did pass a law which obliged Chinese miners to pay three dollars a month to work in the mines. He blamed the state for supporting the people who were trying to get rid of the Chinese. "Throughout the whole mining region, there appears to be an unanimous opposition to the Chinese, and a determination to evict them at all risks." The editors' sympathy was with the Chinese. "The Chinese are at least obedient to law and order, and we question whether in the long run they would not prove more valuable citizens than Americans, whom no authority can control." The editor concluded that, if the Chinese were no longer welcome in California, they could be useful in the south as workers. "There will never be a more admirable opportunity to put the thing in practice. We trust that the enterprise and capital of the South will not neglect it." [35]

Raymond had made his first statements about the way the Californians treated the Chinese. Although he wanted the paper to stay politically independent, Raymond showed his opinion when he felt it was needed. He had to be alert, because in the first years of The Times, his opinion was seen as the opinion of the newspapers and vice versa. In 1852, it almost went wrong for the first time, when he, as correspondent for The Times and as Whig member, attacked the members from the south at the Whig National Convention. He thought they were not cooperating with the northerners on picking the best candidate and this criticism was not appreciated

[34] China-men in America (1852, 9-6) *The New-York Daily Times*
[35] The Chinamen – An opportunity (1852, 14-6) *The New-York Daily Times*

by the southerners. It also had its effects on the reputation of the newspaper, but it helped giving the newspaper an identity.[36]

Unfortunately wasn't his political influence within the Whig Party helping the Chinese in their struggle in California. The sentiment had risen that the Americans had more right to get the gold than the Chinese and this led to the first anti-Chinese legislation proposals in 1852: a Chinese tax on mining. Another legislation that was proposed to discourage the arrival of more Chinese immigrants was an obligation to the master of vessels to post a bond of $ 500 on each immigrant leaving their ships in San Francisco. In response to this new law, the captains of the ships simply raised the sum of the journey with $ 500,-, resulting in the fact that the Chinese paid their own loan without preventing the Chinese immigrants from coming to America. Most of the money collected by the vessel master was used by the government to build new hospitals in de growing city of San Francisco (which Chinese weren't allowed to make use of in many occasions)

Most Chinese knew how to evade the penalty for working in the mines. Having dealt with corruption in their home country, they knew how to avoid paying taxes. But soon the Chinese learned that paying taxes was a better option than evading them, as tax collectors started to use violence to collect their money. The Chinese hadn't the possibility to get justice by court. This right had disappeared for the Chinese population in 1854.[37] A Californian statute of 1849 had already defined that "No Black or Mulato person, or Indian, shall be allowed to give evidence for or against a white man.", and Chief Justice Murray added the Chinese to this statute. He had mentioned that Columbus had called China the 'Indies' and this made them different than Caucasians.[38] From that day on, it was forbidden for Chinese people to testify in Californian state court. This law officially placed the Chinese in line with other racial minorities to the Californian state laws, like blacks and Native Americans.

The law led to an increase in violence against the Chinese population, especially in the mines. The white miners understood that they could terrorize Chinese without being charged for it, and so they decided to try to scare the Chinese

[36] Davis, History, 30-31
[37] Chang, The Chinese, 41-44
[38] Daniels, Asian America, 34

out of the mines. At several places, anti-Chinese warning signs were placed and they were successful. The anti-Chinese sentiment in the mines caused many Chinese to return to their homeland, instead of staying in the United States, as soon as they had collected enough gold to live a happy life in China.[39]

Where the Chinese were having a hard time at the West Coast, The New-York Daily Times circulation numbers were growing. The Times moved twice from headquarters in the fifties as the company was growing. Raymond had developed in his editorials. During the years 1852 and 1859, the Chinese in California weren't a hot topic for the editors. In fall 1852, the editors placed the Bigler case into more perspective. The editor made a comparison between Bigler about the Chinese and Cicero about the Greeks. He decided to spend a long editorial on comparing the Romans with the Americans and the Greeks with the Chinese. The conclusion of this long article was that, if Bigler wanted to act like a true Roman, he had to make some concessions. "The Chinese has its virtues as well as his vice…And therefore, we think, should the inimical Governor confine his censure to the Ciceronian standard, and prohibit them from what they do badly, and praise them for what they do well." By this statement, the editor decided to rest the case.[40]

After spending another editorial on the relations between China and the U.S. in 1853[41], one of the first major stories, which would make the NY Times famous, was published in 1854. It was the accident of the passenger steamer The Arctic. The steamer collided with a French ship in the night of the 27th of September 1854. It took two weeks for the news to reach the American shores. The Herald managed to get an exclusive story from one of the survivors of the accident and Times' night editor Bacon got noticed of that fact. Bacon had its informants within The Heralds' office and he managed to get a copy of the front page of this special edition and information about the time The Herald would be spread the next morning. Bacon tried everything to publish the story before The Herald. He succeeded and one hour before The Herald would publish its special edition about The Arctic, the New-York Daily Times' special about the Arctic, with some small changes in comparison to the

[39] Chang, The Chinese, 44-45
[40] National Vices (1852, 14-10) *The New-York Daily Times*
[41] Our Relation with China (1853, 16-9) *The New-York Daily Times*

original story from The Herald, was sold at every corner of the street. “It was a crush for The Herald.”, and a big boost for The Times. [42]

Just before the major story of the Arctic steamer, an editorial was written about *The Chinese in America*. In this short article, the editor shared with its readers the way the Californians looked at the Chinese, without giving his opinion about it. “It seems hard to find any who look with much favor upon this unloading of the Asiatics on the Pacific Side of our Continent.” [43]

The ‘coolie trade’

One of the main issues of the anti-Chinese groups was the conviction that most of the Chinese were slaves. “Of the 40,000 Chinaman supposed to be in California, about 35,000 are said to be in the condition virtually of slaves to their more wealthy countrymen.” [44] The two most common sorts of slavery, in the eyes of the Americans, were the ‘coolies’, the Chinese contract laborers who sold themselves to organizations in China and who worked for little money abroad, and the Chinese who were slaves of “their more wealthy countrymen” in California.

This ‘coolie trade’ was a returning topic in the history of the Chinese in America. The Chinese being seen as slaves of their wealthier countrymen was something which seemed to be a misunderstanding. The Chinese were very well organized as a group. A very large majority of them was a member of an organization which helped and protected them in the United States. These companies became known as ‘The Six Companies’ and they became influential in the Chinese market in the United States. They organized the earnings of the Chinese, helped them and also supported them in court. Although every nationality had some sort of organization, these ‘Six Companies’ were followed with special interest, because of their strong ties.[45]

Having set his target at getting to know the Chinese better, the editor decided to spend an editorial on an article published in the “*Oriental*; or, *Tung-Ngai Sau-Luk*”, an English-Chinese weekly magazine, in 1855. In the article, a representative of one of the ‘Six Companies’ refuted the charges made by Governor Bigler in

[42] Berger, The story, 18-20
[43] The Chinese in America (1854, 26-9) *The New-York Daily Times*
[44] The California News (1854, 9-10) *The New-York Daily Times*
[45] Daniels, Asian America, 20-25

1852[46]. He had said that these companies were virtually slave owners. The editor made room for the explanation of the representative: "It is one of the original customs of the Chinese, when visiting a strange province, to establish for common quarters a sort of club-house, supported by voluntary contribution, where they lodge and eat." "They are somewhat like American churches!" Chinese could stay and prepared themselves for the journey back home. Or they could eat and slept there. "Our company has never employed men to work in the mines for their own profit; nor have they ever purchased any slaves or used them here."

In response to the much heard complaint that there was a lack of Chinese women, the representative said: "Wives and families of the better families of China have generally compressed feet; they live in the utmost privacy; they are unused to winds and waves; and it is exceedingly difficult to bring families upon distant journeys over great oceans…And further, there have been several injunctions warning the people of the Flowery Kingdom not to come here" The representative concluded that all what the Chinese wanted, was equal protection and treatment. "They (the Americans) have come to the conclusion that we Chinese are the same as Indians and Negroes, and your courts will not allow us to bear witness…When we reflect upon the honorable position that China has maintained for many thousands of years…is it possible that this is in accordance with the will of Heaven?" The editor agreed with their hopes, as "they conclude with a reasonable request for a definite enactment as to their rights and privileges." Another step in the back of his fellow Americans at the west coast and the way they treated the Chinese.[47]

Two years after being elected lieutenant governor for the Whig Party in 1854, Raymond decided to make a switch in politics. Thanks to this switch, Raymond got the chance to play a decisive role in the future of American politics. He became a very important person within the newly created Republican Party. He was a free soil man and he was against the domination of the majority by a minority, which was happening right know on the topic of slavery. [48] He got into the ranks of the new Republic Party and played an important role at the convention in Pittsburgh in 1856. "Raymond was at Pittsburgh and wrote the long confession of faith on which the Republican Party was established – an able and convincing document which showed

[46] Gov. Bigler and the Coolies (1852, 4-6) *The New-York Daily Times*
[47] The Chinese in California (1855, 7-3) *The New-York Daily Times*
[48] Davis, History, 15

no sympathy with the abolitionists, but did express the determination of moderate northerners to end the domination of public life by southern terrorism." For many, he became known as "Godfather of the Republican Party."[49] From that moment, his paper changed its political views, and "The Times stood in the front ranks of Republican journalism of the country." [50] In the slipstream of the personal success for Raymond, the New-York Daily Times had its success as well. In 1857 they reached a circulation of 40,000 copies a day and on the 14th of September, Raymond dropped the word Daily and changed the name of the paper to: The New York Times.[51]

With the contrasts within the country growing, the editorials became harsher. After denying the Chinese in California for some years, an event in San Francisco in 1849, where anti-Chinese groups had been "suppressing a Chinese place of worship on the ground that "that the worship was idolatrous."", drew the attention. The editor called for some respect for the basic principles of the constitution, but he had mixed feelings about rebuking the San Franciscans. This because a Chinaman in New York was to be executed mostly on the fact that it was "the frantic deed of a benighted heathen".[52] Debates about the position of the African American were ongoing in the run up to the Civil War and so was the debate about the position of the Chinese. Thousands of Chinese were on their way to San Francisco and the need was felt to give them a place in society. The 'problem' was that the Chinese were, "notwithstanding their characteristic vices", gentle people who were willing to work for low wages and "may be destined to work great changes in the industrial if not in the social and political condition of America." Next to that, the Chinese were popular as a workforce, as it "is its tendency to supplant the Negro."

The need for a solution was felt, because "there is no reason to doubt that it will soon reach the Atlantic States as well." In that case, an answer had to be given to the question: "What shall their social and political *status* be?" The editor concluded that "these are questions which flit and flicker now along the political horizon."[53] The best way to treat the Chinese, according to the editor in response to the

[49] Berger, The story, 21
[50] Davis, History, 32-33
[51] Berger, The story, 21
[52] Two Religions and Two Races (1859, 17-6) *The New York Times*
[53] The Chinese Invasion (Article 2) (1859, 8-8) *The New York Times*

Californian treatment, was to offer them the same chances as Caucasians. Then, if they are as inferior as they say, "they will deserve and receive but a very small amount of sympathy from anybody." By degrading "them below their natural level…the oppressors as the oppressed" will suffer, according to the editor.

In 1860, the 'coolie trade' became an important topic. With a growing support for abolitionism in the north, the 'coolie trade' became a subject which received much attention from the editors of The Times. The 'coolie trade' was the trade of Chinese slaves across the Pacific. Some of them had already been enslaved in China and were shipped, but some of them fell accidently into the hands of these slave traders. These slave traders possessed the skill to convince innocent and inexperienced travelers to become a 'guest' at their ships. Although these Chinese thought they would go to the west coast of the United States, most of them would land on the shores of South America, being sold as slaves and never to be heard of again.[54]

In spring 1860, a report made by Mr. Elliot from Massachusetts, about the 'coolie trade', was handled in Congress. The report made clear that there were still American ships involved in this 'coolie trade' and it had to be stopped. "If we suffer our flag to become identified in the eastern seas with the excesses and outrages now perpetrated almost exclusively under its starry folds", it would damage the trade in a way which could not be covered by "the profits which half-a-dozen reckless ship-owners may make for themselves by selling the bodies and souls of a few thousand Mongols, yearly to the sugar-planters of Cuba and the guano-workers of Peru". The editor mentioned that the 'coolie trade' was totally different than the regular Chinese emigration. "The Chinese emigrants to California and Australia, like the Irish and German emigrants to America, pay their own passage-money, command their own labor, and are the architects of their own good or ill fortune". "This emigration is not the ally, but the enemy of Slavery." Concluding, the editor thought the time had come for the United States to suppress the 'coolie trade', because "so long as the American flag covers this cruel and cowardly commerce, it must continue to be carried on with all its actual incidents of shame and sin."[55]

[54] Chang, The Chinese, 30-32
[55] American Coolie-trade (1860, 21-4) *The New York Times*

In the summer, the topic of the 'coolie trade' rose again and the editor spent his time on explaining how the 'trade' worked. [56] Also did the Chinese government finally seem to come to action, after some incidents. [57] There had seemed to be a solution for the 'coolie trade'. Lord John Russell, British Minister for Foreign Affairs had put forth a plan "to encourage Coolie immigration as a means of suppressing the African Slave-trade." The editor was glad that the countries were looking for an honest solution to the problem of shortages at the labor market, but he advised the government only to cooperate, when Spain would cooperate as well. Spain was the most important player in the illegal 'coolie trade' and as soon as Spain would agree to give "some substantial guarantee" that the 'coolie immigration' wasn't "the Slave-trade under another name", the president could cooperate.[58]

The last editorial spent on the Chinese before the beginning of Civil War, was an editorial spent on the reaction of the president to the proposal made by Lord John Russell. The editor was glad that the president shared the same doubts and that he had stated that the future of the 'coolie trade' was in the hands of Spain.[59]

In the first ten years of the newspaper, The New York Times was a supporter of Chinese immigration. Although they didn't spend much attention to the Chinese in California, in the occasions they did spend attention to them, they blamed the Californians and defended the Chinese. On eve of the Civil War, the existence of Chinese slaves, better known as 'coolies' at that time, was condemned by the editor, just like the Republicans would condemn black slavery in the Civil War.

The Civil War

Between 1861 and 1865 the country was all about the Civil War between the Union and the Confederacy. The main interest of the people was what happened on the battlefield and therefore no editorials were spent on the 'coolie trade' or the Chinese in this period. Nevertheless, this period was important for the development of the New York Times.

[56] The Coolie Trade (1860, 31-7) *The New York Times*
[57] American Ships and the Coolie Trade (1860, 4-8) *The New York Times*
[58] The Coolie Trade (1860, 18-8) *The New York Times*
[59] The President and the Slave Trade (1860, 21-8) *The New York Times*

The New York Times had become known to be a Republican newspaper. Raymond had become an important person within the party in 1856 and in his slipstream did his newspaper also receive the mark 'Republican'. Although it had received this mark, it didn't follow the party at all times. So were The Times and Raymond not in favor of Lincoln from the start. They wanted New Yorker Seward to become the presidential nominee for the Republicans at the elections of 1860. From the moment it became clear that the majority was in favor of Lincoln, they switched without hesitation. They kept loyal to the party program and started to support the policy to keep the Union alive and to defend the constitution from the moment Lincoln became president.

Although Raymond was a Republican Party member, he kept his ability to look at the both sides of a problem. This was one of the most appreciated virtues of Raymond, but not always understood by his contemporaries. Where many of his editorial competitors felt the need to choose a side, Raymond dared to stay in the middle. This ability especially became visible in the Civil War. He wasn't in favor of slavery, nor was he an outspoken abolitionist, as he thought it to be mainly a southern question. His main objection to the whole question of slavery was the power of slavery in politics. [60]

The Civil War had its influence on Raymond and his growing reputation within the Republican Party, but it had also its direct influence on the New York Times. At first, the style of newspaper making changed. It could usually take days or weeks before news would arrive from the other side of the country. The Civil War brought a change to this. Readers weren't willing to wait several days anymore to hear the stories from the battlefield and so newspapers had to send their own correspondents to the front to gather their stories. These correspondents made it possible that it often happened that news from the battlefield was printed in the newspaper even before it had reached the officials in Washington. Although the readers were happy, it was very dangerous to work in the south as a newspaper correspondent from the north, because "a number of northern correspondents had narrow escapes from lynching." [61] This new way of journalism, during the war, at the front changed the traditions in journalism at forever. [62] The dangers of the Civil War

[60] Davis, History, 48-52
[61] Ibidem, 55
[62] Ibidem, 54-58

were also noticed at the New York Times headquarters. From the 13th till the 15th of July 1863, mobs raged through the city of New York. They were burning down houses, hanging African Americans and attacking newspapers. The well-fortified Times building was able to resist an attack, but their neighbors of The Tribune weren't. Finally after some attacks, the police, with the help of some armed Times staff members, could beat the rioters. Raymond's response in his editorial, "Crush the mobs", convinced the readers and the rioters that The Times wasn't afraid of anybody. [63]

Due to exclusive reports from the battlefield and heroic actions, The New York Times gained popularity during the war. Extra presses had to be bought to prevent that the demand would exceed the supply and a Sunday Times saw its first daylight. The Herald and The Times were competing each other on who was the largest newspapers of the city, both having a circulation of approximately 75.000 copies a day. The Civil War also led to a gain in popularity of Raymond. During the Civil War, the influence of Raymond had grown within the Republican Party, as he became "one of Lincoln's most valued political helpers". [64] He became the chairman of the Republican National Committee and directed the campaign that reelected Lincoln in 1864. In 1865, Raymond became a member of the House of Representatives for the state of New York.[65] Raymond and his newspaper had survived The Civil War in a great way.

While the New York Times was flourishing during The Civil War, was the position of the Chinese declining. The number of Chinese arriving was steady, but the anti-Chinese feelings were growing. In the fifties, the anti-Chinese feelings had grown and had resulted in several anti-Chinese legislations. The Chinese weren't allowed to testify anymore, they were fined for the work they did in the mines and politicians openly expressed their wish to restrict immigration. The amount of violence towards the Chinese had also risen. According to a report of the 'Six Companies', there were 88 Chinese men killed, of whom 11 by tax collectors, in 1862.[66]

The hope which some Chinese may had, that, with Republican Lincoln becoming president and fighting for the freedom of slaves, the Republican Party

[63] Berger, The story, 23-27
[64] Davis, History, 53
[65] Ibidem, 53, 63
[66] S.W. Kung, Chinese in American Life (Seattle 1962) 67

would also advocate freedom and equality for all minorities in the country, wasn't true. Where Republicans in the east were fighting for freedom, the Republicans in the west were particularly interested in the wishes of the white laborers. This was seen in the inaugural address of the newly elected and first Republican Governor Leland Stanford in 1862. He said that "an inferior race is to be discouraged by every legitimate means", and "there can be no doubt but that the presence among of numbers of degraded and distinct people must exercise a deleterious influence upon the superior race." [67] Anti-Chinese feelings had even infiltrated the Republican Party. In the same year in the east, President Lincoln had accepted a legislation that would make a start to completing a transcontinental railway. The Central Pacific Railroad Corporation (Central Pacific) had the task to start in Sacramento and to lay tracks in eastern direction, through the Sierra Nevada and the Rocky Mountains. The Union Pacific had the task to start at Omaha, Nebraska and to connect the two railways in the west. The start of this project led to a massive growth of available jobs in the country.

Just like many companies in the west, the Central Pacific was also driven by the anti-Chinese sentiment (which was to be expected, having Governor Leland Stanford as one of the bosses of the company). This made it possible that, although the Chinese had a reputation of being low-paid and hard workers, the company denied all Chinese men who applied for jobs. They only accepted job applications from white workers, and especially Irishmen found their job at the Central Pacific. Unfortunately for the Central Pacific, many white men in California thought they could earn more money in the mines. This caused the railroad company to have problems filling up its job openings. Despite this fact, Central Pacific started the project with only 800 jobs openings filled and still 4200 available. Most of the workers were Irish and because of the fact that the economy was doing well, the majority of the Irishman the company had hired, were not known to be the best men available. They easily went to strike for better working conditions and higher wages. Although the Central Pacific wasn't in favor of hiring Chinese workers, they decided to hire fifty Chinese workers to put the Irish strikers under pressure. If they kept striking, they would lose their jobs to the Chinese. In response to this threat, the Irish accepted a small wage rise and returned to their work.[68]

[67] E.C. Sandmeyer, The Anti-Chinese Movement in California (Illinois 1973) 43-44
[68] Chang, The Chinese, 53-57

The way the Central Pacific had handled the situation, didn't improve the relationship between the Irish and Chinese workers. Especially the Irish saw the Chinese as dishonest competitors and the relationship between the workers degraded. The Central Pacific wouldn't mind, as they found out that the Chinese were good workers. They worked better and cheaper than the Irish workers, and these good experiences led to a growth in Chinese workers at the Central Pacific. Within a few months they outnumbered the Irish workers. Although many Chinese were willing to work at the railroads, the working conditions were very bad. Especially finding their way through the mountains of the Sierra Nevada and Rocky Mountains, and dealing with the extreme heat of the Nevada dessert, was exhaustive. Despite these bad working conditions, the Chinese supported each other and didn't complain a lot. Until June 1867, when the Chinese decided that they didn't accept the bad working conditions anymore and decided to go to strike for better wages and working conditions. In response to the strike, Central Pacific boss Charles Crocker froze all wages and searched for 10.000 recently freed blacks to replace the Chinese workers. He failed. After a week, he had to agree to a $2, - wage rise. The Chinese had showed that they were willing to fight for their rights.[69]

The beginning of the Reconstruction

The Union had won the war, but the United States were far from unified. Debates on the course the country had to follow were fierce, and the National Union Party (the name under which the Republican Party got to the presidential elections in 1864) was divided after the assassination of President Lincoln. The war was fought, but the peace was far from restored.

The war had been a 'success' for The New York Times. Circulation numbers had risen and the prestige of the newspaper and its editor-in-chief Raymond had grown. This wouldn't last long, as Raymond decided to follow his heart and not the direction of the majority of the Republican Party.

During and after the Civil War, The Times and The Tribune were seen as the leading Republican newspapers of the country. At the end of the Civil War, there were two tendencies within the National Union Party. The majority of the party and

[69] Ibidem, 58-62

Greeley, the boss of The Tribune, saw the Civil War as an effort by the Confederacy to separate from the Union. Their opinion was, that, now the war was won by the north, the southern states which wanted to join the Union again, had to proof that they were worth it. Raymond had a different opinion about this and collided with the majority of his party. In his opinion was the southern rebellion at the beginning of the Civil War a result of the dissatisfaction in the south and not an effort to become an official secession from the north. He proposed to continue as a Union, just like before the Civil War, and to go on as one country. He had been willing to make concessions to the south at the beginning of the conflict and he was prepared to make them again. Being an influential party member, Raymond tried to convince the rest of his colleagues once more at his 'Philadelphia Address' in 1866, but he failed. After this last effort, he decided to resign as the chairman of the Republican National Committee. A year later, he decided to quit politics, after finishing his term as representative for the state of New York. Now he could give his full attention to the New York Times, which circulation numbers had dropped since Raymond's struggle with the majority of his party. [70]

Where national developments were most important during the war, international possibilities were getting the attention of national politics after the war. The Republicans were ruling the country and opportunities in trade or which would be good to capitalism, were supported by the party.[71] And so was the first editorial spent on the Chinese after the war, within the context of China and opportunities in trade. In *The Proposed Steamship Line to China* the editor spoke full of joy about the fact that Congress had passed a bill which would support a steamship line between the west coast and China. It would give a boost to the economy and in combination with the transcontinental railway; the U.S. could become the transit route between Peking and London. [72]

Although the party was in support of foreign trade and encouraged it, a novel by Dr. Draper, called the 'Future Civil Policy of America', went too far. In the editorial *The Growth of the United States through Emigration – The Chinese,* the editor summarized the main points of Dr. Draper's novel. Dr. Draper encourages, in

[70] Davis, History, 64-71
[71] Sandmeyer, The Anti-Chinese Movement, 46
[72] The Proposed Steamship Line to China (1865, 18-2) *The New York Times*

this novel, the admittance of millions of Chinese immigrants to make an end to the shortage of labor in large parts of the country. Next to that would the growth of the population give a major economic boost to the country and would it bring prosperity. After spending 75% of his article on summarizing, the editor came to the conclusion that he disliked this idea. The editors stated that their culture was too different. The Chinese don't know free institutions and Christian virtues and it would only take a matter of time before Oriental thoughts and habits (like polygamy) would become a part of the new American culture. Next to that fact, the editor thought that the country was still too weak after the Civil War. "We have four millions of degraded negroes in the South. We have political passion and religious prejudices everywhere. The stain upon the constitution is about as great as it can bear." If Dr. Draper's novel would become reality, "we should be prepared to bid farewell to republicanism and democracy." [73]

Two years later in 1867, was the outcome of the Civil War and the Republican spirit still felt in an editorial. In *Red, Yellow and Black* was the editor wondering how the future of American society would be, with the arriving of more and more Chinese. Having already to deal with Native Americans and the blacks, the Chinese were to become a third minority and how would they deal with the Europeans. The case of the Native Americans was evident to the editor. Although he thought that the way the Government was treating them, was "a disgrace to the nation", they would never "rise into a very useful or valuable part of our population." Their lifestyle is too different and as they were "the first to posses this Continent, they will be also the first to disappear from it." The Chinese "are singularly patient, industrious and manageable." They will help the country gaining a foothold in China, but they won't be a problem, as "the Chinese will never be absorbed into this nation. They will remain among us, but not of us". In his conclusion the editor thought that the blacks would become a part of society. "For the negro will share the continent with us and be a part of our people so long as we are a people." [74]

By staying true to the constitution, defending the gained rights of the freed slaves and encouraging trade, The New York Times acted like a real Republican

[73] The Growth of the United States through Emigration – The Chinese (1865, 3-9) *The New York Times*
[74] Red, Yellow and Black (1867, 30-6) *The New York Times*

newspaper. But these Republican views of The Times weren't supported by all Republicans throughout the country.

During the Civil War, Republican Governor Stanford had been openly promoting the restriction of Chinese immigration. At the end of the war, had the Republican Party become the National Union Party and called for union, also within its own party. And so, after the war, returned the Republican Party of California to defending the national party program. But this wouldn't last long. Where the north-eastern part of the Republican Party was in favor of equal rights to all men who lived in the country, the western part was getting more and more sympathy for the Democratic point of view on Chinese immigration. The main reason for changing the way they felt was the fact that they were losing votes by holding their position on Chinese immigration. A large majority of the voters in California was in favor of Chinese immigration restriction and this led to a heavy debate within the Republican Party. On the one hand, there were many radical thinkers within the party who were in favor of equal rights and good relations with other countries. On the other hand, there were Republicans who saw the party losing votes because of their idealism. They thought that they had to drop their idealism on immigration to secure their win at the next elections.

That the support for the Republican Party was shrinking became visible at several elections in California. The party, which was defending the rights of Chinese immigrants and the good relations with China and the prosperity that this would bring, lost many votes to the Democrats. In reaction to these losses, the Republicans started to switch towards a less pro-China treatment and they started supporting laws that would prohibit the entry of Chinese contract laborers, as they thought this was the main reason why people voted for the Democrats. [75]

Four years after the end of the Civil War, had the Californian Republicans decided to drop the ideals of the national party on Chinese immigration and decided to follow the present sentiment in California, which favored immigration restrictions. [76] The New York Times was still kind towards the Chinese, but the idea of a massive immigration of Chinese was not received with much joy. They supported the Chinese because he wasn't going to stay and his presence was good for the trade with China.

[75] D. Tichenor, Dividing Lines (Princeton 2002) 95
[76] Daniels, Asian America, 37

The Burlingame Treaty

After years of Republicanism in the White House, one of the great achievements in international trade at the time was the Burlingame Treaty. In 1868, a representative of the United States, Mr. Anson Burlingame, and a representative of China had put their signature under a treaty, in which they had made agreements which would encourage trade and would make migration between the countries easier. For the Republican Party in the northeast, this treaty was all they could ever wish for, but for the Democratic Party and the Republicans in the west, it was a nightmare scenario. It would mean the start of a growth in numbers of Chinese immigrants, but it would also lead to a growth in anti-Chinese sentiments in California.

The Burlingame Treaty was received in California with mixed feelings. Most of the inhabitants feared the consequences of this treatment and a flood of Chinese immigrations, while company owners saw the opportunities of the treaty. One of these companies was the Central Pacific Railroad Corporation. They were still busy laying down tracks between Sacramento and the east and to keep up the pace, the Central Pacific needed more workers. The Burlingame Treaty brought them the ideal opportunity to start an advertising campaign in China. The company longed for more Chinese immigrants and luckily for them, the national government had created the ideal conditions for the immigration of more Chinamen. Thousands of Chinese immigrants were shipped to the American shores and, in 1869, did the Central Pacific Railway complete their task and connected to the Union Railway. [77]

The completion of the Union Pacific Railroad caused 10,000 Chinese to become unemployed. Some of them found work in the fast growing sector of agriculture. The transcontinental railway made it possible to transport goods with a short expiry date throughout the country. The farmers in California saw an opportunity to give themselves a place in the national food market and farms were erected throughout the state. Within a few years, California had become the wheat capital of the country.[78] The unemployed Chinese, who did not find a job in the agricultural sector, entered the labor market during an economic recession. This

[77] Chang, The Chinese, 61-62
[78] Ibidem, 71-72

caused the first labor union to start openly a protest against the Chinese and their immigration. This happened at one of the first of many 'Sand Lot' meetings. The anti-Chinese sentiment was growing and was never to shrink again. In response to the wishes of the white majority, more anti-Chinese legislation was created by the city legislatures. Unfortunately for them were most laws overruled by the state court, because they were in fight with the constitution, the Burlingame Treaty of 1868 or national politics. [79]

The signing of the Burlingame Treaty was seen as a great achievement by The New York Times. Although Raymond had officially left the party, he and his newspaper kept supporting the Republicans and their ideals. But the Burlingame Treaty also caused the newspaper to open its eyes towards the situation of the Chinese in California. For a long time, they saw it as a western affair and didn't spend much attention to it (except in the case of Governor Bigler in 1852). With the signing of the Burlingame Treaty, the treatment of the Chinese in California had become of national interest. This was immediately noticed in the editorials from 1868 onwards.

In the editorial *Chinese Testimony in California Courts*, was the editor ashamed of his compatriots at the western shore. Beginning his editorial praising California as "the one most advanced in true civilization.", all his praise suddenly turned into amazement when he heard that the House of Representatives of California rejected an amendment to the law, which forbade "negroes, Chinamen and Mongolians to be witnesses against white men when an injury to their own persons or property is charged." Although the law had already been accepted in 1854 and the editor at that time, didn't spend any attention to it, he seemed furious in this editorial. The main arguments against accepting the amendment were that the Chinese weren't to be trusted and that they didn't know the value of an oath in court (because they aren't of the Christian faith). The editor was angry about these prejudices against the Chinese and thought that this law had to be placed in the same category as "the Inquisition, under Alba,…the old English system of legal injustice against the Irish, or the laws of the South toward the negro". The Chinese had done nothing wrong, according to the editor, and California was acting far from civilized. He shared his hopes that Mr. Burlingame would do something about this mistreatment and asked

[79] Daniels, Asian America, 38

him “to protest, both in the name of humanity and the Chinese Government, against the acts of atrocity which we hear of weekly from the Pacific Coast, committed on unoffending Chinamen.” [80]

Two months later, the editor is still angry about the subject of the treatment of the Chinese in California and he responded to the news that Mr. Burlingame had been in a cheerful mood at a banquet at the Chinese embassy. He thought that Burlingame had to temper his mood according to the treatment of the Chinese. The Chinese were treated very badly and especially the fact that they were denied the right to testify, was something the editor thought it was a shame. Denying this right to “the most clean, industrious, faithful and respectable working class in the world”, as some travelers and employers called them, was horrible and therefore he asked his readers: “If the code of slavery or the customs of Inquisition contain anything more iniquitous than this, we should be glad to know it.” At the end the editor reminded Burlingame that, before he should sign a new treaty with China about the treatment of the Chinese, he had to deal with the Democrats in his own country first. [81]

After letting the subject rest for a few months, the editor spent a smaller editorial on *The Chinese in California*. Although a majority of the Californians had anti-Chinese feelings, the editor was glad to hear that Methodist Episcopal Church had accepted the fact that the number of Chinese would grow and was willing to give them a warm welcome. By giving them the right to learn the traditions and the language of their new country for free, they would have the possibility to “form a real attachment to the country”. Although the editor thought that they had lost contact with the real world, having impracticable ideas, he stated that: “there can be no doubt that the immediate effect of teaching the Californian Chinese the English language is a most admirable one.” This also because the editor was sure that, one day they shall “take their share of responsibility of voting and ruling”. [82]

A verdict from a court in California in February 1869, brought the attention of the editor back on the subject of the denied right to testify. In *The Singular Case of Ah Wang* the editor spoke of the awkward situation of the Chinese at the time. Ah Wang was being robbed by a black man, named George Washington. After the verdict that

[80] Chinese Testimony in California Courts (1868, 19-4) *The New York Times*
[81] Facts for the Chinese Embassy (1868, 25-6) *The New York Times*
[82] The Chinese in California (1868, 8-11) *The New York Times*

Ah Wang hadn't got the right to testify, Washington was cleared of all charges by the Republican judge. The editor showed his amazement that a Republican judge agreed to this verdict and he hoped that Ah Wang would get justice at the Supreme Court. Supreme Court has to "put an end to the disgraceful oppression that the children of the Flowery Land have heretofore suffered in the Golden State.", the editor stated. [83]

At the end of May, there was another editorial in which the editor was fighting for the rights of the Chinese. This time he found a fellow-thinker in the person of Dr. Heacock, Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Missions at the New School Presbyterian Assembly. He condemned the way the Chinese people were treated at the west coast and he hoped that the people who created this injustice, would soon be punished. Dr. Heacock had come to this opinion after he had held an inquiry under Chinese citizens, asking them why they didn't convert from Confucianism to the Christian believes. One Chinese had responded that the Christians they met at the western shores, were: "oppressive, tyrannical, cruel and insolent; we have been pelted by crowds, robbed of our just earnings by thieves, struck, insulted and spit upon; many of our people have been murdered; we have had no safety for life or property, and even your courts have not protected us, on the ground that we did not believe in the same Deity that you believed in; and yet not one of our bitterest enemies can accuse us of ever having broken your laws or injured one of your faith." The inquiry led to a change of mind for Dr. Heacock and the editor hoped that many would follow him. [84]

While the treatment of the Chinese in California had become a hot topic in New York (having only 100 Chinese in the city, of whom 3 were female[85]) in 1869, The New York Times will forever think with grief at this year. Although the newspaper had fully recovered from the setback in 1866 and were growing even further, the unexpected happened: Henry J. Raymond died at the 19th of June 1869 at the age of 49. [86]

After losing Raymond, who had been the most important man at the newspaper for 18 years, George Jones had the difficult job to look for a replacement. His first choice was John Bigelow to become the new editor-in-chief. He was an

[83] The Singular Case of Ah Wang (1869, 20-2) *The New York Times*
[84] Christianity and the Chinese (1869, 29-5) *The New York Times*
[85] The Chinese in New York (1869, 30-5) *The New York Times*
[86] Davis, History, 78

experienced newspaperman and had also his connections in the political scene. Being a former Minister to France, he was expected to have connections in Europe as well. Despite all his good qualifications, Bigelow decided to leave the post in September after a political scandal. His successor was political editor Shepard. But Shepard was not the editor-in-chief The Times and the other editors needed at that time. Again after a few months, Shepard resigned as editor-in-chief and returned to his former position of political editor. The main reason for doing this was the fact that he couldn't control his editor Jennings. Louis J. Jennings was a former correspondent for The Times (the newspaper from London, Great Britain) and was recently added to the editorial staff of the newspaper, when a murder in the Tribune office was committed in autumn 1869. As The Tribune was one of the most important competitors, Jennings felt the need to spend his editorial space on attacking the editor-in-chief of The Tribune, Greeley. Shepard didn't agree to this, but the editorials of Jennings became such a success, that Shepard felt it would be better for The New York Times to follow Jennings. [87]

While The New York Times was searching for a good replacement for Raymond, the debate about the treatment of the Chinese didn't stop with the death of Raymond. Only ten days after his death, under the supervision of Bigelow, the debate continued. In *John Chinaman – What Shall We do with Him?*, the editor thought the time had come to give the Chinese a place in society. The number of Chinese in the country at that time was thought to be 170,000 and with more to come, the question had to be solved. With the fears of the anti-Chinese movement that the Chinese were looking for supremacy, the editor thought that "it's the negro question all over again". Responding to the plans in which the Chinese were seen as a possibility to replace the blacks in the south, the editor seemed disappointed. They were trying to exploit the Chinaman like they did with the African Americans. The editor reminded his readers that people should look "the forward way, not the backward." [88]

The plans of importing Chinese into the south demanded attention in the summer of 1869. In three editorials within a month, the editors shared their opinion with its readers on Koopmanshoop's plan at the Chinese Labor Convention in Memphis. In the first article, *China in America*, the editor shared the plans of the

[87] Ibidem, 80-90
[88] John Chinaman – What Shall We do with Him? (1869, 29-6) *The New York Times*

convention with his readers and he was quiet positive about it. With the Chinese being fined and barred in California, the Chinese could better be used in the south, being cheap and willing to do the rough work. [89] The next day, the editor continued to explain the plans made by Koopmanshoop and he thought that the country should keep an eye on it. As the Chinese were promised "good treatment and protection" there would be many Chinese coming to the south and that could be the start of a change of the composition of the workforce throughout the country [90] Being in favor of free immigration, the editor warned Koopmanshoop that there were strict rules for the importation of Chinese into the south. In *The Law Against Coolie Importation* he advocated the repeal of the 1862 law, which forbade the importation of 'coolies' by American companies. The Pacific coast needed more Chinese workers to keep up the speed of development, but many Chinese were not capable of paying the crossing of the Pacific. Therefore the editor thought that, to forbid 'coolie importation', is to forbid Chinese immigration.[91] The editor ended his summer editorials about the Chinese, with challenging Senator Casserly from California. His opinion was that the coming of more Chinese would lower the wages of all workers. The editor, pointing to the fact that he had mentioned it multiple times before, thought that there was enough space in the country to give everyone a place, and that the same fear was expressed at the arrival of the Irishmen, and: "No one probably would assert that the rate of native wages has really been lowered thereby". [92]

After spending quiet a lot attention to Koopmanshoop plans under the supervision of Bigelow, the Chinese question kept asking for the attention of the editorial page during the reign of Shepard and Jennings. They felt the need to write an editorial about the introduction of a mining tax on Chinese in Idaho, a tax which was just like the Californians had introduced in 1852. In response to this new law, a Chinese man called Ah Bow went to court and asked for a law to forbid the sheriff to collect taxes. Judge Noggles refused, but stated, according to the editor, that these anti-Chinese laws were "a product of "hostility to the Chinese" and he expressed a determination to banish them from the country". This pleased the editor and he hoped that the

[89] China in America (1869, 14-7) *The New York Times*
[90] Koopmanshoop's Project (1869, 15-7) *The New York Times*
[91] The Law Against Coolie Importation (1869, 24-7) *The New York Times*
[92] Groundless Alarms (1869, 21-8) *The New York Times*

Burlingame Treaty would soon overrule all these anti-Chinese legislations. [93] Eleven days later, a letter from Republican Senator Cole of California was the main subject in the editorial. According to him, it depended on the way you look at the problem whether it was a problem or not. If you compare the "industrious, ingenious and economical mechanics of the Flowery Kingdom" with the "degraded Mexicans" or think of the Chinese as the people who helped developing the state, the Chinese would do well. But when you think of the Chinese as the people who try to overthrow the institutions of the country, you were creating your own hate. The editor liked the fact that the senator had such an open mind towards the problem and thought that the Californians, who wanted to stop immigration, fearing that the Chinese tried to overthrow the institutions, were short-sighted. The editor reminded them that one of the most valuable institutions of the country was that it is a land of immigrants and that if the anti-Chinese supporters wanted to see people who were breaking down the Americans institutions, they've had to look in the mirror. [94]

The last two editorials of 1869 were also kind towards the Chinese. In *The value of the Chinamen*, the editor expressed his wish that one day the Californians would see the value of the Chinese and what they've done for the country, like building the Central Pacific Railway. The Chinese are a "quiet, inoffensive race, and peculiarly liable to oppression at the hands of those who look upon them as intruding rivals". He hoped that Mr. Burlingame could keep his promises made to the Chinese government in his treaty. [95] The next day, the editor responded to a "Declaration of Independence of China", which was created by an anti-Chinese movement. Again he blamed the movement for being short-sighted. They had said: "We pledge ourselves to a system of non-intercourse with these Chinese coolies". The editor thought this was exactly the same as what they blamed the Chinese for, and next to that, the Americans in China behaved exactly the same. The editor thought that the fears and arguments that were spread by the anti-Chinese movement were based on nothing and the only reason why they spread them was because they feared the competition. The editor concluded by saying that they hadn't had to fear this competition. "Our friends in California may set their minds at rest on prospective dangers." [96]

[93] The Burlingame Treaty and Anti-Chinese Laws (1869, 9-11) *The New York Times*
[94] The Chinese Question (1869, 20-11) *The New York Times*
[95] The value of the Chinamen (1869, 4-12) *The New York Times*
[96] The Chinese Problem (1869, 5-12) *The New York Times*

The Chinese question had clearly become a subject to which The New York Times wanted to spend attention to. With the Burlingame Treaty signed, the subject gained a lot more attention. In 1869 The Times spent twice as much attention to the Chinese in their editorials, as they had spent from the beginning of the Civil War until 1868. Their opinion on the subject stayed the same, even though co-founder Raymond had died. They favored the Chinese, because they were good workers and did nothing wrong and blamed the Californians. The New York Times stayed true to the Republican ideas: international trade is good and equality between different races is preferred.

Spreading throughout the country

The seventies of the 19th century became the decade in which the western Chinese question turned into a national debate on the federal exclusion of Chinese immigrants. The signing of the Burlingame Treaty caused many Republicans to pay attention to the treatment of the Chinese in the west, but also Koopmanshoop's project caused many citizens to keep an eye on Chinese immigrants. With the completion of the Pacific Union railroad, there had come a possibility for the Chinese to cross the Sierra Nevada in the eastward direction. With the possibility that the Chinese would spread throughout the country, the Chinese question became a national problem, with only 63,000 Chinese living in the country at that time. [97]

At the beginning of the seventies, still 78% of the Chinese in the country, lived in California, and 99% lived in the western states. The anti-Chinese sentiment was growing and ways were sought and found to make clear that the Chinese weren't welcome in the western states. There was only one problem, and that was that the state legislators had to find a way to avoid the constitution and the Burlingame Treaty. Many of the proposed anti-Chinese laws were overruled or found unconstitutional because of the violation of one of both. The main problem was that the constitution forbade race-based laws, so the state legislators had to design laws which would hurt the Chinese economy and population, without being race-based. The solution lay in laws which were based on Chinese behavior. By this way, they tried to undermine the constitution. In 1870 two new anti-Chinese laws were introduced. One of them was the 'Cubic Air Ordinance'. This law obliged lodging

[97] Sandmeyer, The Anti-Chinese Movement, 17

places to have 500 cubic feet of open space available for each adult. Although the law wasn't focused on the Chinese directly, it had its effects indirectly, as the Chinese were known for sleeping in groups in small places. The other law focused on destroying the Chinese industry, by forbidding the use of poles to transport goods and creating a tax for transporting goods by foot. In case the Chinese denied paying the fine, their cue was being cut off in jail (something that was very humiliating to Chinese men). Everything was tried in California, within the rules of the constitution, to humiliate the Chinese people. [98]

With the completion of the transcontinental railroad, the plans in the south and the success stories from western capitalists about the Chinese, the Chinese were ready to cross the continent. This spreading throughout the country started in east and southward directions 1870, and was really something new, as sixteen states had no Chinese citizens at that time and only eight states had more than hundred Chinese citizens.[99] Many Americans had never ever seen a Chinese person in real life and this was thought to change soon. In the south, plantation owners were trying to replace the freed African Americans with Chinese at their plantations. Although many Americans placed the Chinese in the same category as the former black slaves and natives, the Chinese had rights in the majority of the country. This was a fact where many plantation owners weren't used to. They treated the Chinese as bad as they treated their slaves before, but instead of going on with it without facing prosecution, the Chinese went to court each time something unlawful happened to them. Where plantation owners were used to the fact that they didn't have to think about wages or working conditions in the era of slavery, the Chinese tried to negotiate with them for better wages and working conditions. The experiment of Chinese workers at the plantation hadn't been the great success they hoped for. [100] Eventually, the editor would even advise to make an end to the plantation system after the failure to replace the former slaves by Chinese workers, and to give the freedman the space to employ themselves.[101]

Convinced by the same stories, which had convinced southern plantation owners to hire Chinese, were the north-eastern capitalists. The north-eastern part of the United States was a well-developed, industrial and capitalist-minded society.

[98] Chang, The Chinese, 118-119
[99] Ibidem, 21
[100] Chang, The Chinese, 93-95
[101] Labor in Louisiana (1873, 5-10) *The New York Times*

Differences between poor and rich grew larger and company owners did everything to gain profit. White workers were having a hard time in the northeast. Having fought in the civil war, many of them had to search for a new job when they returned. These jobs were hard to find, competing with thousands of new immigrants which had arrived from Europe in the meantime and which were willing to work under poor working conditions and for lower wages. Despite the fact that there was already a large workforce available, several companies decided to replace white workers by Chinese workers. Just like in the western part of the country, white workers were becoming more expensive by the day as they were well organized and went on strike easily. The rumor of the hard-working, not striking and low-paid Chinese workers had reached the eastern shores and it was Calvin Simpson of the North Adams shoe factory, who brought in the first Chinese workers to the east coast. They had to replace his striking white female workers.

Under heavy protests of white workers and their associations, the Chinese went to work and it was a success. They produced more for less money and soon several other companies replaced their workers with Chinese workers. The success wouldn't last long, as the Chinese went to strike as well and started to act like their white colleagues. Also this experiment didn't go as was hoped for. [102] Although it wasn't a success, it led to an anti-Chinese sentiment under the workers and this would led to a change of policy of the National Labor Union (NLU). At first they thought that Chinese laborers deserved the same protection as white laborers, but after the experiences in the east and involvement from western laborers, they decided "that the presence in our country of Chinese laborers in large numbers is an evil entailing want and its consequent train of misery and crime on all other classes of the American people, and should be prevented by legislation." [103] And so, as expected, the Chinese question started to travel, with the Chinese, throughout the country.

Debates about the position of the Chinese were held throughout the country, and so were they within the Republican Party. In 1870, Charles Sumner, Republican and Senator of Massachusetts, offered an amendment to the proposed Naturalization Act to change "free white men" to "free men". This amendment would count on heavy capacitance throughout the Senate, and even from his fellow Republicans from the

[102] Ibidem, 99-101
[103] Daniels, Asian America, 43

west. Senator Stewart, a Republican from Nevada, thought it would be necessary to restrict the power of the Chinese people within the country, as they would undermine the basic principles of the Republican Party. Chinese people were loyal to a monarchist emperor and had no Christian background. They were simply not like other immigrants and former slaves, who were acquainted with the standards and values of the American Constitution. Next to the fact that Sumner's ideas were attacked by a fellow Republican, was Stewart's reaction even stranger, because he had been defending the civil rights of the Chinese only a year before. It became clear that Republicans from the west were feeling pressured by electoral defeats in the west and that they were even willing to attack their fellow Republicans, in order to secure their position. Sumner felt betrayed by his colleague, but the majority of the Senate felt like Stewart and so the amendment was rejected. [104]

Despite the heavy debates throughout the country and within the Republican Party, The New York Times stayed true to its Republican ideals and their opposition towards the Democratic Party and their ideas on the Chinese question. But also on other occasions, did The Times keep opposing the Democratic Party and injustice. Where the Chinese became well known throughout the country, The New York Times was gaining respect as well. The main reason for this was their fight with the leader and his friends of the Democratic Tammany Hall in New York, better known as the Tweed Ring.

Just after the death of Raymond, the Tweed Ring was gaining power in New York City. George Jones, who now had become the most important person at The Times, had the wish to investigate the frauds of the Tweed Ring. There was only one problem, and that was that James Taylor. He was a Times director and a business partner of Tweed and a supporter of the Tweed Ring. He would never support such an attack by George Jones, but luck was on Jones' side, as Taylor died in September 1870. That was the moment for Jones to start the attacks on the Tweed Ring and Tammany Hall. Not being a gifted writer himself, Louis Jennings did his work as editor-in-chief and he made John Foord responsible for the reports. This was the start of a fight with not only the Tweed Ring, but also with other newspapers, which felt the need to defend the Ring, as the Ring was responsible for most of the advertising

[104] Tichenor, Dividing, 96

revenues for those newspapers. For a long time, the attacks on the Tweed Ring didn't seem to work out well for The Times. Dealing with a lack of evidence of the frauds, Tammany Hall and the Tweed Ring kept running the city and they won the elections of 1870. But again luck was at the side of the New York Times. In January 1871, Tweed's financial controller James Watson died at an accident. In the search for a successor, the Tweed Ring stepped into a trap of James O'Brien. O'Brien was the head of The Young Democrats and he wanted to replace Tweed as the leader of Tammany Hall. The successor of James Watson, Matthew O'Rourke, was secretly working for O'Brien. After an attempt to get more money from Tweed, which Tweed had refused, O'Brien wanted revenge and ordered O'Rourke to make some copies of fraudulent financial transactions. In order to make these frauds public, O'Rourke went to some newspapers to sell this information. After contacting some newspapers, which all refused, fearing the effects on their own advertising revenues, O'Rourke went to the New York Times in the beginning of July 1871. O'Rourke brought Jennings the evidence he was looking for and the Tweed Ring would disappear soon. [105]

The New York Times had gained respect nationwide by winning this battle with the mighty Tweed Ring and fighting against injustice. Their fight with the injustice that happened to the Chinese was continued in their editorials. In the first editorial of 1870, the editor responded to the ratification of the 15th Amendment. The 15th Amendment guarantees that the "right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or any State, on account of race, color, or previous conditions of servitude.". The editor thought that there would be an important role for Congress to make sure that the amendment would be respected throughout the country, as the editor was convinced that several states would try to nullify it by creating new restrictive legislation. He tried to ease the minds of his fellow countrymen, by saying that they wouldn't have to be afraid of the fact that Chinese were willing to gain a foothold in society by voting. "He is so much a sojourner that he has not even brought his women." The editor was confident that this 15th Amendment wasn't the start of a new chapter of The Chinese question. [106] In *What shall be done with John Chinaman?*, the editor thought that the problem with Chinese labor was that it "has fallen into the hands of jobbers, who seek chiefly their

[105] Berger, The story, 35-42
[106] What next? (1870, 22-2) *The New York Times*

own profit." Having a recent history with slavery, the country had to keep an eye on it. But nonetheless, he supported, under strict rules, that Chinese organizations could help the Chinese coming to America. [107]

Having only a hundred Chinese in New York, the possible arrival of larger numbers of Chinese to the city, seemed to worry the editor. In April 1870, he responded to new information about the number of Chinese arriving at San Francisco. Where the New Yorkers were used to thousands of European immigrants a day, the Californians seemed to get used to the same numbers. With the help of the Pacific Union railway, the editor thought that the New Yorker had be prepared for "numbers of these Orientals at our own doors". "The questions of economic and international policy which their advent must create will be among the most important which we shall be called upon hereafter to determine." [108] On the 21st of June, the first 150 Chinese laborers arrived from the west in New York. [109] Only one week later, the editor reported of a meeting between the mayor and laborers about the arrival of the Chinese. Immediately he noticed that there was a tendency to use arguments based on prejudices in the debate. Especially The Tribune used these prejudices on the Chinese 'coolies' and the Chinese question, and the editor asked for an intelligent debate, based on facts. Once more he explained to The Tribune that the Chinese immigrants were no slaves and came here on their free will. [110]

Although the fact that the arrival of thousands of Chinese a day worried him, it was clear that the editor had been dealing with the subject of Chinese immigrants for a while and that he thought that most of the fears about the Chinese by the Americans were overdone. This was seen in *A New Solution of the "Servant Girl" Question*. In this article, he made a fool of the problems the women in New York were having, finding a good servant girl. The solution to the problem was the Chinaman, but "his principle weakness is a coveting of the neighbor's chickens", pointing at the shared conviction of the population that no chicken was safe in the neighborhood of the Chinese chicken eaters. He concluded that if the white mistresses would accept this only 'weakness' and dared to hire a Chinese servant,

[107] What shall be done with John Chinaman? (1870, 3-3) *The New York Times*
[108] Chinese Immigration (1870, 15-4) *The New York Times*
[109] Arrival of One Hundred and Fifty Chinamen (1870, 21-6) *The New York Times*
[110] Theories and Facts about the Chinese (1870, 1-7) *The New York Times*

she could return to her job and bring even more prosperity to herself, her family and the country. [111]

The editor persisted in trying to convince his fellow citizens of the fact that the fears were based on prejudices and that facts were needed to find an answer to the Chinese question. Three editorials showed the same ingredients in the summer of 1870. In *The Chinese in the American Labor Market* the editor had found the solution to the problem of Chinese laborers working for lower wages. "The Chinaman must land upon our shores as free to go where he pleases, and to profit by his labor, as the German or the Irish immigrant…Once here, with the perfect freedom of action, the market value of Chinese labor will soon rise to its proper level." There was only one condition, and that was that Congress had to accept an anti-contract-labor legislation and was willing to fulfill its duty. After that, the Chinaman can be free and the Chinese question will be solved. [112] In the second editorial, the editors repeated the fact that he was tired of listening to the debates based on opinions and prejudices and he decided to investigate the Burlingame Treaty himself. After reviewing his research with his readers, he came to the conclusion that the only possibility to get rid of the Burlingame Treaty legally was the fact that the Americans didn't have the same rights, privileges and immunities in China as the Chinese. But changing the treaty would be undesirable. Next to that, the editor was convinced that the fears about a Chinese supremacy and the Chinese ruining the labor market weren't true. [113] At the end of the summer, the editor responded to the plans of the San Francisco Labor Union. After refuting the three main arguments made against the Chinese, the editor hoped that the anti-Chinese movement would stop making false presumption about the Chinese and to be honest once, like they had been recently in Ohio, where they had said: "We don't want Chinese here anyhow." By doing that, they would finally be honest and an honest debate about the constitution could be held. [114]

In order to find a solution to the problem of the Chinese, the editor wanted to pay attention to all facts which were important to the question. In this perspective, the editor felt the need to give a better insight of the country where the Chinese immigrants were coming from. His main conclusion was that, although the Chinese

[111] A New Solution of the "Servant Girl" Question (1870, 6-7) *The New York Times*
[112] The Chinese in the American Labor Market (1870, 7-7) *The New York Times*
[113] Our Chinese Immigrants (1870, 14-7) *The New York Times*
[114] The Labor Question (1870, 18-8) *The New York Times*

had the reputation of being kind, tea-drinking, quiet people, their country had been ruled by chaos for decades. "The nation…which we generally regarded as existing in a condition of sluggish comfort, is one of the most unfortunate and distracted upon the earth." [115]

Whether it was because of the official start of the fight in the editorials with the Tweed Ring or the events in China was unknown, but the attention for the Chinese question from the editor suddenly dropped in September. After convincing its readers, a summer long, of the fact that the most arguments used by the anti-Chinese movement were based on prejudices, attention for the problem faded.

Although the attention in the editorials may have moved to the Tweed Ring, the *The Tien-Tsin Massacre* in China could not be denied. At the Tien-Tsin massacre, almost sixty Christians, of whom forty were Chinese, were killed after the rumor was spread that French priests and nuns were buying Chinese orphans from kidnappers to use their eyes for medicine. This rumor caused an angry mob to plunder and burn down British and American churches in Tien-Tsin and to murder sixty Christians. When the editor heard of the news that a mob in California saw this massacre as an occasion to attack Chinese men and women, he felt the need to respond. The editor tried to explain that it was unfair and not correct, when searching for revenge, to look at the Chinese population as one group. The Chinese are comparable to the Europeans, having different cultures and background throughout the population and the editor condemned the attacks. [116]

The seemingly revival of the Chinese slave trade was another event which caused the editor to spend attention to the Chinese at the end of 1870 and the beginning of 1871. After spending many editorials on the topic just before the start of the Civil War, the news that two vessels had been in a state of mutiny in Hawaii, brought the subject back to the editorial page. He understood why these mutinies had happened and blamed the Portuguese for keeping the slave trade from Macao alive. It had to stop, as "John Chinaman is, perhaps, in no way an angel; but he has rights which all calling themselves Christians and civilized should be bound to respect." [117] In the beginning of 1871, the editor spent another article on the revived slave trade,

[115] An empire that is not peace (1870, 25-7) *The New York Times*
[116] The Tien-Tsin Massacre (1870, 17-9) *The New York Times*
[117] Chinese Coolie Mutinies (1870, 10-10) *The New York Times*

in which he again condemned it. In *The Slave Trade Revived*, he spent much attention to explaining how this slave trade worked [118] and at the beginning of the summer, after hearing of the news of the death of hundreds of Chinese at the ship *The Don Juan*; he called one last time for action. "The civilized world should combine, as once before, in the case of the African slave trade, for its suppression." [119]

In contrast to what may have been expected, considering the last editorial before the 'western' Chinese arrived at the eastern shore, the number of editorials on the Chinese dropped since their arrival in the summer of 1870. Although the editor had shared the fear with his readers that the New Yorker should be prepared for "numbers of these Orientals at our own doors", did the editor stay true to its Republican ideals and thoughts. He even got more spirited to battle the anti-Chinese movement with arguments based on reason instead of prejudice. Now that the battle with the Tweed Ring had finished, the question was whether the Chinese question would return to the editorials as often as before or not.

The Celts and the Celestials

The Chinese were spreading throughout the country and the Chinese question was coming with them. The number of Anti-Chinese laws in the west had grown and events like the Tien-Tsin massacre had become the pretext for revenge. While in the meantime, had debates about the 14th and the 15th Amendment led to a discord within the leading Republican Party on the topic of Chinese immigration. The tension within all the sections of the population was growing.

After the successful fight with the Tweed Ring, the NY Times had become a respected newspaper nationwide. Another development which caused a gain in respect was the fact that The Tribune had left the Republican Party, as Horace Greeley had accepted the nominations for the presidential ticket for the Liberal Republican and Democratic Party in 1872. This made The New York Times "the

[118] The Slave Trade Revived (1871, 16-1) *The New York Times*
[119] The Later Slave Trade (1871, 2-7) *The New York Times*

leading Republican paper of the East at least, if not the entire United States"[120], while the circulation of The Tribune dropped. The Times had become the only Republican newspaper of the city. This was something which would indefinitely lead to some internal struggles, as one of the main pillars of the newspaper was its independence from any political party. And so, as an independent paper, it had to blame the Republican Party in the occasions it deserved it. There was a growing dissatisfaction among the editors with the Republican Party. This led to a short flirt with the Liberal Republicans in 1872, but this flirt stopped immediately when it became clear that the party had nominated Greeley as their candidate. By nominating Greeley, the trust in the reforming capacity of the party was gone, as Greeley had failed to support The Times' wish for reforms during the Tweed scandal and at the end of the Civil War. The newspaper had decided to stay true to the party, but it became increasingly difficult, as the line of the party and the newspaper were developing each in another way. [121]

With The New York Times still in support of the Republican Party, the editor showed his delight that Republican candidate Booth had been elected as governor in California. But despite his contentment, he showed his disappointment with the fact that the both the Democrats and the Republicans shared their views on immigration, which involved "hostility to Chinese immigrants". [122] This hostility to Chinese immigrants had not only been shown by the politicians in California, but also by mobs. One of the first large-scale mob acts against the Chinese population were the riots in Los Angeles on the 24th of October 1871. [123] The riots began when two armed, rival Chinese groups gathered together to fight each other. To prevent the Chinese groups from fighting, a policeman and a civilian tried to come between them, but they were shot by the Chinese. In reaction to this, a large, white group of five hundred men entered Chinatown to get their revenge at the fifty Chinese. At the end of the evening it had become clear that the white mob had hanged fifteen Chinese and had set several Chinese buildings on fire. [124] Two months later, the editor spent for the first time attention to these riots. He responded to the report of the Grand Jury on the race riots. The outcome of the report was that the police could

[120] Davis, History, 118
[121] Ibidem, 117-121
[122] California All Right (1871, 8-9) *The New York Times*
[123] Sandmeyer, The Anti-Chinese Movement, 48
[124] Chinese in California (1871, 15-12) *The New York Times*

have done something to prevent this massacre from happening. Although it may have been another opportunity for the editor to blame the Californians for the bad treatment of the Chinese, he decided to rest his case. He condemned the riots, but he didn't support the calls to the United States Government to start an investigation on the subject. He was happy that that some suspects were charged and he trusted the judgment of Republican Governor Booth to settle the case. [125]

The fact that he was willing to give the judgment of Governor Booth a chance, was also shown in his next editorial two days later. In *The Celts and the Celestials,* the editor spent attention to the inaugural speech held by the new governor. In this speech, the governor showed, according to the editor, that the Republican Party had chosen to copy the strategy of the Democratic Party on the Chinese question. He did this to "make political capital by catering to the class prejudices of the ignorant." The editor blamed the Republican Party for doing this and he reminded the governor that, although he wanted to bring "our national legislators to fully comprehend the evils threatened, which are now local and not general", Congress couldn't stop the immigration of certain groups or races because it was in fight with the constitution. In the last two paragraphs of the editorial, he decided to blame the Irish for being the instigator of all the Chinese exclusion wishes. The Irish had always supported slavery and now that it had been abolished, the Irish sought a new scapegoat and found it in the Chinese population. He concluded that the United States had enough space for new immigrants and always had been a land of immigrants. Therefore the country "cannot be expected to refuse a welcome to Celestial merely because he is distasteful to the Celt." [126]

After spending years on the subject of Chinese immigration and the anti-Chinese movement, an overall sarcasm seemed to have taken over control of the editorial staff. Especially the fear which was being spread by the anti-Chinese movement and their so-called elevated position compared to the 'degraded' Chinese were returning items in the upcoming years.

The first editorial in 1872 was a review on the first two years since the start of "an immense influx of Mongolians, who were to fill all branches of labor to the complete exclusion of their white rivals". The fears, which were spread by the west

[125] Ibidem
[126] The Celts and the Celestials (1871, 17-12) *The New York Times*

throughout the east, "have been found to be wholly groundless." The editor thought that the Chinese decided to stay in the west because they always kept the wish to return to China one day. Next to that did Confucianism obliges them that, when they die, their "body should lie in his native soil". The editor is convinced that the main reason why they came to the United States was the gold rush. This had been a temporary hype and although the numbers of ships crossing the Pacific was still growing, the number of Chinese coming to the country was steady. The editor was convinced that "if it were not for the colony of seventy or eighty thousand of them now in California, there would be no emigration at all".[127] There was nothing to be scared of, according to the editor, but the developments in China at the moment. The Chinese were being seen as "incapable of making any progress in anything", but recent discoveries by Chinese intellectuals showed otherwise. Despite the American and European feelings of supremacy towards the Chinese, the editor thought this feeling could be over soon, as China had the ability to become the "most powerful military Empire on the globe." [128] He thought the time had come that his fellow citizens would come to the sense that they were not as civilized as they thought.

A Heathen Festival is the example of the sarcastic tone the editor decided to use more often in the next years and it is felt throughout his editorial. In the article, he described the Chinese feast of Monks from an Irish point of view. He had set the tone by noticing that the Chinese began their day with drinking tea instead of whisky, by which the Chinese "went on to prove their infinite inferiority to civilized people." Then they danced on the music played by an "absurd Chinese violin", played some card games which were "doubtless of an extremely ridiculous nature" and "occasionally twitched each other's pig-tails in a way so obviously good tempered as to excite the disgust of every civilized spectator who saw such admirable opportunities for an enlivening riot so utterly thrown away." In the afternoon "these barbarians drank nothing at dinner stronger than tea" and the fire-works afterwards "excited their childish natures". "Finally they all went to bed soon after dark, and not a single Chinaman thought of doing honor to the mysterious "Monks" by stabbing a fellow-heathen." But, the editor stated, his civilized countrymen wouldn't have be afraid, as the Chinese would soon civilize like them and would forget the "habits of his barbarian birthplace." Then finally the Monks festival would be more civilized

[127] John Chinaman (1872, 1-3) *The New York Times*
[128] The Test of Civilizations (1872, 8-10) *The New York Times*

and “we shall then enjoy the inspiring spectacle of the drunken Chinaman celebrating his holiday by perpetual libations of whisky, varied with free fights of really creditable character; and when we read in the newspaper of the following day of Chinese wives knocked down and trampled upon, and, perhaps two or three vigorous Chinese stabbing matches, we can feel that the example of civilization has not been wholly in vain”. [129]

The Chinese are coming

The editorial attention for the Chinese question seemed to be declining. The number of immigrants coming to the United States looked stable and the fear that the Chinese would spread throughout the country to take over the east and south, seemed to be untrue. Even the Californian state legislators seemed to have calmed down, with no anti-Chinese legislation added to the State Law in the last years.

But 1873 would become the year for the revival of the anti-Chinese movement. The numbers of Chinese immigrants would rise again from that year on and the Eastern Panic, caused by the failure of a major eastern banking house, caused unemployed workers from the east to go to the west, creating a mass unemployment and unrest in California.[130]

After spending one more article on the revived slave trade[131], the editor continued with writing his articles with the purpose to show his readers how imbalanced the relationship between the Americans and the Chinese was and that there was no reason to feel superior towards the Chinese. This is also shown in an article on *Mr. Supervisor Nye,* who was a supervisor of the city of San Francisco. He and his colleagues created and adopted legislature for the city and, as “the politician who most loudly proclaims his hostility to Chinamen is nearly sure to score the largest number of votes”, all the designed legislations were for Chinese at that moment. After explaining the three laws which had been created by the supervisors (The first law was that the Chinese had to pay a fine if they carried the washed clean linen by hand and not on a horse. The second was that, if the Chinaman refused or couldn’t pay his fine, he was put in jail and his cue would be cut off. The last law designed

[129] A Heathen Festival (1872, 21-12) *The New York Times*
[130] Chang, The Chinese, 121-123
[131] The New Slave Trade (1873, 11-6) *The New York Times*

forbade Chinese to be buried in American soil), the editor summarized that "the Chinamen are forbidden to make a living by washing the clothing of soiled Americans, are made contemptible in the eyes of their compatriots, and compelled to submit to perpetual exile from the Flowery Kingdom by losing their pig-tails, and are forbidden to permit the dust of Chinese dead to mingle with the soil in which the Supervisors' bones will ultimately be laid." The editor concluded in the style of the 'civilized', white man way of thinking that it was a pity to the supervisors that the Mayor of San Francisco was "neither civilized, generous, nor Christian" in the eyes of the supervisors, as he decided to veto the laws. [132]

A few days later he spent his editorial on a response by Mr. Lai Yong to the plans of supervisor Nye. The editor thought this response had "given evidence of the possession of any marked sense of humor", as Mr. Lai Yong called for a repeal of the Burlingame Treaty and called for a return to "her old-policy of non-intercourse." As the Burlingame Treaty was forced upon the Chinese, and as the treaty was disliked by the white population of California as well, Mr. Lai Yong thought that repealing the treaty would be the ideal solution to the problem. The badly treated Chinese would be happy to return to China and the Americans would go back to America. Knowing that the Americans would never agree to this, as the Burlingame Treaty had a major economic value; the editor hoped that Mr. Lai Yong's letter would finally open the eyes of many Americans about the fact how imbalanced the relationship between the United States and China was. [133] In contrary to many Americans, the editor thought that the coming of more Chinese hadn't caused this imbalance to grow further, as the Chinese would "become absorbed and incorporated into the now dominant white races". Just like the Africans, "who were once believers in Mumbo Jumbo", and had become a part of the society, the Chinese would make "important modifications" adapting to the American lifestyle, language, religion and laws. The Americans had to accept the fact that the Chinese were among them and that they were in no way superior to the Chinese. [134]

And so the editor continued to write his editorials about the Chinese and the way they assimilated into the so-called superior American society. That these superiority feelings weren't always based on solid grounds was something the editor

[132] Mr. Supervisor Nye (1873, 12-6) *The New York Times*
[133] Lai Yongs Letter (1873, 17-6) *The New York Times*
[134] The Coming Race (1873, 26-6) *The New York Times*

tried to remind his reader of. In *Civilized Travel*, the editor described the feeling which thirty Chinese students may have had while the train they were in was being wrecked by some highwaymen, killing one engineer of the train. What would they think of the country they were visiting? The editor thinks the time had come to make an end to the imbalanced relationship between the countries and to the superiority feeling of the United States towards China. First, the editor thought, the United States had to mind its own business, before it may had the right to criticize other countries. The editor concluded that the only thing the United State could hope for was that "our Celestial neighbors should think and call us barbarous".[135]

After criticizing the superiority feeling of the American society towards the Chinese society, the editor showed that adopting to the American society, also had its dangers for the typical Chinaman with the dreams of a typical Chinaman. The editor describes how *The fate of Ah Gim* in American society had fatal consequences. Ah Gim came to America, dreaming of a Christian paradise. In this paradise, everyone would be honest, his wages would be good and his treatment would be based on Christian values. After the arrival at the American shores, Ah Gim soon found out that this dream was a lie, but nonetheless, he decided to make the best of it. He became a cook in the household of Mr. Dubois and his daughter, Alice, saw in Ah Gim a perfect target to proselytize to Christianity. Ah Gim fell in love with Christianity and Alice and asked her to marry him. She declined in a brute way, saying "that his proposition was unworthy of a moment's consideration", but she confessed him to keep believing in God. After asking her again, she declined once more and in response to this, Gim decided to shoot her. Having in mind that she was dead, he had shot himself through the head. In the conclusion of the article, the editor shared with his readers the outcome of the trail, as daughter Alice had survived the gunshot. She "has been acquitted by the Coroner's jury of all blame for the suicide of her proselyte." The editor thought that this story had to be a warning for all Chinese, "against accepting service in houses where there are hard-hearted, religiously enthusiastic young ladies." [136]

Three months later, he spent another article on a trail. This time the question was: who was to be blamed for the death of the inexperienced factory worker Ah

[135] Civilized Travel (1873, 25-7) *The New York Times*
[136] The Fate of Ah Gim (1873, 7-9) *The New York Times*

Tong? (Who died after the explosion of a factory machine) He started his editorial by explaining his readers how the Chinese were being treated in California those days: "If he falls through an open hatchway, his ill-luck is made the occasion for brutal jokes in the local columns of the daily newspapers. If his queue gets entangled in a door and he drops upon the threshold, bruised and insensible, the kick of a passing pedestrian is the most humane of the attempts that are made to help him. Indeed it is useless to deny the fact that the death of a Chinaman, no matter how much of the horrible there may be associated with it, is looked upon by the San Franciscans as something to be thankful for and to make merry over." The outcome of the trail was a confirmation of this horrible treatment of the Chinese. Where normally these kind of 'accidents' of Chinese were waved aside by the jury, thinking "a Chinaman the less", this time the 'accident' made it to the newspapers. One of the jurors had to add something to the shared opinion of the other eleven, who were agreeing on the fact that it was an accident. The twelfth juror stated that it should be prevented that Chinese were even allowed to work with engines in factories in the future. The judge agreed to this view and so he decided that the death of Ah Tong had been an accident and were the legislators advised to design a law which would bring an end to Chinese working with machines in factories. [137]

At the end of 1873, a year in which the third largest number of Chinese immigrants in one year had entered the country[138], the New York Times editors felt the time had come to bring an end to the bad treatment of the Chinese and to the superiority feelings of the Americans. More Chinese were coming and the Chinese, who were already here, were busy adapting their lifestyles to the American society. The Eastern Panic had led to an increase in unemployment in the west, which led to the revival and growth of anti-Chinese sentiment in California. The panic also led to large defeats for the administration of Republican President Grant at elections throughout the country. In the next few years, The Times and the country had to decide which way they would follow concerning the Republican Party and the Chinese, which seemed to have come to stay.

[137] A Chinaman The Less (1873, 27-12) *The New York Times*
[138] Sandmeyer, The Anti-Chinese Movement, 17

"He has come to stay"

The fears of many Californians seemed to come true. The number of Chinese in the country kept rising and the rumors of Chinese being naturalized in other states were true. It seemed that they had come to stay.

The editor of the New York Times seemed to enjoy the fact that the Chinese were finally becoming 'civilized'. After spending many editorials on the fact that, mainly, the Irishmen had the feeling that they are much more civilized than the 'degraded' Chinaman, he finally had the opportunity to spend an article on the fact that the Chinese were more and more adapting to the 'elevated' Irish civilization. In *Converted Heathens* the editor explained that the Chinese were adapting to the Irish civilization and that the Irishmen had to be happy with it. 'John Chinaman' seemed to have let the "habits of his barbarian birthplace" go, like described in *A Heathen Festival*[139], as "already we hear of Chinaman, arrested for burglary, for bigamy, for highway robbery." Especially two incidents were the evidence that the Chinese were finally 'civilizing', according to the editor. The first incident was about a Chinese man who "went reeling about the streets of San Francisco, crying as he went: "Me all same now as Melican man, hair cut short and drunk as". The second incident was about a Chinese supervisor at a factory who almost got lynched, because he wasn't willing to give his Chinese workers more food. Although the Californians had to be happy that the Chinese were 'assimilating' into the American Society, the editor feared that it wouldn't bring equality to the Chinese in society, but only in court. [140]

Other events also convinced the editor that the Californians had to be afraid of the fact that the Chinese were staying. "He has come to stay. There is no longer any possibility of doubt as to his intensions. Ah Sin is permanent." 'Ah Sin' was the aggressive variant of 'John Chinaman' and was the result of an increasing self-confidence among the Chinese citizens. The Chinese had become willing to fight for their rights in society and "even the little Chinese boys in the cities on our Pacific Coast look mute defiance at the white hordes who stone them and duck them in horse-ponds." They received equal rights in British Columbia and "they will shortly demand the same privileges everywhere in the new Eldorado." The number of stories about aggressive Chinamen was also growing, which were "characteristics which indisputably prove that he is getting civilized." The editor frightened the Californians

[139] A Heathen Festival (1872, 21-12) *The New York Times*
[140] Converted Heathens (1874, 6-6) *The New York Times*

that soon "The Celestial Alderman from the Chinese ward" and the "Americo-Chinese party" would be in local politics and that "the American citizens of California towns may expect to be met with the demand from Chinamen that Confucius shall be daily read in public schools." [141] The Californians had to be prepared for a growing influence of the Chinese, as they were even sending their missionaries to the United States.

"Consternation, wide-spread and terrible, fell upon that Boston audience when Wong Chin Foo lifted up his voice in the Parker Memorial Hall." The editor told about how Foo took his time to explain how China had become such a peaceful and successful country for more than two thousand years, with the help of Confucianism. "We worship God ten times nicer in this way than you can in your way." Next to that, he explained that the Chinese civilization was "vastly more sincere, ingenious and cultured than that of the United States and Europe", and although they lived with more then four hundred fifty million people in one country, the number of killings was much lower. "Nothing, he thinks, can lift us from degradation but the religion of Confucius, which raised China from a low and disturbed condition, and gave her so many centuries of brilliant peace." The editor stated that Foo could say this in Boston and that the reporters in Boston would call him "sometimes even elegantly", but this message would not be accepted in California, where "a witness in a murder trail, being asked if he had ever been guilty on homicide, replied that he had never killed a man, but that "he believed he had shot a few Chinaman""[142]. But although in California the Chinese were being seen as barbarians and "destitute of souls", in other parts of the country the Chinese were becoming more and more American by the day.

This Americanization process had a different pattern throughout the country. Chinese living in places where there were not many of them, like the south or Midwest, acculturated more easily than their west coast compatriots. The Chinese in the west were gathered together in large Chinatowns in the cities and therefore they did not mix with the white population (of which most had an Irish background). This created a large gap between the two populations, and led to misunderstandings and prejudices. In the other parts of the country, Chinamen married white woman and

[141] The Aggressive Chinaman (1874, 30-11) *The New York Times*
[142] A Heathen Missionary (1874, 2-10) *The New York Times*

simply had to adapt to the American way of living, as there weren't any other Chinese in the neighborhood to keep their Chinese habits alive. These interracial marriages often occurred in cities in the north-east. In New York were marriages between Chinese men and Irish women quite common and although sometimes made fun off, they were accepted. Marrying another race was often an important step in the Americanization process. Also a visit to their homeland could be a decisive factor. Back home, they noticed that everything had changed, and they decided that they weren't willing to return to the conservative way of living, like their parents. Many Chinese decided to return to the United States, which had become their new homeland. [143]

One of these interracial marriages was the subject of the last editorial in a series of editorials on the Americanization of the Chinese. In *John Chinaman at last* the editor explained to his readers that he sympathized with the Chinese who wanted to become an American citizen, but couldn't because of the "mob of gentlemen" who were running Congress at that moment. This "mob of gentlemen" made it possible that there wasn't a clear definition about whether Chinamen were able to marry white women and become an American or not. It depended on what the judge decided. A Chinaman in Connecticut could become an American citizen, while a Chinaman, in exact the same situation, in the state of Washington could be denied the same right. The editor thought it was a shame, but in the continuation of his editorial, he tried to find and explanation for this policy, by stepping into the heads of the Democratic, Irish "mob of gentlemen". While doing this, editor constantly exaggerated the proud and patriotic feelings of the Irishmen and anti-Chinese movement. He accepted that it must be hard for "descendants of the Puritans" to see that "the daughters of descendants of Kings of Connaught" were becoming the wives and partners of the 'degraded' Chinamen. And this would only be the beginning, as the editor continued with describing the event of the arrival of the "hordes". He imagined that a hundred million Chinese would arrive at the Pacific coast. They would "wipe out every remnant of our proud Caucasian, and set up a Tartat-Manchu Empire on the relics of our poor little Republic". All religions would be swept and would be replaced by Confucianism and "even John Kelly (head of the Democratic Tammany Hall at the time) and John Kelly's men could not embrace these immigrants fast enough to

[143] Chang, The Chinese, 108-118

secure their votes." Concluding the article, the editor made fun of the anti-Chinese fears in California about the news that some Chinese had been naturalized: "We have naturalized two Chinamen. Let the anti-coolie party be warned in time." [144]

Although the editor had been spending most of his time on blaming and ridiculing the patriotic and proud Californians and Irishmen, he also started to spend attention to the deterioration of the situation of the Chinese in California. Where the editor already had spent attention to the anti-Chinese laws and an overall anti-Chinese sentiment in California, the appearance of "hoodlums" renewed his interest in the situation of the Chinese. In August 1874, he mentioned these hoodlums for the first time, in an article which started with the news that China and Peru had signed a treaty which had to stop the 'coolie trade' between the countries. The editor explained that in Peru 'coolies' were seen and treated as slaves and inferior people who deserved no place in society, while in California the term 'coolie' originally meant Chinese laborer. He continued with the fact that this difference was disappearing with the appearance of more and more hoodlums in San Francisco. A hoodlum roamed throughout the streets, insulting arriving Chinese immigrants. According to the editor, he "is the half-developed ruffian of California". They were the "young ruffians who make the nights hideous and the days dangerous." On the opposite was the Chinese laborer, who was "industrious, inoffensive and a pagan". This made them an easy target for these hoodlums. The editor showed that he understood that not everything was desirable about the Chinese immigrants. "He does not build tidy cottages, nor beautify his home, nor take pride in the comely and decent appearance of wife and children. He does not contribute to that element of the State which we call thrifty comfort; and it is not natural that a laborer of the better class should be pleased to have John Chinaman for a colleague or competitor." But the editor stated that this didn't mean that hoodlums were allowed to welcome new immigrants with stones and violence. The police had to do something about it, or else, once the Chinese were gone, the white population would be the next victim of these ruffians. [145]

[144] John Chinaman at last (1875, 11-4) *The New York Times*
[145] Coolies and Hoodlums (1874, 15-8) *The New York Times*

At the end of 1875 it had become clear that the Californians and the editor were sure that the Chinese had come to stay. Although the Page Act had been signed by President Grant to stop 'coolie labor' and Chinese prostitutes in March 1875[146], the Chinese question didn't receive full attention of Congress. Also the New York Times wasn't giving its full attention to the question, spending only three editorials on the Chinese question in 1875[147]. But this would all change. Grant's administration was punished for its lack of reform (in the eyes of The Times). This led to major losses at the elections in 1874 and to a majority for the Democrats in the House of Representatives for the first time since the Civil War [148]. In California were the hoodlums getting more support as the citizens of California felt that the Federal Government didn't listen to them. With the upcoming presidential elections in 1876 and the growing unrest in the west, the Chinese question was ready for federal interference.

The Chinese question entering national politics

With the presidential era of Grant coming to an end and a large victory for the Democrats at the latest elections, 1876 was expected to be a year full of changes. Would the Democrats take over the White House after securing the House of Representatives a year before? And would the Chinese question play a role in the presidential elections of 1876?

At the beginning of 1876 the New York Times could not have predicted that it would become a year which would be full of changes for the newspaper as well. Louis J. Jennings was still editor-in-chief and the newspaper continued with treating the Chinese question in the way they had treated it in the years before. At the end of January, the editor responded to news from San Francisco that a Chinaman, who had been shot through the head, survived the assault after a surgery. The editor thought that this news must have been met with much excitement by the Californian citizens, and especially by "lunatics" Scannell and Landis. According to the editor, these men were "lunatics who persist in amusing themselves by shooting their fellow-men".

[146] Daniels, Asian America, 44
[147] Editorial 6 (1875, 12-2) *The New York Times*; John Chinaman at last (1875, 11-4) *The New York Times*; An Absurd Prejudice (1875, 17-8) *The New York Times*
[148] Davis, History, 123

The news that Chinese could be shot without dying was the solution to the problem on what to do with men like Scannell. "There can be little doubt in the minds of most people that it is better to have a Chinamen shot than to be shot themselves." Therefore, the ideal solution in the eyes of the 'Californian' minded editor was: "Let us satisfy his desires and save our own lives by supplying him with Chinamen." [149]

The news that George Jones had bought ten extra shares of his newspaper at the beginning of February, which had belonged to the family of James B. Taylor, brought suddenly an end to the supervision of Jennings. In the months up to the national conventions of 1876, George Jones and The New York Times had again difficulties in its relationship with the Republican Party. Jones wasn't happy about the rumors that James Blaine would become the Republican presidential nominee, as he thought that Blaine wasn't the right man to accomplish the desired reforms within the party. The Republican Party wasn't happy with the criticism from The New York Times and plans were made, in cooperation with Editor-in-chief Louis Jennings, to take over the newspaper by buying a majority of the newspapers' stock. This to make sure that The Times would become "a real party organ". [150] Unfortunately for Jennings and the Republican Party, Jones took note of the plans and before the Republican investors could, had Jones obtained a majority of the shares by buying the Taylor' shares. Jennings attempt to take over control was repelled by Jones and Jennings resigned a few weeks later. [151]

Under the direction of the new editor-in-chief John Foord, the editorial staff kept on blaming and ridiculing the Californians for the way they thought of the Chinese and how they treated them. They showed very little sympathy to the way the Californians felt and kept condemning them. Also the hoodlumism, which was gaining a foothold in California without being punished for it, was abominated by the editors. In *Smiting the Heathen* the editor stated that the Chinese were "in the same plane like the umbrella, as an object which can be stolen or smashed without fear of punishment" "And as China had no fleet with which to bombard San Francisco, in imitation of the American and European custom of exacting satisfaction for the murder of a drunken sailor by a brutal mob of bloodthirsty Chinese, the "hoodlums"

[149] A Suggestion to Scannell & Co. (1876, 28-1) *The New York Times*
[150] Davis, History, 128
[151] Ibidem, 128-129

need no fear of punishment."[152] The fact that the Californians thought that they could do what they liked, without being punished for it, was also shown in the next editorial. In the article, the editor shared with his readers the idea of Senator Sargent of California to modify the Burlingame Treaty. He saw it as the main reason behind the massive immigration from China and as a burden for California legislators, to create their own laws. The editor explained that the last law proposed by the state legislators was being rejected by the Supreme Court. This law would give the State Commissioner of Immigration the right to class immigrants "as pauper, idiots, imbeciles, deaf, dumb, crippled, infirm, or otherwise become a public charge, and exact for each one a bond for $500, gold, that they should not become such, with sureties as before mentioned." The Supreme Court responded that: "It is hardly possible to conceive a statute more skillfully framed to place in the hands of a single man the power to prevent entirely vessels engaged in a foreign trade, say with China, from carrying passengers, or to compel them to submit to systematic extortion of the grossest kind." Changing the Burlingame Treaty, like Sargent wanted, would have major consequences for the American trade with China, according to the editor, as the current treaty was very much in favor of the Americans. The editor had to confess that "it is not denied that the Chinese question a serious one for the Pacific States", but he was convinced that Congress wouldn't "make the doubtful experiment of solving it by abrogating the treaty." [153]

The editor seemed to be fed up with all the claims and fears spread by the anti-Chinese movement and the Californian politicians. About the number of Chinese living in the country, which seemed to be an everlasting topic, the editor said: "If the people of California believe, as they have declared, that they have 200,000 Chinese in their own state, they are fighting a phantom." [154] Also other allegations made the editor furious. Mr., William A. Piper, a Democratic representative from California, "has been an apt scholar in the new Democratic School of Scandal." According to the editor, he was known to slander and he showed that. The editor could live with much of this slander, but the allegation that the Chinese were responsible for the death of Mr. Burlingame six years before, while he was in St. Petersburg, made him furious. "Nobody but a mean and contemptible person would invent such a charge." The

[152] Smiting the Heathen (1876, 7-4) *The New York Times*
[153] The Burlingame Treaty (1876, 25-4) *The New York Times*
[154] Editorial 8 (1876, 4-5) *The New York Times*

editor could accept that some people didn't like the Chinese, "but when a man who would like to be considered an American statesman invents and publishes a falsehood like this, he gets down lower than the Chinaman whom he maligns." [155] Blaming the Democrats had become a new sport of The Times editors, with the national conventions coming up.

The national conventions of the Democrats and the Republicans were held in June 1876. It was during these conventions, that the parties had to adopt a position on the Chinese question for the first time. The Democrats were clear in their judgment: there had to done something about the growing amount of Chinese immigrants. Therefore they favored an exclusion act and supported the committee which was proposed by western Republicans to investigate the Chinese immigrant situation. At the Republican convention, the subject led to a bitter debate, even discussing the fundaments of the party. On the one side there were members (mostly from the north-east of the country) who felt they would betray Lincoln and his equal rights to all men idealism to favor a Chinese exclusion act and to investigate the Chinese situation. On the other side there were members (mostly from the west and south) who felt that the Chinese contract laborers didn't go hand in hand with the Republican fundament of free labor. They were in favor of anti-Chinese legislation. The fierce debates ended in a win for the south/western coalition and from that moment on, the party supported an investigation on Chinese immigration.[156] With both parties being in favor of an investigation, President Grant installed a special joint committee of both Houses on 17th of July.[157]

The presidential nominees elected at the conventions were Rutherford B. Hayes for the Republican Party, and Samuel J. Tilden for the Democrats. The New York Times was delighted that Hayes was nominated and not Blaine. The nomination of Tilden as Democratic nominee was received with modesty by the newspaper. The New York Times knew Tilden already for a long time, playing an important role in getting the Tweed Ring behind bars as a lawyer. In 1874 he had become the new Democratic governor for the state of New York. The switch to Tilden as the governor of New York, had led to mixed feelings within The Times

[155] A Specimen Slander (1876, 5-6) *The New York Times*
[156] Tichenor, Dividing, 99-101
[157] Daniels, Asian America, 45

staff. Next to the fact that Tilden was a Democrat, had Tilden become the big hero at the end of the Tweed Ring scandal. This was something the staff members of The Times disliked, because they knew he hadn't been a supporter of The Times' fight against the Ring from the beginning, but only after the newspaper came up with the decisive O'Rourke evidence. He stepped into the arena after all the dirty work had been done, and he left it being the hero. On the other hand, Tilden earned respect for being a Democrat who dared to fight its own corruption in the Democratic Tammany Hall. This was something the New York Times had failed in, in cases of corruption in the Grant administration. Concluding, The New York Times knew that Tilden was a strong candidate and that the Republican Party needed all the help it could get, to stay in the White House. [158]

In the meantime, the Chinese question didn't leave the editorial pages. Possibilities to make the Californians look like a fool or to ridicule their ideas were grabbed with both hands. In *Foo-Che-Pang* the editor spent attention to the arrival the Chinese missionary Foo. During the entire article, the editor showed to be full of sympathy to the Californians: "Luckily, we are warned in time. If it had not been for this shrill note from the pious Californian, we should have been all Confucianized – if one may use that word – before a cry for help could have been raised." And the poor Californians would have to deal with Foo themselves, as he hadn't come for the Chinese. "Foo-Che-Pang comes to proselyte Bill Nye (supervisor in San Francisco[159]) and his fellow-citizens." It got even worse for the Californians. "Between pauses of stoning the exasperating and perversely non-combative Chinaman, the Californian is compelled to listen to expositions of the religion of Confucius in choice pigeon-English." "The Republic is under great obligations to our fellow-citizens on the other side of the continent." Concluding the article, the 'Californian' editor responded to the commotion which only one missionary had caused, by stating: "Let us have an act of Congress against Confucianism."[160]

This Californian 'tradition' to ask for new anti-Chinese laws every time the fear about the Chinese was growing, was made a fool of in *Respiration by Law.* The editor couldn't understand why the 'Cubic Air Ordinance', which obliged that every

[158] Davis, History, 125-127
[159] Mr. Supervisor Nye (1873, 12-6) *The New York Times*
[160] Foo-Che-Pang (1876, 8-6) *The New York Times*

person in a house should have a minimum of cubic air to live in, was only applied to the Chinese population. He thought it showed ”unseemly favoritism” to the Chinese, as the editor acted to think that the state had created this law to prevent their citizens from poisoning themselves, by sleeping and living in a space with only a little amount of fresh air available. Continuing in the spirit of this law, the editor proposed equal laws to prevent Irishmen from drinking themselves to death and to prevent “unwholesome dishes in restaurants”. But there was one thing he couldn’t understand. “If the objectionable foreigners are poisoning themselves by slow degrees in 306 feet 6 inches, of cubic air, why not let them go on and thin out the race?” [161] But although the editor seemed to make jokes about it, he was starting to understand that the Chinese question could no longer be denied by the eastern states. This understanding came in response to Mr. Roach, an anti-Chinese missionary, who had travelled throughout the east. “In Atlantic States people might try to evade this mighty issue, but the West has seized it with the greatest enthusiasm while we are amusing ourselves with the world’s politics.” [162]

The editor kept switching between ridiculing and blaming the Californians. At the beginning of the election month, the editor responded to first reports from the Special Joint Committee on Chinese Immigration, which was busy with interrogating people in California. The committee explained that “the idle and vicious boys called hoodlums become idle, and, therefore, vicious, because the Chinese usurp the employment which youths would gladly engage in if they were permitted.” The editor disagreed with this view, because every large city had young ruffians who became vicious, without blaming the Chinese for it. The main reason was to be found in the trade unions. “With and unaccountable selfishness, men who are fathers of boys have legislated in such a way as to confine the trades to the hands of the smallest possible number of grown men, and to reduce the number of young learners to the lowest minimum.” The people had to look at themselves in order to get these youngsters to work, instead of blaming others. And that the Californians seemed to be learning from their past, was shown in the event of a Chinaman voting in California at the presidential elections. The editor showed his amazement about the fact that it had taken weeks before this news reached the eastern shore. “It should have been flashed across the continent with the additional intelligence that the

[161] Respiration by Law (1876, 29-6) *The New York Times*
[162] An Anti-Chinese Missionary (1876, 31-7) *The New York Times*

population of the Golden West, as Californians prefer to call their proud land, were in hysterics. We should have expected to hear that an outraged public opinion was prepared for any "Havoc!" and let loose the Hoodlum upon Chinatown." But nothing happened. The only thing in what the Californians were interested, was the answer to the question on which of the two parties the Chinese had voted. Especially the Democrats were curious, because if he had voted Republican, it would be disastrous for the Democrats. The "hordes" would definitely wipe the Democrats out of the state in the future. But although both parties were very anxious to see the question answered, the Chinese said: "Me no tellee you." [163]

The reason why the answer to this question may have been even more important was the fact that the Democrats and Republicans were in a very close race at the time. The results of the presidential election were uncertain for a long time, because the outcome of the voting was very close in several states. Where many newspapers declared that Tilden had won, the morning after the election, The New York Times was still in doubt. During the next days, the paper showed to be a true Republican newspaper, supporting Hayes and gathering results which would secure him the win. Although they weren't sure about it and they only had Republican statistics to trust, the paper proclaimed Hayes to have become the next president. And they were right in the end. The counting process in the decisive states had become such a mess due to corruption and the importance of the outcome that the outcome of the elections had to be decided by an independent commission. This commission had to decide whether there would be a recount of the votes (which were in favor of Hayes with a very small majority) or not. By a margin of one vote (8 to 7) the commission decided that the outcome of the elections was correct and that there wouldn't be a recount. Republican Hayes had become the 19th President of the United States. [164]

Special Joint Committee on Chinese Immigration

With the first observations from the Special Committee on Chinese Immigration already published in the newspapers, the publication of the final report was looked forward to. In the meantime in California, a state committee on Chinese immigration

[163] Chaos Come in California (1876, 21-11) *The New York Times*
[164] Davis, History, 132-142

had already compiled a very prejudiced report which reflected the opinion of the anti-Chinese movement[165] and The New York Times had also been busy searching for arguments. Luckily for them, Anson Burlingame's son, Edward, had been doing the same and refuted most of the anti-Chinese arguments in an article which was published in Scribner's Monthly. In the editorial *John Chinaman Again*, was the editor glad to see that the anti-Chinese movement had been silent for a while, now that the Chinese question had gone to Congress. This made it possible to hear the unheard voice of an opponent of the movement and the editor showed to be glad about it.

In the article he reviewed the arguments which Mr. Edward Burlingame (without mentioning his name or the name of the article) used in his article. At first, the editor was happy that there was evidence that there never have been a 'coolie trade' to the United States. Burlingame had spoken to officials who claimed that "this emigration has been entirely voluntary in its character." The existing 'coolie trade' was from Macao to South America, while the Chinese immigrants who were going to the U.S., left from Hong Kong. Further on was the editor happy that Burlingame's article was supporting the editor's opinion on the number of Chinese in the country, stating that the Californians "grossly exaggerate the number of Chinese in their State". There wasn't an unfair competition as there was no 'coolie trade' and the prejudice that the Chinese took all the money out of the country, was also doubtful in the eyes of Burlingame. Figures showed that the Chinese had a substantial share in the economy of California. "This respectable total of nearly $14,000,000 should not be left out of sight when people discuss the proposition that "the Chinese send more money out of the country than they spend in it."" In the conclusion of his article, the editor sympathized with the Californians about the fact that there were "objectionable features" accompanied with Chinese immigration, but they had been "enormously exaggerated", and that the "whole question is popular regarded through a false medium."[166] After sharing his excitement about the fact that the 'coolie trade' between China and Cuba seemed to be finally over[167], the editor

[165] Daniels, Asian America, 45-46
[166] John Chinaman Again (1877, 20-2) *The New York Times*
[167] Suppression of the Coolie Trade (1877, 26-2) *The New York Times*

showed his disgust about the conclusion of the report of the Special Joint Committee on Chinese Immigration.[168]

The report was based on a visit of the committee to California for a month. In California, it had searched for a representative of the anti-Chinese groups and for a representative of the pro-Chinese groups. Hundred twenty-eight witnesses, of whom none were Chinese and only a quarter in favor of the Chinese, were heard by the representatives of both groups in front of the committee. Most of the pro-Chinese witnesses came from the industrial and agricultural sector. Both sectors had the Chinese a lot to thank for. Also many churches were kind towards the Chinese and their behavior. The anti-Chinese forces were "working people, the politicians who depended on their votes, and the newspapers that catered to popular interests."[169] Their hatred towards the Chinese was mostly based on the fact that their habits were different. The fact that they smelled, they worked cheaply, their women were prostitutes and they didn't share the same religion, were their main arguments. Knowing that the majority of the Californians shared these views, Senator Sargent of California, part of the committee, published the report.[170]

On the 1st of March, the editor responded to the report. The editor showed to be surprised by the conclusions in the report from Mr. Sargent. Where the editor had expected that the conclusions would show a "great diversity of opinion", the conclusion was more in favor of the "extreme "anti-coolie" party of California. The editor thought that Sargent had interpreted the results in such a way that the conclusion would be anti-Chinese. This was also shown by the fact that Senator Morton of Indiana, who had been the chairman of the committee, "felt obliged to say that he could not agree with its conclusions." In the rest of the article, the editor summed up the conclusions of the report and blamed Sargent for his weak arguments. The final conclusion of the report was that the treaty had to be changed to make it for "strictly commercial purposes." The editor reminded Congress that when they decide to adopt the proposals made by the committee, they also had to accept that it would bring an end to Americans in China.[171]

[168] The Chinese Question in Congress (1877, 1-3) *The New York Times*
[169] Daniels, Asian America, 51
[170] Ibidem, 47-52
[171] The Chinese Question in Congress (1877, 1-3) *The New York Times*

Where the editor had spoken with delight about the fact that the anti-Chinese movement had been silent for a while in February, the murder of five or six Chinamen near Chico, California, warning companies not to hire Chinese[172], brought the anti-Chinese movement back to the editorial pages at the end of March. The hope that the anti-Chinese movement would tone down, now that the Chinese question was being debated in Congress, seemed to be unfounded. In a series of short editorials, the editor spent attention to the violence used by "a secret organization known as "the Order of Caucasians"" which was "modeled on the pattern of the Kuklux of the South" and which used "mob violence in order to drive the Chinese out of the country." The editor explained that "the lately revealed brutality of the anti-Chinese society in Chico is a natural result of the teachings of the demagogues who have been the leaders for years of the California labor unions."[173] The "Order of Caucasians", which was, according to the editor, a nickname of the Californian Labor Union, had two main targets which they class as Class A and B. The first target was the Chinese population and the second were the people who hired Chinese. Their main objective was to drive the biggest competitor on the labor market, the Chinese, out of the country.[174] The fact about this organization which seemed to worry the editor the most was the fact that they "do not seem in the least dismayed by the arrest and conviction of any of their number." They saw it as a "holy war against Chinese cheap labor" and were willing to make sacrifices. To bring an end to this, the editor stated that "the courts must mete out the full penalty of the law to the offenders. Otherwise, we may as well admit that, "civilization is played out" in the United States."[175]

The influence of the anti-Chinese movement was growing in the west and it also seemed to have infected the mind of party officials. The editor spent an editorial about Mr. Bloomer, who ran for a position in the legislature, but who was defeated in the primaries of his party, "because he had his clothes washed." After spending some paragraphs 'searching' for the explanation, he found out that this washing had been done by a Chinaman. The washing hadn't to do anything with it, but the problem was that a Democrat was "encouraging the existence of the Mongolian in any manner." In the conclusion, the editor longed for the Jeffersonian times, when questions like: "Is

[172] Editorial 3 (1877, 19-3) *The New York Times*
[173] Editorial 3 (1877, 2-4) *The New York Times*
[174] The Caucasians (1877, 3-4) *The New York Times*
[175] Editorial 3 (1877, 23-4) *The New York Times*

he honest?", or "Is he capable?", were more important than: "Is his washer-woman of Caucasian origin?"[176] As seen before, the editor seemed to have the tendency to vary the style of his editorials from ridiculous to serious and back. His style of writing seemed to depend on the event on which he commented. When he heard of the fact that 'working men' in San Francisco saw a strike against a railway company on the east side of the Rocky Mountains as a reason to attack Chinese in Chinatown, the editor responded with a series of editorials condemning it. The Chinese had nothing to do with it and the ruffian, who did this kind of things, is the one who "shows that he is unfit for American citizenship."[177] In the next article, the editor seemed excited that "old Californians threaten to revive the Vigilance Committee of 1856, which hanged rioters and outlaws without the usual formalities of law". Maybe they would make an end to these hoodlums, as he thought that "no more conclusive evidence of the ruffianism and cowardly brutality of the average loafer could be found."[178] He was certain that, although "there is undoubtedly a very strong prejudice against these poor foreigners, not only amongst the baser sort, but among substantial citizens", the anti-Chinese violence would weaken the movement in the end.[179]

At the end of the summer of 1877, the editor spent some editorials on the narrow-mindedness of many Americans. In *A Chinese Mystery*, the editor told the story of a Chinese commissioner who lived in Providence, Rhode Island. After arriving in the city with two women, of who was supposed that it were his wife and sister-in-law, they received a very warm welcome. After a while, the Chinese commissioner made public that his wife had given birth to a son. The whole community congratulated him and his wife and he received many presents. When, after four months, the commissioner became father of another son, the community became 'suspicious'. "The utmost efforts were made to solve the mystery", as they knew that it was something that "could not be overlooked." "Finally the truth was obtained directly from the frank and unsuspecting Commissioner, who explained that he had: "two piecee wife", instead of a wife and a sister-in-law". With the population now being aware of this fact, the commissioner had become the "miserable pagan" instead of "the best of men". Giving no judgment at the end of the story, the editor thought he

[176] The Crucial Test of Democracy (1877, 5-6) *The New York Times*
[177] The Force of Sympathy (1877, 25-7) *The New York Times*
[178] Editorial 5 (1877, 26-7) *The New York Times*
[179] Editorial 4 (1877, 28-7) *The New York Times*

had made his point.[180] One week later, the editor explained that the Californians had found another reason to complain. After blaming the steamships and The Burlingame Treaty for the "influx of the hordes", a statesman declared that Great Britain was responsible for the emigration of the Chinese to the United States and that the Chinese government wasn't favoring emigration at all. In response to this news, the editor thought that "Great Britain, from this time forth, must be regarded with unfriendly eyes by all true opponents of Chinese immigration." He advised them not to concentrate too much on the British, as his experience with the Chinese question told him that "it is not impossible that another hidden course of the Chinese trouble may yet be discovered."[181]

The editor thought that the Californians were not likely to have the patience to consider the consequences of their deeds and just followed their instincts. Next to that, he also seemed to think that the Californians exaggerated a lot. Both elements were shown in the editorial about the news of the murder of some white persons in Rocklin, California. The suspects of the murder were Chinese and a 'logical' consequence of these kinds of murders was that "the citizens of the region in which the murders were committed were prompt in demanding vengeance upon all Chinamen." And so it happened. The editor thought that the Californians seemed to have had "a happy knack of putting upon the entire Mongolian race the sins of individual Chinamen."[182] The editor blamed them for overreacting in these occasions and the fact that he thought Californians liked to exaggerate, was seen in the last editorial in this series. In *A Californian Ghost* the editor told the story of Yung Ting, who had received a visit of a 'ghost' each night. This 'ghost' had demanded more and more food and drinks, threatening the Chinese to take him "to his private grave", if he wouldn't satisfy his demands. Although the editor stated that the easterners were thought to have "a monopoly of the business" of ghosts, "a Californian ghost has just made its appearance" which "is far in advance of the ablest Eastern ghost." At the end of the story, the 'ghost' appeared to be an Irishman, who felt asleep in the house of the Chinaman, drinking too much of the ordered Brandy. Concluding the editorial, the editor showed his 'respect' to "the magnificent climate of California", which "once more demonstrate its capacity for the production of every desirable

[180] A Chinese Mystery (1877, 23-8) *The New York Times*
[181] A New Cause of Complaint (1877, 1-9) *The New York Times*
[182] Editorial 5 (1877, 18-9) *The New York Times*

object upon a scale far grander than that to which the inhabitants of the effete climate of the Eastern States are accustomed."[183]

During the year it had become clear that anti-Chinese violence was growing in number. The murder of Chinese in Chico and the mob violence after the strike in the Rocky Mountains were condemned by the editor. Other events which had to do with the Chinese were treated more lightly by the editor. By varying in the style of the editorials, the editor tried to put the Chinese question in perspective. On the one hand, by making fun of the Californians and the Chinese, he tried to convince his readers that the whole question was exaggerated, just like the Californians did. On the other hand, the reader was also starting to realize that something had to be done about the Chinese problem in the west. Therefore he used some of his editorials to condemn anti-Chinese events and called for punishment and political interference. With demagogue Denis Kearney arriving at the scene, who had made it already to the editorials at the end of the year[184], and his Workingmen's Party gaining support, the Chinese question would ask for more attention in the editorials. Next to that, politicians had found their way to Congress, proposing anti-Chinese legislation[185], since the Sargent report brought Chinese immigration to Congress.

Looking for an answer

Sargent's report brought the Chinese question to Congress and although not everyone was happy with the conclusions of the report, it had its effect. In the last months of 1877 and the first of 1878, several solutions for the problem were proposed by several Congressmen. The editor spends much attention to them in the first months of 1878.

The fact that he spent much attention to the proposed amendments and legislation wasn't a sign that he was glad with all the proposals. This is shown in the first editorial on the Chinese question, which was about an alternative report on the results of the Special Joint Committee on Chinese Immigration, written by the recently deceased Senator Morton and presented to Congress. He was glad that

[183] A Californian Ghost (1877, 16-10) *The New York Times*
[184] Popular Incendiaries (1877, 17-11) *The New York Times*
[185] See also: Editorial 2 (1877, 7-11) *The New York Times* ; Editorial 3 (1877, 8-12) *The New York Times*

Senator Morton had come with its own unprejudiced conclusions, and had not listened to public opinion. The editor thought it should not be in the "human nature of men who want to be Senator or Representatives to fly in the face of average public opinion." Unfortunately, the editor wasn't sure anymore that the Congress was full of men like Mr. Morton, whose "habit of thought would take a broader and more liberal view on the whole question of Chinese immigration than could possible be included in the scope of the small Californian politicians who have made most of the noise over this complicated problem." These Californian politicians were convinced that anti-Chinese legislation was the only way to stop the "lawless citizens of California" from exterminating "the hated Mongolians at once". And so the editor concluded with the fear that, although the conclusions of Senator Morton's report "seems conclusive" "to an impartial mind", his advises won't be acted upon by Congress.[186]

The editor didn't hold most of Congressman in high regard at that time and this was shown in a series of editorials in which he criticized several, mostly Democratic, Congressman. In *Capitalists in Disgrace* the editor responded to an amendment proposed by Democratic Representative Luttrell of California to prohibit Chinese men from sailing at American ships. Luttrell stated that his primary objective with the law was, to protect American seaman from the capitalists who hired cheap Chinese. After questioning himself whether this amendment would be in fight with the Burlingame Treaty, the editor concluded: "To the average Californian, a mention of the Burlingame treaty is like a red rag to a mad bull." The fact that it could be in fight hadn't probably not even came up in the mind of Luttrell. Next to that, thought the editor that it was surprising to see that the capitalists had become the new enemy of the Californians. Even more surprisingly was the fact that the House hadn't accepted the amendment straight away, as capitalists were known to have "few friends and many enemies". But the editor knew that protecting the American seamen from the capitalists wasn't the real reason. It was yet another try to drive the Chinese out of the economy and he warned Congress that "when we begin to discriminate against races and religions, there is no knowing where we shall stop." "We should, for example, lose John Kelly as well as John Chinaman." [187] The editor seemed to try to convince the Congressman that their solutions were partial and could easily end up being used against them. And so, just like the fact that Luttrell's

[186] Senator Morton and The Chinese (1878, 18-1) *The New York Times*
[187] Capitalists in Disgrace (1878, 25-1) *The New York Times*

plan could lead to driving out John Kelly (the leader of Tammany Hall in New York), it was also possible that Shelley's plan would run into trouble. Democratic Representative Shelley had come up with the idea to put Chinese into reservations, just like the Native Americans. The fact that this could be in fight with the Burlingame Treaty, hadn't even come up to his mind and he was serious about it. Shelley gave the Chinese two options: they return to China or they go to the reservation. If they didn't make a choice, "they are to be transported to the spot selected for their colony, and any Chinaman hereafter found outside of the limits is to be put into prison for a term not exceeding twenty-five years." Thinking that this plan was too absurd for words, the editor decided to 'support' Shelley's idea and took the plan even further. "We cannot afford to stop with one or two varieties of color. And it is quite possible, too, that other foreigners than the Chinese would improve by being put on reservations." At the end of the editorial, the editor showed his true opinion, proposing that "if all objectionable folk are to be put on reservations, we are now only on the eve of a great movement. The time may come when we shall have a reservation of Shelleys."[188] The editor couldn't seem to wait before this moment would happen, as he continued ridiculing Democratic Congressmen. His next target was Representative Willis of Kentucky. He had compiled a report on Chinese immigration which "shows the true character of the Chinaman and renders it impossible for any honest patriot to venture to defend the yellow heathen." Proclaiming that he "does not oppose the Chinese immigration from selfish motives", Willis came to his conclusions based on "morality". This conclusion was that the Chinamen were "wicked, and hence have no right to dwell among our virtuous fellow-countrymen." Although the editor showed 'sympathy' and 'agreed' on all the arguments throughout his editorials, the style of writing showed his true opinion. [189]

In the last two editorials before the summer, the message of Republican Senator Booth of California seemed to open up the mind of the editor. Booth stated "that if in New York, Iowa or Georgia there were 100 Chinese male adults to every 150 voters, the Mongolian problem would be regarded as supremely important". The editor couldn't deny that, but the main problem for the editor was the fact that it still wasn't clear how big the problem really was. It wasn't even possible, according to

[188] Shelley's reservation (1878, 4-2) *The New York Times*
[189] The Wicked Chinaman (1878, 28-2) *The New York Times*

the editor, to find two Congressmen who would agree on "the numbers of the Mongolian invaders." "Nobody can insist that California should be forced to bear a burden that can be honorably and justly lightened; but the first step towards lightening it should include a trustworthy account of what it is." Once an agreement on the importance of question had been made, the editor stated that he would be open to treaty revisions.[190] But the editor knew that most Congressmen didn't have the patience to wait for the outcome of such an investigation and he was glad to hear that the Congressmen were showing some moderation in their latest proposed laws. The House Committee on Education and Labor had proposed a bill which was directed at the American seamen who imports them, not fining or imprisoning Chinese. "To make the vessel-owner liable for the crime of emigration, instead of the innocent victim, is a masterpiece in Christian statesmanship; yet even this stroke of magnanimity, which possibly resulted from the prospect of over-running all the jails in California, sounds like a mockery in the view of the existing treaty". The editor hoped that these kinds of proposals were a step in the right direction, and that the Congressmen would temper in their calls for action and would think of laws which were in not in fight with the existing treaty. They wouldn't have to wait long, as the editor was convinced that the treaty could be changed within a few years and he stated that it would be a shame if the treaty would be violated before that, as it would have major consequences for the American trade. [191]

Despite the fact that the Congressmen were finally showing some "Christian statesmanship", was the editor not reassured and he showed his interested in what the future of the question would bring. On the one hand, demagogues in California, like Denis Kearney of The Working Men, were gaining support and was the violence increasing, while on the other hand, the arrival of the Chinese embassy was a step in the right direction to come to treaty revisions, and a political solution to the Chinese immigration problem. In *The Chinese Embassy*, tried the editor to explain to its readers the importance of a good relationship with China and what the role of the embassy could be in keeping this relationship all right. He thought that the embassy wouldn't have much trouble with modifying the existing treaty with the United States. Their main objective had to be representing their countrymen, which were

[190] The Chinese Puzzle (1878, 15-4) *The New York Times*
[191] Congress and the Chinese (1878, 20-5) *The New York Times*

having a hard time in the United States. [192] One of the main reasons why the Chinese were having a hard time was the existence of demagogues and "anti-Mongolian agitators"[193], like Denis Kearney. He had visited the east and the editor spent an article on his visit to Boston, where he had spoken to the local population. The editor couldn't understand that, although the Chinese question was "a matter of about as much practical import to Massachusetts working men in the Autumn canvass as the British protectorate of Cyprus", the crowd did "pool their issues" at Mr. Kearney. He responded with proclaiming that "the Chinese must go" and spread the hidden message that he would solve the problem "by force if not by law." The editor thought that Kearney was past his peak, as demagogues seemed to loose the support of the population and newspapers in California. He hoped that, although Kearney was past his best, he didn't influence the minds of the workingmen too much. "We may now properly seek to modify our treaty, with the view of checking an influx if it is becoming burdensome; but to talk of driving back, either by mob violence or the not less despicable device of cruelly discriminating laws, the Chinese here is quite another matter." [194] A week after this editorial, the editor showed once more that he hoped that the days of these agitators were over, calling them "earthquakes" which used to stay in California. Now that both shores of the continent were connected by a railway, these earthquakes travelled throughout the country and the editor thought that, if it would continue, "we must take the matter into our own hands and tear up the Pacific Railroad at once." [195]

The editor had clearly become in favor of a solution to the problem by ways of Congress and diplomatic negotiations. The editor kept on stating that he hoped that Congress wouldn't yield towards the pressure of the "anti-Chinese agitators on the Pacific Coast". Before accepting new laws on immigration, the treaty had to be modified to keep up "the good name of the country and for the public respect due to what the Constitution pronounces the supreme law of the land". The editor hoped that modifying the treaty would become easier with the recent establishment of the Chinese embassy in Washington. The "treaty honor" was "at stake" and the country had to be guarded against the "un-American character of most of the attempted anti-

[192] The Chinese Embassy (1878, 7-8) *The New York Times*
[193] Ibidem
[194] The Chinese and the Working Men (1878, 15-8) *The New York Times*
[195] Imported Earthquakes (1878, 23-8) *The New York Times*

Chinese legislation". [196] The editor showed his trust in the Chinese embassy. Minister Chin Lan Pin of China was "reputed to be a man culture, scholarship, refinement, and travel, upward of sixty years of ages, of impressive appearance, apparently well qualified for the task he has in hand." The first task for the embassy would be to discuss the terms of the Burlingame treaty with the U.S. Government, in which "the Administration expects no difficulty in bringing the Chinese legislation to its own views in regard to treaty revision." It had been said that "the Chinese Government is wholly apathetic at the subject – neither encouraging nor discouraging emigration." But the Administration hadn't to be in a cheerful mood already, according to the editor, because "if China agrees hereafter to authorize only a certain specified number of her subjects annually to come to America, she will be entitled to pledges of protection." This protection of the Chinamen in the United States was something in which the Government had failed since their arrival.[197]

The Chinese question had become an important subject and this was noticed by the editor. The number of articles spent on the Chinese was growing and the tone of the articles was changing. Senator Booth had given the editor the insight that a treaty revision was needed, but the editor wanted this to happen in a respectful way and kept repeating that the existing treaty had to be respected. It was also clear that the subjects of the articles were less alternating than before. Where the editor was used to switch from proposed anti-Chinese legislation in California to the case of a single Chinamen and back to blaming the Irish short-sightedness, he spent more articles on fewer subjects in 1878. Making fun of the Democrats, the Californians or the importance of the question, were things which the editor couldn't live without, but the number seemed to be decreasing. With the arrival of the embassy in the United States and the ongoing debates in Congress, the question finally seemed to get full and serious attention of the editor.

The veto and the rise of Kearney

The first six months of 1879 would have an enormous impact on the development of Chinese question. At first, the people of California, encouraged by Denis Kearney,

[196] Black, Yellow and White (1878, 3-9) *The New York Times*
[197] The Chinese Embassy (1878, 26-9) *The New York Times*

showed their discontent with the sustaining congressional debates on what to do with the Chinese, by creating their own constitution for the State of California. [198] In the meantime, Congress denied the advices of the editor by passing an anti-Chinese bill which was in fight with the existing Burlingame Treaty.

The news that the House of Representatives, in which the Democratic Party had a majority, passed "fifteen-passenger anti-Chinese bill", was met with disappointment by the editor. The editor, who already had disapproved the passing of this bill in May 1878, thought that "it may be regarded as an act for self-stultification of Congress". The Fifteen Passenger Bill prohibited vessel owners to board more than fifteen Chinese on a ship in China, with the intention to go to the United States. If they would board more than fifteen passengers, the vessel owner could end up in jail and had to pay a fine of 100 dollar a person. This bill was clearly in fight with the Burlingame Treaty and the editor was shocked by the decision of Congress. "Congress never yet has set the precedent of deliberately and intentionally violating…a treaty with a foreign nation", and it "puts the Government in a dishonorable position." Next to bringing the Government into trouble, the editor was furious about the fact that the only reason why a majority voted in favor of this act, was "to make political capital in California", with state elections coming up. [199] The editor even thought that "it is not likely that many of the Congressman who voted for this bill knew or cared anything about its probable effect on the country or upon the people against whom it was aimed." The editor stated that many Congressmen didn't see the consequences of their 'yea' vote for political reasons. "In a barbarian nation such a prohibition would be defied as monstrous. In this country it is called by an astute popular leader "a mere political dodge." [200] The only thing the editor could hope for was that it would not pass the Republican Senate or otherwise would be vetoed by the president.

In the weeks between the passing of the House and the voting in the Senate, the editor spent attention to the consequences for the steamship companies. They were disastrous for them and although "excited hoodlums and half-educated Congressman of California may look upon this with indifference," the "businessmen

[198] Chinese Immigration (1879, 13-1) *The New York Times*
[199] Congress and the Chinese (1879, 29-1) *The New York Times*
[200] "A Mere Political Dodge" (1879, 31-1) *The New York Times*

of the State" wouldn't be happy with the law that passed the House. [201] A short editorial about the news that a Chinaman tried to sell his wife, was a small interruption in a series of articles on the Fifteen Passenger Bill. After stating that the editor agreed with the Californian newspaper, who were "justly clamoring for the abolition of this slave trade"[202], the editor continued with writing about the debates in the Senate. The tone of the debate in the Senate was anti-Chinese and the editor was not positive about the outcome. "The merits of the bill do not seem to have received much consideration." [203] One of the few senators, who made an argument against the adoption, was Senator Conkling. He "developed some hostility to the bill, and talked of treating the question "according to the manners prevalent in civilized nations."" [204] But just like the editor had expected, the arguments against the bill, couldn't convince a majority of the Senate. In *The Chinese Bill in the Senate*, the editor reported of the voting in the Senate. With 39 yeas and 27 nays, the bill had passed the Senate and the editor was disgusted with it. He hoped and thought that the "Republican Senate" "should have had the courage to take a different path"; instead of showing "that hoodlumism is a sound plank in the Republican or Democratic Platform". The state elections in California seemed to have taken control of their minds, while in the opposite situation, when China would have passed such a law against the Americans, it "would have been held ground of non-intercourse or war." Also the argument that recent numbers from the San Francisco port had made clear that there was "an actual excess of Chinese departures over arrivals, to say nothing of the loss by death", wasn't even mentioned. The only thing to do was to wait for the response from China about Congress being in favor of violating the Burlingame Treaty. [205] The response from China, which came in a day later, was not exactly what the editor had expected. They were in favor of an immigration bill and in response to that news, the editors stated that "the Pekin Government has no more concern for the welfare of its handful of subjects in this country, than it has for insects which live and die in one day." As the Chinese government wanted to return to a non-intercourse relationship with the rest of the world, according to the editor, "the victory of the Anti-Chinese Party in the United States is no less a victory for the

[201] Editorial 9 (1879, 5-2) *The New York Times*
[202] Editorial 12 (1879, 11-2) *The New York Times*
[203] Editorial 2 (1879, 14-2) *The New York Times*
[204] Editorial 4 (1879, 15-2) *The New York Times*
[205] The Chinese Bill in the Senate (1879, 17-2) *The New York Times*

Anti-Foreign Party which rules China."[206] The only one who could stop this anti-Chinese legislation, which passing of Congress had been followed with much interest in Australia[207], from becoming a law, was President Hayes.

The editor hoped that "President Hayes will not shirk his responsibility in this matter." He had three options in the eyes of the editor. The first option was to approve the bill, with the consequence that the Republican Party would lose "a great many intelligent citizens in the East who go to make up the rank and file of the organization". The second option was to do nothing, with the result that the bill would be rejected by Supreme Court, being in violation of the Burlingame Treaty. But doing nothing "will disgust Republicans all over the country, and may contribute to defeat in 1880." "The only safe and honorable course for President Hayes is to veto the bill, in a straightforward, manly fashion." By doing this, he would show the country where the Republican Party was standing for. "That the Republican Senate has passed the bill as a matter of expediency is no reason why a Republican President should fail in his duty to his party and the principles upon which it is founded." [208] Waiting for the final judgment of the president, the editor had found an ally in the Chamber of Commerce, which hoped that the president wouldn't listen to the citizens of the "Pacific slope"[209]. But the editor wasn't sure whether this would happen, as the citizens of the "Pacific slope" were known for giving politicians a hard time, when they wouldn't listen to them. In *Legislators Threatened*, did the editor report of Californian agitators stating that "they would not be answerable for the consequences if should be defeated." That they had experience with these kinds of threats was shown by the editor. He mentioned the Anti-Railroad Bill of Nevada, which was proposed to lower the freight tariff of the Central Pacific Railroad company. The people decided to take immediate action to make sure that the bill would pass the state legislators. The editor stated that this was a regional tradition, as "the impulsive people of the Pacific States do not always pause to consider how their demonstrative exhibitions may be regarded by impartial observers." A senator who was not in favor of the proposed Anti-Railroad bill was "asked to resign immediately" and for other legislators who were opposing the bill, the proposition to hang them was ""received

[206] Editorial 1 (1879, 18-2) *The New York Times*
[207] Editorial 1 (1879, 23-2) *The New York Times*
[208] The Fate of the Anti-Chinese Bill (1879, 24-2) *The New York Times*
[209] Editorial 4 (1879, 27-2) *The New York Times*

with cheers”.” The editor feared that these threats also had reached Washington, as the politicians acted like them may have been proposed: “Vote, or hang”?” [210]

With the bill passing Congress, many newspapers felt obliged to spent attention to the Chinese question and also felt the need to prove their Christianity by comparing it to Confucianism. The editor laughed about it in his editorial, as Confucianism is no religion and has nothing to do with a religion like Christianity. [211] The verdict of the president was almost there and the signs were positive about the president vetoing the bill[212]. On the 4th of March the editor showed his delight about the veto of the president. But this delight was only felt at the east coast, as the people on the west coast were very disappointed. The editor could understand their disappointment, but he tried to explain why the president vetoed the bill. “The people of California may have exclusive interest in Chinese immigration; but when Congress is invoked to enact laws to regulating that immigration, the whole American people are concerned in what is to be done.” This veto had let many Californians think that the people on the east coast were against them, “but it is grossly unjust to say that those who have opposed the bill to restrict Chinese immigration necessarily favor, or are indifferent to, the immigration of Chinese.” “The truth is that the people who live on this side of the Rocky Mountains have long been waiting for their fellow-citizens on the other side to propose some lawful and practical remedy for the evils so loudly deplored. Thus far, Californian legislation in this direction has been either ineffective or barbarous.” Concluding the article, the editor thought it was a shame that most of the Californians felt betrayed by their east coast countrymen, and tried to convince them that, when they would propose a law which was not in fight with the treaty, they would be willing to listen to their fellow-citizens and to support them. [213]

The question was whether the Californians were willing to wait for the approval of their fellow-citizens on the east coast. At the beginning of the year, the editor had spent an editorial on a convention, held by the people of California, for a new state constitution. The three most important topics were that: the state police had to get more power to settle the Chinese problems, people who didn’t have the right to

[210] Legislators Threatened (1879, 27-2) *The New York Times*
[211] Editorial 8 (1879, 28-2) *The New York Times*
[212] Editorial 3 (1879, 3-3) *The New York Times*
[213] California and The Chinese (1879, 4-3) *The New York Times*

become a citizen of the United States had to be refused entry to California and these persons were also not allowed to work, to fish, to sue or to live in the state. After laughing at most of the topics of the proposed state constitution in January, thinking that they weren't achievable[214], the editor stated, only a week after the presidential veto, that he would keep an eye on the developments of this new constitution, as popular vote was to decide whether the constitution would be adopted or not. [215] To let his readers know what the Californians were going to vote for, he spent an editorial on *The Proposed Constitution for California*. The editor thought it had communistic ideals in it, as it gave itself the permission to tax companies in any way that they thought was necessary. Next to that, it was full of proposed anti-Chinese laws. State companies wouldn't be allowed to hire any Chinese anymore, all companies in State wouldn't be allowed to import Chinese workers anymore and the Chinese would officially be denied the right to vote, but still had to pay the poll-tax of $2,- annually. The terms of the constitution didn't surprise the editor anymore. Although he criticized them, he was in doubt whether they would ever listen to him, as the opinion of the Californians was "that we who dwell in the dense ignorance of the older States do not know anything about the Chinese evil" But although the Californians wouldn't pay attention to their fellow-citizens on the other side of the continent, the editor couldn't stop himself from remembering the Californians that they could not stop the Burlingame Treaty by themselves.[216]

Two months later, when it had become clear that a majority of the Californians had voted in favor of the new constitution, the editor spent another editorial on the subject. In *Communism in California*, the editor explained to his readers what the Californians had chosen for. "They (The Workingmen Party) have desired to drive out the Chinese, to oppress capital and corporations, and to break up and destroy large land-holdings." The new constitution had to make an end to "a wide-spread suspicion that the laws were for the protection of the rich, and not for the defense of the poor". The adoption of the constitution by the population of California didn't seem to shock the editor. He stated that the main problem for the new state constitution would be the fact that it was in fight with the federal constitution on most of the terms (especially all the anti-Chinese legislation), and that

[214] Chinese Immigration (1879, 13-1) *The New York Times*
[215] Editorial 5 (1879, 10-3) *The New York Times*
[216] The Proposed Constitution for California (1879, 17-3) *The New York Times*

therefore only a part of it could be achieved. “But enough will remain to bring disaster and financial distress upon the people.” [217] This was also the point of view in his next editorial, in which he promoted the free market and blamed the “uncertain” white man. By regulating companies on who they could hire, they would destroy the economy. “The Chinaman does not strike; he does not get drunk; he does not leave his work without giving due warning; and he never wastes the time or the material of his employer. It’s not because the Chinaman works more cheaply, but because he works more faithfully, that he is preferred above white work-people.” The new constitution would not solve this problem and the editor was convinced that “time will show that the remedy is worse than the disease.”[218]

During the rest of the year, the editor spent no more editorials on the new constitution of California, nor about the Fifteen Passenger Bill. He did spend attention to new proposals from the western states to make an end to the problem of Chinese immigrants. And as promised in his article after the veto of President Hayes, he was prepared to take them into consideration, if they were showing signs of moderation. The plan of Senator Jones of Nevada was the first to be judged by the editor. The plan had three main topics: the state had to keep an inquiry on the subject of ‘coolie trade’, the president had to contact Great Britain to make an end to possible ‘coolie trade’ from Hong Kong and the third part was, again, the fifteen passenger law. “The first two of these propositions show that the fiery zeal of the anti-Chinese champions is so far cooled down that they are able to see that there is a right and proper way to go about the redress of such grievances as they feel that they suffer from.” But the last proposition was again, the editor stated, in fight with the Burlingame Treaty. [219] Another possibility to get rid of the Chinese was being shared by General Legendre, formerly United States Consul at Amoy, China. “The British authorities at Hong Kong can stop all this immigration with the turn of the wrist.” This possibility had been mentioned before, the editor acknowledged, “but, as it originated in the rude wilds of the Atlantic States, where the people dwell in dense ignorance concerning to all matters relating to the Pacific States, it has never received the least attention. A man who urged that the Chinese evil might be cured

[217] Communism in California (1879, 9-5) *The New York Times*
[218] Another Bull in a China Shop (1879, 14-5) *The New York Times*
[219] The New Anti-Chinese Project (1879, 10-3) *The New York Times*

by applying at the source of the difficulty – China – was derisively called a "mawkish sentimentalist"" The editor hoped that the Californians would finally grab this opportunity with both hands, as it was not in fight with the Burlingame Treaty. [220] But, again, they didn't seem to listen to the editor, as Governor Slater of Oregon had new plans to regulate the Chinese in America. After his research, he had come to the conclusion "that foreigners in this country are in the possession of many privileges", and especially the Chinese. He wanted to restrict the privileges of foreigners. In response to this, the editor pointed him at the fact that Irishman are also foreigners and that his arguments made no sense. [221]

At the end of the summer, the hype surrounding the Chinese question seemed to be over. Where there were editorials on the subject of the Chinese almost weekly in the first six months of the year, the last six months showed a return to normal numbers. This gave the editor the opportunity to return to editorials which were about the cases of single persons and which may had its influence at the Chinese question indirectly. In *The Tale of a Chinaman*, the editor told the story of Ho Ah Kow. Kow was a Chinaman who was temporarily residing in San Francisco and who was charged for violating the 'Cubic Air Ordinance'. After being unable to pay the fine, he had to go to prison, in which his hair was "cut off within an inch of his scalp". Being insulted by this punishment, he went to the United States Circuit Court to press charges against Sheriff Nunan. He explained to judge Field that, cutting of the cue of a Chinese, was being seen "as a mark of disgrace; and that, in their religious faith, it is attended with misfortune in this life and suffering after death". He also said "that the defendant, Nunan, was aware of this custom and belief". The reason why the editor had spent attention to this case was the final judgment of Judge Field: "If this was inflicted in consequence of the sentence, it was punishment in addition to that imposed by the court; if inflicted without regard to the sentence, it was wanton cruelty." "The whole spirit of the ordinance was in violation of the Constitution and the laws of the United States. It was only intended for the Chinese in San Francisco." The editor was excited that finally the true nature behind the 'Cubic Air Ordinance' was showed. [222] Speaking of showing its true nature, the editor was shocked about the true nature of "the Hon. Hendrick B. Wright, of

[220] A New View From China (1879, 31-3) *The New York Times*
[221] Editorial 4 (1879, 23-5) *The New York Times* ; Editorial 5 (1879, 23-6) *The New York Times*
[222] The Tale of a Chinaman (1879, 16-7) *The New York Times*

Pennsylvania". As the head of a Congressional Committee on the Condition of Labor, he was visiting California "in an official capacity", "at the cost of the Government." During this visit he showed to be a real "demagogue", "re-echoing the slogan of the great Denis, "The Chinese must go."" The editor concluded that the Democratic Representative had leaned too far to "the lowest and meanest prejudices of the people" and that "Congressman Wright has found his sphere at last."[223]

In September, the editor saw the first cracks in the new constitution. The Oregon Circuit Court had decided that it was unlawful to prohibit municipal companies to hire Chinese and this received much attention from Californian newspapers. The editor was not willing to enter the debate once again, and stated that: "This is the official warning that the proscriptive legislation embodied in that singular instrument will not stand severe judicial scrutiny." [224] He seemed to be fed up with the debates with the westerners, as they wouldn't listen anyway, and stayed out of the debates in the last three editorials of the year, spending more attention to the Chinese question in the east.

A research on race prejudices concluded that the Chinese were on the bottom of the racial ladder. They were now even beneath the Italians, which were always thought to be the lowest class in New York City, but even the African American and the "degraded Digger Indian" had found a place in the social ladder above the Chinese. "There may be a race yet lower than the Mongolian, but it has no representative in this Republic." [225] The situation of the Chinese had become so sad, that the editor even spoke of *The Chinese Myth*. The editor stated that "every advanced thinker" knew that the Chinese language is a myth and does not exist. The fact that the Chinese language is a myth, was shown by the fact that their language is impossible to learn. With more than 36,000 Chinese signs to learn, to master the Canton and Mandarin language, it would take 1,300 years to master the language, as it took the superior white population almost five years to master 26 letters. "And yet we are told that this impossible language is spoken and read by millions of men and women whose average length of life is precisely that of Europeans and Americans." The editor stated that it impossible that these 'degraded' Chinese could learn such a language. "If any one wishes to know in what language Chinamen really converse,

[223] Congressman Wright's Sphere (1879, 7-9) *The New York Times*
[224] The Oregon Chinese Case (1879, 26-9) *The New York Times*
[225] Race Antipathies (1879, 28-11) *The New York Times*

let him visit a Chinese laundry, where he will very soon find that what is vulgarly called "pigeon English" is the genuine Chinese language."[226] The prestige of the Chinese population had reached its bottom. In the last editorial of the year, the editor described the case of John Brown Smith. He had become a martyr and hero in Massachusetts, spending already ten months in jail, because he kept refusing to pay the poll-tax as he couldn't vote, because he didn't want to become an American citizen. "John Chinaman's case is much harder than John Smith's", the editor stated. But sadly, "John Chinaman, however, is not of the stuff from which martyrs and heroes are made."[227]

The position of the Chinese in society had reached its all-time low and the editor showed that he understood that something had to happen. He seemed to have accepted that the Californians simply think in a different way than the people on the east coast and this understanding might be the reason why he stopped ridiculing the Californians in his editorials in 1879. The Chinese question had become a serious one, with major consequences if not dealt with in the right way. The editor had come to the conclusion that it would be better for all those involved, that the question would be settled soon, as the Californians were getting impatient.

"The Chinese Must Go."

Denis Kearney and his Working Men Party had taken over control of the city of San Francisco. Although both the Republican and Democratic party had tried to make "political capital" by voting in favor of the Fifteen Passenger Bill, weren't they as successful as hoped at the state elections of 1879. The Working Men had gained the right in San Francisco to elect members to many positions, of which the mayor and the sheriff were most influential. They also had won positions within the several boards which were active in San Francisco, like the Board of Education. [228] In the meantime was John Foord still editor-in-chief of the New York Times and had the Chinese question become an integral part of the editorial page, although the attention for the subject had dropped in the last months of 1879.

[226] The Chinese Myth (1879, 2-12) *The New York Times*
[227] John Smith, Martyr (1879, 9-12) *The New York Times*
[228] The California Election (1879, 9-9) *The New York Times*

This drop wouldn't last long, as the Working Men Party (often called Kearneyites by the editor), with Denis Kearney as its president, always knew how to get attention for the cause of "The Chinese Must Go." In the first months of the year, all the editorials about the Chinese question were about the situation in San Francisco. Mr. Kalloch, Kearneyite Mayor of San Francisco, had said that "the portion of the city which is almost exclusively inhabited by the Chinese, is to be declared a nuisance." According to the editor, "this means that the Chinese are to be driven out of the city, unless Mr. Kalloch is mistaken." [229] Two weeks later, the City Board of Health confirmed the fact that the Chinese quarter was a nuisance, and the editor showed to be interested in what Mayor Kalloch, who was "elected by these half-frantic people", would do. He had "promised that if the Chinese quarter was indicted as a public nuisance the Chinese should be expelled from the city." But what if the Chinese would make their quarter conform the health laws? [230] The editor was wondering whether they "are in earnest in their threats, or whether they are merely talking for effect." He thought it was totally unpredictable, and therefore "it will not surprise anybody if there were a murderous riot by and by. The Kearneyites have lost their wits, or else they want sober people to think they have gone daft." [231] With the growing attention for the situation of the Working Men in San Francisco, the editor thought the time had come for a review of the first half a year that the new constitution of California was in power. After spending some paragraphs on the proposed legislation in the constitution and their chance to make it to the book of law, the editor switched to the Chinese. The constitution hadn't achieved anything yet, concerning the Chinese question, and the editor thought that the Californians had to accept that "the probability is that the question has almost nothing to do with the present dull time in California." "Somehow, it was thought that the adoption of the new Constitution would cause the Chinese to be deported from the State, swallowed up, or otherwise put out of the way. There has been no hegira of Celestials. It is not reported that many of them have returned to China, and the avalanche which was to be precipitated upon a scoffing and unsympathetic section of the Republic has not started from the other side of the Rocky Mountains." The constitution seemed to be a failure already, and it was no surprise to the editor, that "the so-called Working men,

[229] Editorial 6 (1880, 10-2) *The New York Times*
[230] Editorial 5 (1880, 23-2) *The New York Times*
[231] Editorial 4 (1880, 26-2) *The New York Times*

having done all in their power to cripple every industry, are loudly lamenting their distressed condition." [232]

Although the editor had stated that the constitution was a failure, as it was demolishing the economy and the ""the Chinese do not go"[233], the editor wasn't reassured about the fact that the Kearneyites would lay down their arms. He seemed to have lost his faith in politics, concerning the protection of the Chinese in California, and thought that "there is every reason to believe that within a few days a San Francisco mob will make an attack on the Chinamen." Nobody would help the Chinese, as San Francisco was in the hands of the Kearneyites. "There are a few weak sentimentalists in the Eastern States who would look upon a massacre of the Chinese in San Francisco as a shameful crime", but they were an exception. No political party dared to defend the rights of the Chinese, because which party "is foolish enough to risk losing the votes of the Pacific States by undertaking to do justice to the Chinese? They are practical men, and their rule of conduct is to do what will secure votes." "Denis Kearney and his followers intend to drive out the Chinamen, and there is no more for protecting the Chinese against him than there has been for protecting the Indians against white men who wanted their lands." The only hope the editor had at the present time, was the rumor that Republican candidate and former President of the United States, General Grant, might be in favor of protecting the Chinese. [234] But although he may have been in favor of the Chinese, the editor thought that the existing, friendly treaty between China and America had no value anymore, as "we are now in the position of a nation which has invited commerce with a nation which subjects are not wanted on our shores." [235] Every time arguments were used to convince the politicians and citizens that "the Chinese must go", they were false or based on prejudices and the wishes of white men. The editor came once more to this conclusion, after hearing the arguments which the City Board of Health had used to declare the Chinese quarter to be a nuisance. The editor thought that the only reason why they wanted to get rid of the Chinese quarter was the fact that it was a popular place for young whites to go to and "learn immoral practices and contract evil diseases." "Because they live (and refuse to die) in the midst of filth, and are in

[232] The California Experiment (1880, 24-2) *The New York Times*
[233] Ibidem
[234] "The Chinese Must Go." (1880, 26-2) *The New York Times*
[235] Editorial 1 (1880, 1-3) *The New York Times*

the way of ministering to the perverted appetites of evil-inclined young white people, the Chinese must go." [236]

That the San Franciscans wanted to get rid of the Chinese, either by free will or by force, had come to the ears of Governor Perkins. In response to the news he had stationed troops in the vicinity of the city of San Francisco, in case the Sand Lot mobs would keep their words. But the editor had doubts whether something actually would happen. He thought that "Kearney is a vaporing, swaggering swashbuckler, who uses vituperative and violent terms without the least idea of their meaning and weight. It should not be forgotten that this noisy creature has never executed any one of his multitudinous threats". The editor felt sorry for the city of San Francisco that the whole Chinese immigration question had got out of hand. But the truth was hard, as General J.F. Miller had described the situation as "the existence side by side of two distinct forms of civilization which are incapable of being blended." Until peace had been restored in San Francisco, the editor told to the agitators and the population that "their city is a powder magazine."

The arrival of the army led to "a feeling of greater confidence in the triumph of law and order in San Francisco"[237], and the tension in the city started to decrease. Followers of Kearney, who had threatened an inn-keeper to hang him if he wouldn't fire his Chinese employees, were convicted for their "ambition to equal Kearney as a blusterer"[238] and the threats by Mayor Kalloch, who had promised that "if the nuisance were not abated by March 26, they would move upon Chinatown, and drive the pagans into perdition.", seemed to be bluster as well. Nothing happened in Chinatown. [239] Now that the whole situation in San Francisco had come to rest and the negotiations with China about a revision of the Burlingame Treaty had started, the editor came to the conclusion that the whole Chinese question had been "much ado about nothing." "Never in the history of this country has so much been made from so little as in the case of the Chinese in the United States." It was only because of the repeating complaints and threats from Denis Kearney, its Working Men Party and the State of California, that it kept getting attention. And when he looked at the number of Chinese in the country, about 90,000 according to the latest reports, the

[236] Chinese as a Nuisance (1880, 6-3) *The New York Times*
[237] The Army in San Francisco (1880, 11-3) *The New York Times*
[238] Editorial 4 (1880, 22-3) *The New York Times*
[239] Editorial 3 (1880, 27-3) *The New York Times*

editor stated that “the prodigious hullabaloo which has been raised over “Asiatic Hordes” was childish.” [240]

At the beginning of the summer, the Kearneyites were past their best and the editor switched his attention to the conventions of the two major parties. As the Chinese question was expected to become a major issue in the forthcoming elections, he decided to follow the conventions in California with extra attention. The Republicans of California had chosen the “anti-Chinese statesman” James G. Blaine, who was disliked by the New York Times’ editorial staff, as their candidate. [241] The Working Men Party decided to support Democratic Senator Thurman of Ohio, instead of justice Field, of who the editor thought it would have been a great candidate for the party. [242] The attention the Democrats received was in the form of blaming candidate Hancock and the Irish in his editorials. In *The Pagan and The Church* the editor described the event of some Chinese visiting a worship service in a Catholic church at Mott Street, New York City. He stated that the Chinese were driven out of the Church immediately by the Irish Catholics after they had resolved that the Chinese had to go. The editor stated that they didn’t even try to “convert the heathen”, but had send them out immediately. This was not surprising the editor, as he stated that “the most natural thing for the Americanized Irishman is to drive out all foreigners, whatever may be their religious tenants.” The “hatred of the Chinese springs eternal in the Celtics breast. In fact, the hospitable and generous Irishman has almost no friendship for any race but his own.” ‘Luckily’, the church was safe again, as “clean, industrious, water-drinking gentlemen, who will vote for Blaine, the great-hearted leader of the anti-Chinese party, moved into the tenements vacated by “the Hordes.”” Although the idea of millions of Chinese coming to New York wasn’t a pleasant one for the editor, he stated that: “Ten or twenty thousand Chinese in New-York would not convulse the community, although the departure of that number from San Francisco would depopulate Chinatown and give rest to the perturbed souls of Kalloch and Kearney.” And therefore he concluded that there was place for everyone

[240] Much ado about nothing (1880, 6-4) *The New York Times*
[241] Editorial 2 (1880, 3-5) *The New York Times*
[242] The Unappreciated Field (1880, 20-5) *The New York Times*

in New York. “Let us welcome to our free and happy land foreigners of every race and religion. But let the pagan give the church a wide berth.” [243]

Continuing with the national conventions, the editor shared the hope that the party platforms would only include matters which would be important to the whole country. He thought that subjects like the Chinese immigration were only interesting for the west coast. They would only become part of the party platform with the purpose to gain political capital in certain parts of the country. [244] Two days later, the editor was disappointed that the Republican Party hadn’t paid attention to his argumentation. After adding the Chinese question to their party platform, the editor responded: “It is intended to catch votes on the Pacific Coast, but bids for sectional votes are not in order in a national platform, and this one adds to the fault of narrowness that of ambiguity amounting almost to duplicity. The resolution asks nothing sufficiently definite for legislative action, but only seems to ask what a purely local and by no means entirely rational sentiment at the moment requires.”[245] And so he was glad to hear the next day that the most Republican newspapers had blamed the party for integrating the subject into the platform. According to the editor, the only way to win the votes of the Californians was to “imitate Kearney, and declare that the Chinese must go, without more ado. Failing in this, the ambiguous and half-hearted resolution embodied in the Chicago platform is really more disappointing than absolute silence on the subject would have been.”[246] The news which had arrived from the west coast that Kearney had been deposed as President of the Working Men Party, made the fact that imitating Kearney would bring votes uncertain the same day. The nomination of Hancock by the Democratic National Convention had led to a split within the party. Kearney had switched to favoring Weaver, the nominee for the Greenback Party, while the rest of the Working Men stayed true to supporting the Democrats and Hancock. In the conclusion of the article was the editor glad that “Hancock’s nomination, absurd though it is, has had the result of dismembering the following of the pestilent fellow, Kearney.” [247] With the end of Kearney, the editor felt that the collapse of the Working Men Party was near. A day after hearing the news of Kearney, the editor made up his mind about what the

[243] The Pagan and The Church (1880, 7-5) *The New York Times*
[244] Political Hobbies (1880, 4-6) *The New York Times*
[245] The Republican Platform (1880, 6-6) *The New York Times*
[246] Editorial 1 (1880, 7-6) *The New York Times*
[247] The deposition of Kearney (1880, 5-7) *The New York Times*

Kearneyite had done to the State of California. The constitution was horrible and the legislators were making a fool of themselves, trying to turn the proposals of the constitution into laws. He advised them that, "however obnoxious may be the presence of the Chinese in California, it is worse than useless for the Legislature of that State to go on, as it has been doing, in violation and defiance of he treaty obligations and laws of the United States." [248] In the last article spent on the collapsing Working Men Party, the editor stated that also their last remaining hope, the number of Chinese in the city, was not in favor of them. Although the latest estimates were that San Francisco had 300,000 citizens of whom 60,000 were Chinese, the actual numbers showed that the city had only 230,000 citizens of whom 20,000 were Chinese. "It wholly upsets the calculations of the anti-Chinese party, which has perpetually howled death and destruction to the "Asiatic hordes."" The editor laughed about the number and assured his readers that "Chinese paganism will not overturn our institutions before the census of 1890." [249]

After spending again many editorials on the Chinese question, although the editor thought it was "much ado about nothing", he may have hoped that the question would disappear from the editorial page. But after leaving Chinese immigration for more than two months out of the editorial page, it suddenly returned, in the run up to the presidential elections. The elections were between Republican candidate Garfield, in which the New York had showed great confidence after giving first its support to a third term for Grant[250], and Democratic candidate Hancock. A few weeks before the presidential elections, a letter showed up, which was alleged to be written by Garfield and in which 'he' had stated to be in favor of Chinese immigration. Where the Democrats claimed that the letter was real, the Republicans had claimed it to be a forgery, which was made up by the Democratic National Committee. In a series of five editorials, the editor showed his disgust about this "forgery". After blaming Barnum, the president of the Democratic National Committee[251], he showed his disappointment with the fact that such an uninteresting subject as the Chinese question would have its influence at the elections. On "this side of the Rocky Mountains hardly any interest is felt in it", and the few Chinese who were here, were quiet and peaceable and worked under the same conditions as

[248] Sand Lots Legislation (1880, 8-7) *The New York Times*
[249] "The Chinese Hordes" (1880, 5-8) *The New York Times*
[250] Davis, History, 142-143
[251] The Great "Fly-Gobbler" (1880, 28-10) *The New York Times*

other laborers. “The Chinese question is a product of the Pacific coast, and there it is doubtless a far more serious matter than it is here, but it is not a party matter.” “The subject is one to be maturely considered and soberly dealt with by the Government, and a Republican Administration is far more likely to treat it in a “just, humane and reasonable” manner than one controlled by men capable of contemptible pettifogging with public interests which the Democrats have displayed throughout this canvass.” [252] But, the editor thought, the Democrats couldn’t help it, as forgeries were a tradition in the Roman Catholic church and therefore also in the Democratic character. [253] Although they ‘couldn’t help it’, the editor still felt the need to condemn the Democrats and their voters for the forgery. Anti-Chinese riots in Denver in the beginning of November, asked for a responds from the editor: “The cause of the bloody and disgraceful riot in Denver, which stains the record of the day, was the invention of a fictitious issue in the canvass.” “This shameful affair is thoroughly characteristic of the men upon whom the Democratic Party found its strengths.”[254] After blaming the Democratic Party for what they’ve done, the editor also had to say something about the voters in California and Nevada. He stated that “the ignorant and credulous, with whom the hatred of the Chinese amounts to fanaticism”, were “ready to accept as final any charge affecting a candidate which touched his character as friendly to Chinese immigration.” “If California has gone Democratic, it is because this forgery, indorsed and circulated by the Democratic National Committee, has had its influence with ignorant and unthinking people.” [255]

The fears of the editor, that the Chinese letter would have had any negative effect on the chances of Garfield being elected, didn’t come true. Garfield won the elections and became the 20th President of the United States. Looking back at a year in which the editorial staff of The Times again had spent much attention to the Chinese question, it had become clear that the editors were being fed up with the question. The problem had completely run out of control, with even the army needed to protect the Chinese, while there were only 90,000 Chinese in the country, of whom 60,000 lived in California. It was “much ado about nothing”, according to the editor, and now that the Republican administration could finally continue with its intentions to

[252] The Chinese in the Canvass (1880, 29-10) *The New York Times*
[253] Forgery (1880, 30-10) *The New York Times*
[254] A Democratic Demonstration (1880, 2-11) *The New York Times*
[255] California and Nevada (1880, 5-11) *The New York Times*

bring an end to the Chinese immigration problems, the editor couldn't wait until the Chinese question would disappear from the editorial page forever.

A Vexed Question Settled

Thirty-two years after the arrival of the first group of Chinamen during the gold rush, and thirty years after the mentioning of the Chinese in an editorial for the first time, the Chinese problem seemed to come to an end. At the beginning of 1881 it seemed that all parties involved had come to the conclusion that it was best for the country to make an end to the ever lasting Chinese question. Where the editor was used to spent whole editorials on the case of one single Chinaman, defending them or ridiculing the Irishmen, the editor had enough of it. This was clearly visible in his editorials in the last eighteen months before the adoption of the Chinese Exclusion Act.

The first editorial on the Chinese question in 1881 was about an interview with Mr. Swift about the new treaty with China. This article was in line with most of his editorials in the last years, in which he mainly spent attention to responding to political news about the question. Mr. Swift, part of the committee which had been sent to China to negotiate the treaty, declared in this interview that he was glad that the committee had achieved the right to control immigration, to deny Chinese citizenship and to reverse the citizenships of the few Chinese who already had become an American. Next to that, Swift confirmed the rumor that the government also had gained the right to send unwanted Chinese back to China. Although the editor couldn't believe the latter, he thought the Californian demagogues would feel, after hearing the outcome of the negotiations, like "it will seem as if the bottom of all things had unexpectedly dropped out." If all the mentioned changes were true, the editor stated that the surrender of the Chinese Government "is much more complete than any ever before obtained by any civilized Government of any but a fallen power." He also thought that it "has taken away the occupation of numberless able and indefatigable American politicians.", blaming the anti-Chinese politicians who had been spending all their time on this question. [256] That to much time had been spent on the Chinese question, was made clear in the editorial which was written after the publication of the new treaty on the 14th of January: "It is safe to say that everything accomplished by the new treaty could have reached long ago, if, long ago,

[256] The New Chinese Treaty (1881, 11-1) *The New York Times*

we had adopted the simple plan of going directly to the Chinese government with our grievances." The editor felt that "an alliance with the United States is regarded by the imperial Government as desirable", given the way the Chinese government was prepared to accede to all the American wishes. The most important part of the treaty for the Californians had to be the right that ""the Government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it."" The rumor that unwanted Chinese could be sent back to China seemed false, as nothing was mentioned in the treaty about this. The editor concluded that this treaty was all the country could have hoped for, although the promise to treat the Chinese already living in the country the same as those of the most favored nation, would be a tough one. [257]

The news that the Californian Democrats, for who all this effort had been done in the eyes of the editor, had advised their fellow Democrats to vote against the treaty, was received with anger. The two main objections were that if the Chinese had the same rights as the white population, they also wanted the right to naturalize and second, that the word laborer was a very vague concept. The objections were not taken serious by the editor. If they had read the treaty and had paid attention the last years, it would be clear that it was up to the U.S. Government to decide what the concept 'laborer' would be and that the current laws already had made Chinese illegible for citizenship. The editor stated that it didn't matter to the Democrats that their arguments didn't make any sense, as "the truth is, however, that there is in this country a large number of demagogues who will be sorry to see the Chinese question taken out of politics. From them, almost exclusively, will come the opposition to a confirmation of the new treaty." [258] After a few months, the editor showed in a few smaller editorials that the mood in the Senate, which had to vote for it, was in favor of the treaty, despite the fact that "Senator Farley's Democratic constituents regarded the Chinese treaties with disfavor as "a Republican Trick." [259] The next day he showed his excitement about the passing of the new treaty by the Senate, in the editorial *A Vexed Question Settled.* "The ratification of the Chinese treaties by the Senate yesterday may be taken as a conclusion of the whole matter." In the next paragraphs he gave an overview of the history of the Chinese question and thanked

[257] The Chinese Treaty (1881, 14-1) *The New York Times*
[258] The Chinese Treaty (1881, 24-1) *The New York Times*
[259] Editorial 1 (1881, 3-5) *The New York Times*; Editorial 2 (1881, 3-5) *The New York Times*; Editorial 1 (1881, 4-5) *The New York Times*; Editorial 1(1881, 5-5) *The New York Times*

Republican Gen. J.F. Miller, "who resisted the insane attempts of local demagogues to settle the Chinese question without recourse to diplomacy". "It now remains to enact the laws of Congress which are permitted by the terms of the treaty, regulating and restricting Chinese immigration. And when this is done, let us hope the Chinese question will disappear forever from American politics." [260]

After spending attention to the debate and the signing of the new treaty, it took some months before the first Congressmen came up with a law which would make the terms of the treaty a part of the American law. In the meantime, the editor spent some editorials about the relationship between the Chinese, China and the United States. In *A Wyoming Prejudice* the editor described the situation of Mr. Lee Chin and Mrs. Eva Lee. They wanted to get married, but the territory of Wyoming forbade Chinese to get married. In response to this news, they went to Colorado, got married and returned to Wyoming after the ceremony. Back in Wyoming they heard that their marriage was unlawful. In the meantime, the new treaty had been signed and this obliged the United States to guarantee the Chinese the same rights as white men. Being informed about the terms of this treaty, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Chin were now going to Colorado to get justice. Concluding to the editorial, the editor thought that, although the law would agree with them, the outcome of the case would not make any difference. The editor stated that the people of Wyoming were not known to be the most understandable persons and the fact that interracial marriages were allowed by law, wouldn't make a difference to them. They would condemn it anyway. [261]

Where the Americans seemed to be excited by the signing of the new law, the Chinese seemed to be pleased as well. As the editor already mentioned in an editorial before, he thought that the Chinese Government was in favor of an anti-foreign policy. This was also shown in the latest developments concerning the withdrawal of the Chinese Educational Commission in the United States. The editor thought it was a shame, as most Chinese students were very talented. "No American youth could possibly, in addition to conquering an alien language, make such progress in study as is made by these high-caste students from the oldest Asiatic empire." But the Chinese students did not only take the new skills back to China, but also new political ideas. The editor concluded that "China cannot borrow our learning, our

[260] A Vexed Question Settled. (1881, 6-5) *The New York Times*
[261] A Wyoming Prejudice (1881, 9-6) *The New York Times*

science, and our material forms of industry without importing with them the virus of political rebellion. Therefore, she will have none of these things."[262] And whether that decision of China was a good or a bad thing, was a question which the editor had been asking himself for a while. In *A Plea for Quietness*, did the editor want to excuse himself and his countrymen for the fact that they were always trying to spread their civilization throughout the world. The civilized world had to accept "that China is contented with things as they are, and simply asks to be let alone." "Is there to be no spot left alone on this globe where contented and happy barbarism may be left unmolested?" He concluded this reflection, excusing himself and the western world. "And so we may well be sorry when the last of the leisurely and the self-contained nations of the earth plunges into the mad race for something new." [263] Another happening which plead for quietness, was the death of President James Garfield on the 19th of September 1881. After being shot on the 2nd of July by Charles Julius Guiteau, an alleged supporter of Vice-President Chester Arthur, Garfield had been in the hospital for more than two months before he died. Vice-President Chester Arthur became his successor and this would become a turning point in The Times' support for the Republican Party. John Foord and his editors distrusted the true intentions of Arthur as a president. With the rumors that Arthur dealt with corruption at lower ranks of government, they felt Arthur was not interested in doing what's best for the country, but in doing what's best for him. They were suspicious of him securing friends of him within high ranks of the administration and kept monitoring him.[264]

At the beginning of December, Gen. J.F. Miller, who had become senator for the State of California, was the first to propose a law based on the terms of the treaty. The editor seemed glad with the content of the law, as "it's noticeable that the terms of the bill are precisely those of the treaty in the description of persons to be excluded from and persons to be admitted into the United States." [265] With the renewed attention for the new treaty, because of the proposed law by J.F. Miller, the editor grabbed the opportunity to remember his readers of the fact that this way of settling the Chinese question was a product of Republican "statesmanship". The editor thought that Kearney would be disappointed and also the Democratic Party

[262] China in the United States (1881, 23-7) *The New York Times*
[263] A Plea for Quietness (1881, 4-9) *The New York Times*
[264] Davis, History, 142-143
[265] Editorial 4 (1881, 6-12) *The New York Times*

wouldn't be excited, as "by the conclusion of a treaty which should settle forever the Chinese question, the California Democrats would lose their remnant of political capital." Once more the editor stated that he was happy that the Chinese question would be settled forever, as "the treaty is now a part of the fundamental law. Senator Miller's bill is designed to enforce its remarkable provisions."[266]

With only 747 Chinese living in New York[267], the editor had become tired of all the debates on how many Chinese there were in the country. In the last editorial of 1881, he expressed the hope that the new law would make an end to this ever lasting debate. [268] In February 1882, the proposed laws were finally debated in Congress. This hadn't been soon enough for many Californians, as they had already started to organize mass-meetings and had started to threaten Congressmen. In response to this, the editor stated that "Congress will keep on talking until the day of doom, and no amount of threatening individual Senators and Representatives will hasten by one day any pending measure." [269] Although the editor stated that "the people of San Francisco are determined to free their minds on the subject before its too late", the editor thought it was "beyond comprehension" why another "monster meeting" was needed a week later. [270] The dissatisfaction about the time it took before the law was adopted was also starting to be felt by the editor. The editor got aggravated that the debates in the Senate about the Chinese question were taking so long. He even thought that he senators acted like "the Chinese question had never been in Congress before."[271] In the opinion of the editor, Senator Miller had done excellent work in defending his proposed law and had refuted the arguments against it in a convincing manner. The proposed bill was not in fight with the new treaty and the question had already been "authoritatively settled by the previous action of the President and the both houses of Congress", in the case of the Fifteen Passenger Bill. The editor thought that the United States couldn't show inconsistency in its behavior, with accepting a treaty but rejecting the associated laws. The "old cry of "race prejudice"" [272] and the "objections on the broad ground of humanity and the theoretical

[266] The Going Chinese (1881, 9-12) *The New York Times*
[267] Editorial 5 (1882, 14-1) *The New York Times*
[268] Editorial 3 (1881, 21-12) *The New York Times*
[269] Editorial 3 (1882, 18-2) *The New York Times*
[270] Editorial 5 (1882, 27-2) *The New York Times*
[271] Editorial 5 (1882, 7-3) *The New York Times*
[272] China in the Senate (1882, 4-3) *The New York Times*

brotherhood of nations" [273] had been heard enough, according to the editor. In response to the senators who came up with the African American question, the editor assured them that "there is no rational connection between the settled problem of negro citizenship and the unsettled problem of Chinese immigration." [274] The editor thought it was taking to long and only thing the editor hopes for, was that the proposed law would pass Congress soon and that the president would ratify it.

Two weeks after his last editorial, the editor responded to the passing of the bill by Congress. He reviewed the debates held in the Senate and thought it was an enumeration of the usual arguments which had been heard for decades. But especially "the popular disregard of the promises of the political platforms" made the editor angry. As both of the parties had promised in their party platforms that they would make an end to the question, he did not understand why the debates had to take so long. After the passing of the bill by the Senate, the editor stated: "Time and again, both political parties have promised to do what has now been done, and nobody has raised a voice of protest or disavowal of responsibility for such promises. The bill as it goes to the President suspends the importation of Chinese laborers into the United States for a period of twenty years." [275]

The only thing that had to happen to settle the question was that the president would approve the bill. This wasn't certain, as the editor states that "it is understood that the President favored a term of ten years". The editor feared that amending the bill was exactly what the opposition of the bill wanted and that there wouldn't become a bill in the end. [276] The rumors that the president was going to veto the bill were growing stronger. The argument was heard that twenty years was not "reasonable" according to the treaty. [277] Having read the treaty thoroughly, the editor thought that twenty years wasn't in fight with the terms of the treaty. Although he was sure of his case, he already showed his trust in Congress that an amendment of the law would pass as well.[278]

On the 5th of April, the president had indeed vetoed the law and the editor showed some understanding, now that he knew the reasons for doing it. The bill which was proposed by Congress was much different than what the negotiators of

[273] Editorial 4 (1882, 2-3) *The New York Times*
[274] Negro and Chinaman (1882, 9-3) *The New York Times*
[275] Restriction of Chinese Immigration (1882, 24-3) *The New York Times*
[276] Editorial 3 (1882, 25-3) *The New York Times*
[277] Editorial 1 (1882, 4-4) *The New York Times*
[278] Editorial 5 (1882, 27-3) *The New York Times*

both countries had expected. “The Chinese thought that these intervals of suspension might be two, three, or five years in duration.”, and not twenty. The president concluded that the bill was in fight with the spirit of treaty, because China had only signed these papers, having the verbal agreements during the negotiations in mind. The editor hoped that the Californians could keep their temper, when they heard of the veto of the president. “But we are persuaded that when the first bitterness of the disappointment has passed, and less radical means for overcoming the Chinese evil are employed, the President’s firmness and wisdom will be recognized.” [279] To prevent that the amended law would be vetoed as well, the Senate asked the Committee on Foreign Relations for advice. After listening to their advice, “an effort will now be made to meet the objections of the President by changing the time of limitation in the bill from 20 years to 10 years.” [280] As hoped for, the revised bill had no problems passing the House[281], but the Senate was again troublesome. Again the same arguments had come up and the editor thought that, as a far more objectionable bill already had passed the Senate with a large majority, the debate “is certainly profitless and needless.” [282] On the 29th of April the editor was glad to say that the revised bill passed the Senate[283]. The question was finally settled in his editorial of the 9th of May 1882, in which he stated: “The president has signed the new bill to suspend the immigration of Chinese laborers for a period of ten years.”[284]

[279] The President’s Veto (1882, 5-4) *The New York Times*
[280] Editorial 1 (1882, 6-4) *The New York Times*
[281] Editorial 2 (1882, 18-4) *The New York Times*
[282] Editorial 4 (1882, 27-4) *The New York Times*
[283] Editorial 4 (1882, 29-4) *The New York Times*
[284] Editorial 1 (1882, 9-5) *The New York Times*

Conclusion

After spending almost two-hundred editorials on the Chinese immigration, better known as the Chinese question, it had finally been settled. Under the supervision of Raymond, Bigelow, Shepard, Jennings and Foord, the editors had shared their varying opinions with their readers. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 made an end to thirty years of debates about the Chinese immigration. By reviewing the thirty years of the debate, it is possible to answer the research question: What was the position of The New York Times during the debate on the Chinese immigration to the United States from 1851 until 1882 and why did they take this position?

Seven months after The New York Times had been founded by Henry J. Raymond and George Jones in September 1851, the newspaper started to participate in the debate. Raymond was the editor-in-chief and the most important person at the newspaper. The main principles of New York Times were to be politically independent and to avoid “fantastic extremes” and “personal feuds” in their editorials. The first principle would be hard to keep, as Raymond was already a Whig member at the foundation of the newspaper and later on became an important person within the Republican Party.

The Chinese immigration wasn’t much discussed in the editorials of the newspaper in the years up to the Civil War. In the few editorials spent on the Chinese, the editor defended the Chinese and the Republican ideals. These Republican ideals had become important for Raymond from the moment he joined the newly erected Republican Party in 1854. During the Civil War, no editorials were spent on Chinese immigration, but these years were important for the development of The Times. The stories from the battlefield and the stories about heroism during an attack by mobs in New York caused The New York Times to grow further.

The Burlingame Treaty of 1868 and the completion of the transcontinental railroad changed the attention the newspaper had for the Chinese question. The New York Times had become one of the leading Republican newspapers, this because Raymond had become a very important person within the party. Although he left the party in 1867, after having a different opinion than the majority of the party, the newspaper would stay true to the Republican ideals. The Burlingame Treaty was seen as a victory for the Republicans and The New York Times, as it would make the trade with the Chinese easier. On the other hand, the Burlingame Treaty was met

with fear by their fellow-citizens of the west coast. They feared that millions of Chinese would come to the country. From this moment, the treatment of the Chinese in California became an interesting topic for the Republicans and the newspaper. They feared that a bad treatment of the Chinese in California would have negative effects on the trade with China. In 1869, the number of editorials written about the Chinese had doubled the number of editorials written from 1852 to 1868. In most of the editorials, the editors were blaming the Californians for the way they treated the hard working Chinese.

In the summer of 1869, Raymond suddenly died unexpectedly and was succeeded by Louis Jennings. Although there was a change of editor-in-chief, the newspaper didn't change their position on Chinese immigration. The arrival of the first Chinese workers in New York led to a small turmoil within the editorial staff in 1870. They stated for the first time that a solution to the problem of Chinese immigration was needed. This turmoil was short-lived, as the editors came to the conclusion that the feared 'masses' weren't coming. In the next years, the number of articles spend on the subject would decrease again. The editors thought that it was mainly a western problem and that the Californians were exaggerating it. The Californian wish to modify the treaty to prevent the Chinese from coming was met with editorials full of sarcasm. In these editorials the editor 'praised' the superiority feelings of the Irish and 'totally understood' the fears about the Chinese coming to stay.

Blaming and ridiculing the Irish was something that had started under the reign of Jennings, and the editors of the New York Times would continue doing it in the forthcoming years. One of the main reasons for it was the battle which Jennings had as editor-in-chief with Tammany Hall in 1870. Tammany Hall was a political organization, controlled by the Democrats, which helped immigrants, mainly Irish, in New York and controlled the city and state politics. Being a true Republican newspaper, The New York Times decided to attack the Tweed Ring (the group which was ruling Tammany Hall), which was suspected of large-scale frauds. The newspaper won the fight and from that moment, the Irish became a synonym for the Democrats and became the enemy of the Republican New York Times.

After years of making fun about the way the Californians felt, did the rise of hoodlums in San Francisco lead to awareness by the editors that the situation of the Chinese was deteriorating. The editors understood that the Chinese were going to

stay and that something had to be done about the growing anti-Chinese violence in California. Chinese immigration had also become a subject with which the parties tried to make political capital. This had already led to a switch of policy by the Republicans of California at the end of the sixties, as the Republicans in California had switched to an anti-Chinese policy to prevent the party from losing elections in the state. In 1876, both national parties had to decide whether they would support a federal investigation on Chinese immigration or not. Chinese immigration had become a subject which was discussed in national politics.

In the meantime, Jennings had been replaced by John Foord, after he had attempted to gain control of The New York Times. Foord stayed true to the Republican ideals. Although the editors had come to the conclusion that something had to be done about the hoodlums, they still thought that the whole question was getting to much attention. In the run up to the presidential elections of 1876, the editors found a new sport in ridiculing Democratic politicians and they kept switching between blaming and ridiculing the Californians for their behavior. When they responded to the news that the Chinese had been attacked by mobs, their response was fierce and they would condemn the action. But when the news was less serious, the editor took his time to blame the Californians for being short-sighted and tried to make a fool of them. By switching between these two styles, the editor wanted its readers to see the problem in perspective. Attacks on Chinese had to be condemned, but all the complaints of the Californians were exaggerated.

In 1878, the Chinese question finally got the full attention of the editors. Although the year had begun with embarrassing plans proposed by Democratic congressman, the statement made by Republican Senator Booth impressed the editorial staff. Booth stated that when the situation in California would have taken place at the eastern shore, The Times would have responded differently to the question. The editor showed sympathy and accepted that the people at the west coast were the ones who had most experience with the Chinese and therefore knew best what had to be done. From that moment, the editorial staff decided to support a modification of the Burlingame Treaty. Also the fact that the Chinese embassy, which had arrived that year, was in favor of a modification of the treaty, convinced the editor to support treaty revisions.

The passing of the Fifteen Passenger Bill by Congress (which would be vetoed by the president), while the negotiations about modifying the Burlingame

Treaty were ongoing, led to a furious response of the editor. The bill was in fight with the Burlingame Treaty and the editor expressed the fear that, if the country would put the Chinese under pressure even more, it would have negative consequences for the trade with China. The next day, the response of the Chinese government became a turning point in the way The New York Times dealt with the Chinese immigration. The Chinese government stated that they were also in favor of an anti-immigration bill and the editors started to wonder what the whole debate had been about. They felt that it had been "much ado about nothing" [285] and that the problem would had been solved much sooner, if the people from the west coast would had listened to them.

This spirit was also felt in the last years before the treaty was signed. The new constitution of California, the rise of Kearney's Working Man Party and the possible interference of the army in San Francisco were met with amazement. The editor couldn't believe that the Chinese immigration debate had led to this. Also the fact that the question had become part of both the Democratic and Republican Party platforms led to an angry response of the editor in 1880. The editor thought it was a shame that the Chinese would play a role at Election Day, while the administration was already busy with negotiating a new treaty. He seemed to have lost all his faith in the politicians, because it took a long time before the Chinese Exclusion Act, which was wanted by both parties, would pass Congress. On the 8th of May 1882, the president brought an end to the debate about the Chinese immigration, by singing a law which suspended the immigration of Chinese workers for the next ten years. The editor was glad that the Chinese question would disappear from the editorial pages forever.

Summarizing the position of The New York Times during the debate, the following conclusions can be made. The change of editors-in-chief didn't lead to major differences in the style of writing or the position in the debate. It is also possible to say that the editorial staff never really treated the problem of Chinese immigration seriously, except in cases that violence was used against the Chinese. This could be declared by the fact that the editor felt that it was mainly a western problem. There was only a small group of Chinese living in New York City and the importance of

[285] Much ado about nothing (1880, 6-4) *The New York Times*

the problem wasn't felt in the east. That the editor had responded differently to the Chinese if they had arrived at the east coast, just like Senator Booth said, could be inferred from some editorials. The editor had spent some editorials about the prospect of the Chinese coming to the east and in these editorials, the editors showed unpleasant feelings towards the coming of thousands or millions of Chinese. Whether the Chinese immigration would have been taken seriously by the New York Times when they had to cope with thousands of Chinese at their ports, is something that remains unknown.

The Republican Party had the most influence on the position The Times took in Chinese immigration debate. One of the main principles of The New York Times, to become an independent newspaper, was denied by the editors-in-chief from the start. Although Raymond had been a Whig member at the start of the New York Times and became a very influential member of the Republican Party, he was the least prejudiced editor-in-chief during the debate. Jennings and Foord spent much more editorials within the mindset of the Republicans, blaming the Democrats and the Irishmen. It is plain to see that the editors were much more positive about the plans or ideas that Republican politicians made, than about the plans and ideas proposed by Democratic politicians. The main example for this was Republican Newton Booth. In his time as Governor of California, in 1871, the editor showed its trust in the judgment of Booth on the race riots of Los Angeles. Eight years later, it was the same Booth which convinced the editors that a treaty revision was needed. The relationship between The New York Times and the Republican Party played the most decisive role in the choice which position the newspaper would take during the debates.

Despite the fact that their support for the Republicans looked unconditional, the newspaper would soon break with the party after the signing of the Chinese Exclusion Act. John Foord stepped aside in 1883 and was succeeded by the more independent Charles Miller. Next to that, the Republicans decided that their party members had to choose between President Arthur and James Blaine, on who would become their candidate for the presidential elections of 1884. Both men were disliked by the New York Times, and so would the decision to nominate James Blaine as the Republican presidential candidate in 1884 lead to an end of an era. George Jones

announced the official breakup of the New York Times with the Republican Party on the 23rd of May 1884 in his newspaper. [286]

After the breakup between The Times and the Republicans, the Chinese exclusion act would be renewed multiple times. It would take until 1943 before President Roosevelt made an end to the Chinese exclusion. In 2012, the House of Representatives passed a resolution in which it expressed its regrets to the passing of anti-Chinese laws in the past. [287] The Chinese Exclusion Act hadn't been the only anti-immigration law in the history of the United States. It had been the first in a row of multiple immigration restriction acts which would eventually lead to the passing of the Immigration Act of 1924, which made an end to mass-immigration to the United States at the beginning of the 20th century. [288]

In continuation to this research about the position of the New York Times during the debates about the Chinese immigration, it will be interesting to see how the editors of the New York Times have written about the debates on other immigration acts. By doing this, it is possible to see whether the position held in this research was an exception, or that the New York Times stayed true to its Republican ideals. Further research makes it also possible to see whether Senator Booth had been right, blaming the easterners that they didn't knew what the Californians were going through. New York had much more to do with other immigration acts which succeeded the Chinese Exclusion Act and by doing a research on those act and The Times, we shall see if The Times still thought it was "much ado about nothing".[289]

[286] Davis, History, 149-154
[287] http://www.govtrack.us/, (2012) H.Res. 683: Expressing the regret of the House of Representatives for the passage of laws that adversely affected the Chinese in the United States, including the Chinese Exclusion Act.
[288] http://history.state.gov/, (2012) Office of the Historian - Milestones - 1921-1936 - The Immigration Act of 1924...:
[289] Much ado about nothing (1880, 6-4) *The New York Times*

Sources

Articles (sorted by date: year, day-month):

The New-York Daily Times

Orientals in America	(1852, 14-4)
Relations with China	(1852, 30-4)
Gov. Bigler and the Coolies	(1852, 4-6)
A Chinese Puzzler	(1852, 5-6)
China-men in America	(1852, 9-6)
The Chinamen – An opportunity	(1852, 14-6)
National Vices	(1852, 14-10)
Our Relation with China	(1853, 16-9)
The Chinese in America	(1854, 26-9)
The California News	(1854, 9-10)
The Chinese in California	(1855, 7-3)

The New York Times

Two Religions and Two Races	(1859, 17-6)
The Chinese Invasion (Article 2)	(1859, 8-8)
American Coolie-trade	(1860, 21-4)
The Coolie Trade	(1860, 31-7)
American Ships and the Coolie Trade	(1860, 4-8)
The Coolie Trade	(1860, 18-8)
The President and the Slave Trade	(1860, 21-8)
The Proposed Steamship Line to China	(1865, 18-2)
The Growth of the United States through Emigration – The Chinese	(1865, 3-9)
Red, Yellow and Black	(1867, 30-6)
Chinese Testimony in California Courts	(1868, 19-4)
Facts for the Chinese Embassy	(1868, 25-6)
The Chinese in California	(1868, 8-11)
The Singular Case of Ah Wang	(1869, 20-2)
Christianity and the Chinese	(1869, 29-5)
The Chinese in New York	(1869, 30-5)
John Chinaman – What Shall We do with Him?	(1869, 29-6)
China in America	(1869, 14-7)
Koopmanshoop's Project	(1869, 15-7)
The Law Against Coolie Importation	(1869, 24-7)
Groundless Alarms	(1869, 21-8)
The Burlingame Treaty and Anti-Chinese Laws	(1869, 9-11)

The Chinese Question	(1869, 20-11)
The value of the Chinamen	(1869, 4-12)
The Chinese Problem	(1869, 5-12)
What next?	(1870, 22-2)
What shall be done with John Chinaman?	(1870, 3-3)
Chinese Immigration	(1870, 15-4)
Arrival of One Hundred and Fifty Chinamen	(1870, 21-6)
Theories and Facts about the Chinese	(1870, 1-7)
A New Solution of the “Servant Girl” Question	(1870, 6-7)
The Chinese in the American Labor Market	(1870, 7-7)
Our Chinese Immigrants	(1870, 14-7)
An empire that is not peace	(1870, 25-7)
The Labor Question	(1870, 18-8)
The Tien-Tsin Massacre	(1870, 17-9)
Chinese Coolie Mutinies	(1870, 10-10)
The Slave Trade Revived	(1871, 16-1)
The Later Slave Trade	(1871, 2-7)
California All Right	(1871, 8-9)
Chinese in California	(1871, 15-12)
The Celts and the Celestials	(1871, 17-12)
John Chinaman	(1872, 1-3)
The Test of Civilizations	(1872, 8-10)
A Heathen Festival	(1872, 21-12)
The New Slave Trade	(1873, 11-6)
Mr. Supervisor Nye	(1873, 12-6)
Lai Yongs Letter	(1873, 17-6)
The Coming Race	(1873, 26-6)
Civilized Travel	(1873, 25-7)
The Fate of Ah Gim	(1873, 7-9)
Labor in Louisiana	(1873, 5-10)
A Chinaman The Less	(1873, 27-12)
Converted Heathens	(1874, 6-6)
Coolies and Hoodlums	(1874, 15-8)
A Heathen Missionary	(1874, 2-10)
The Aggressive Chinaman	(1874, 30-11)
Editorial 6	(1875, 12-2)
John Chinaman at last	(1875, 11-4)
An Absurd Prejudice	(1875, 17-8)
A Suggestion to Scannell & Co.	(1876, 28-1)
Smiting the Heathen	(1876, 7-4)

The Burlingame Treaty	(1876, 25-4)
Editorial 8	(1876, 4-5)
A Specimen Slander	(1876, 5-6)
Foo-Che-Pang	(1876, 8-6)
Respiration by Law	(1876, 29-6)
An Anti-Chinese Missionary	(1876, 31-7)
Chaos Come in California	(1876, 21-11)
John Chinaman Again	(1877, 20-2)
Suppression of the Coolie Trade	(1877, 26-2)
The Chinese Question in Congress	(1877, 1-3)
Editorial 3	(1877, 19-3)
Editorial 3	(1877, 2-4)
The Caucasians	(1877, 3-4)
Editorial 3	(1877, 23-4)
The Crucial Test of Democracy	(1877, 5-6)
The Force of Sympathy	(1877, 25-7)
Editorial 5	(1877, 26-7)
Editorial 4	(1877, 28-7)
A Chinese Mystery	(1877, 23-8)
A New Cause of Complaint	(1877, 1-9)
Editorial 5	(1877, 18-9)
A Californian Ghost	(1877, 16-10)
Editorial 2	(1877, 7-11)
Popular Incendiaries	(1877, 17-11)
Editorial 3	(1877, 8-12)
Senator Morton and The Chinese	(1878, 18-1)
Capitalists in Disgrace	(1878, 25-1)
Shelley’s reservation	(1878, 4-2)
The Wicked Chinaman	(1878, 28-2)
The Chinese Puzzle	(1878, 15-4)
Congress and the Chinese	(1878, 20-5)
The Chinese Embassy	(1878, 7-8)
The Chinese and the Working Men	(1878, 15-8)
Imported Earthquakes	(1878, 23-8)
Black, Yellow and White	(1878, 3-9)
The Chinese Embassy	(1878, 26-9)
Chinese Immigration	(1879, 13-1)
Congress and the Chinese	(1879, 29-1)
“A Mere Political Dodge”	(1879, 31-1)
Editorial 9	(1879, 5-2)

Editorial 12	(1879, 11-2)
Editorial 2	(1879, 14-2)
Editorial 4	(1879, 15-2)
The Chinese Bill in the Senate	(1879, 17-2)
Editorial 1	(1879, 18-2)
Editorial 1	(1879, 23-2)
The Fate of the Anti-Chinese Bill	(1879, 24-2)
Editorial 4	(1879, 27-2)
Legislators Threatened	(1879, 27-2)
Editorial 8	(1879, 28-2)
Editorial 3	(1879, 3-3)
California and The Chinese	(1879, 4-3)
Editorial 5	(1879, 10-3)
The New Anti-Chinese Project	(1879, 10-3)
The Proposed Constitution for California	(1879, 17-3)
A New View From China	(1879, 31-3)
Communism in California	(1879, 9-5)
Another Bull in a China Shop	(1879, 14-5)
Editorial 4	(1879, 23-5)
Editorial 5	(1879, 23-6)
The Tale of a Chinaman	(1879, 16-7)
Congressman Wright's Sphere	(1879, 7-9)
The California Election	(1879, 9-9)
The Oregon Chinese Case	(1879, 26-9)
Race Antipathies	(1879, 28-11)
The Chinese Myth	(1879, 2-12)
John Smith, Martyr	(1879, 9-12)
Editorial 6	(1880, 10-2)
Editorial 5	(1880, 23-2)
The California Experiment	(1880, 24-2)
Editorial 4	(1880, 26-2)
"The Chinese Must Go."	(1880, 26-2)
Editorial 1	(1880, 1-3)
Chinese as a Nuisance	(1880, 6-3)
The Army in San Francisco	(1880, 11-3)
Editorial 4	(1880, 22-3)
Editorial 3	(1880, 27-3)
Much ado about nothing	(1880, 6-4)
Editorial 2	(1880, 3-5)
The Pagan and The Church	(1880, 7-5)

The Unappreciated Field	(1880, 20-5)
Political Hobbies	(1880, 4-6)
The Republican Platform	(1880, 6-6)
Editorial 1	(1880, 7-6)
The deposition of Kearney	(1880, 5-7)
Sand Lots Legislation	(1880, 8-7)
“The Chinese Hordes”	(1880, 5-8)
The Great “Fly-Gobbler”	(1880, 28-10)
The Chinese in the Canvass	(1880, 29-10)
Forgery	(1880, 30-10)
A Democratic Demonstration	(1880, 2-11)
California and Nevada	(1880, 5-11)
The New Chinese Treaty	(1881, 11-1)
The Chinese Treaty	(1881, 14-1)
The Chinese Treaty	(1881, 24-1)
Editorial 1	(1881, 3-5)
Editorial 2	(1881, 3-5)
Editorial 1	(1881, 4-5)
Editorial 1	(1881, 5-5)
A Vexed Question Settled.	(1881, 6-5)
A Wyoming Prejudice	(1881, 9-6)
China in the United States	(1881, 23-7)
A Plea for Quietness	(1881, 4-9)
Editorial 4	(1881, 6-12)
The Going Chinese	(1881, 9-12)
Editorial 3	(1881, 21-12)
Editorial 5	(1882, 14-1)
Editorial 3	(1882, 18-2)
Editorial 5	(1882, 27-2)
Editorial 4	(1882, 2-3)
China in the Senate	(1882, 4-3)
Editorial 5	(1882, 7-3)
Negro and Chinaman	(1882, 9-3)
Restriction of Chinese Immigration	(1882, 24-3)
Editorial 3	(1882, 25-3)
Editorial 5	(1882, 27-3)
Editorial 1	(1882, 4-4)
The President’s Veto	(1882, 5-4)
Editorial 1	(1882, 6-4)
Editorial 2	(1882, 18-4)

Editorial 4 (1882, 27-4)
Editorial 4 (1882, 29-4)
Editorial 1 (1882, 9-5)

Books

Berger, M., The story of The New York Times 1851-1951 (New York 1951)

Chang, I., The Chinese of America (New York 2004)

Daniels, R., Asian America (Washington 1988)

Davis, E., History of the New York Times 1851-1921 (New York 1969)

Kung, S.W., Chinese in American Life (Seattle 1962)

Lee R.H., The Chinese in the United States of America (Oxford 1960)

Sandmeyer, E.C., The Anti-Chinese Movement in California (Illinois 1973)

Tichenor, D., Dividing Lines (Princeton 2002)

Internet

http://abcas3.accessabc.com/ecirc/newstitlesearchus.asp (2011)
ACCESS ABC: eCirc for US Newspapers, the 17th of March 2012

http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/hres683/text (2012)
H.Res. 683: Expressing the regret of the House of Representatives for the passage of laws that adversely affected the Chinese in the United States, including the Chinese Exclusion Act., the 27th of June 2012

http://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/ImmigrationAct (2012)
Office of the Historian - Milestones - 1921-1936 - The Immigration Act of 1924...:, the 27th of June 2012

http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0027/twps0027.html (1998)
Population of the 100 Largest Cities and Other Urban Places in the United States: 1790 to 1990, the 17th of March 2012