

APPENDIX A:

*Postbellum Electoral Politics in California and the Genesis of the Chinese
Exclusion Act of 1882*

Identifying Congressmen and Senators on Chinese-Related Issues

Congressional Globe, 36th congress, 1st session, December 5, 1859 to June 25, 1860 (pp1441)

- Thomas D. Eliot (**Representative, Massachusetts, R**) asked the consent to the House to prohibit the Chinese coolie trade, which William Barksdale (**Representative, Mississippi, D**), Henry Burnett (**Representative, Kentucky, D**), Lawrence O'Bryan Branch (**Representative, North Carolina, D**), and John Sherman (**Representative, Ohio, R**)

Congressional Globe, 38th congress to 39th, no mentioning of anti-Chinese topics

Congressional Globe, Senate, 40th Congress, 2nd Session (pg838)

ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- James Johnson (**Representative, California, D**): I ask unanimous consent to offer the following resolution: resolved. That the Judiciary Committee to inquire whether it be in the power of congress to prevent the immigration of Chinese and other inferior races to our country; and also whether the civil rights act and the proposed amendments to the constitution of the united states confer the rights of citizenship, including the right of suffrage upon Chinese as well as all other males born in the United states over the age of twenty-one years, and to report by bill or otherwise

NON-ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- William Pile (**Representative, Missouri, R**): I object
- James Johnson: I simply desire the reference of this subject to the committee on Judiciary. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection:
- William Pile: I must insist on the objection. I think the resolution is a burlesque on the common sense.

Congressional Globe, 41st Congress, 2nd Session

- George H. Williams (**Senator, Oregon, R**) proposed to regulate Chinese immigration (preventing coolies) (pp301)
- Jacob M. Howard (**Senator, Michigan, R**) argued that such a proposal did not aim to prevent importation of coolies but to prevent immigration of Chinese. Samuel C. Pomeroy (**Senator, Kansas, R**) agreed with Howard. (pp301)
- William Stewart (**Senator, Nevada, R**) also stated that the California tax bills imposing on Chinese were unfair(pp301)
- Cornelius Cole (**Senator, California, R**) stated that “a great many persons are imported from China whose presence in this country is not only of no use but really detrimental to the general welfare I have no doubt”. However, Cole also acknowledged that not all Chinese were “bad” by stating California and the Western Territories heavily relied upon them to a great extent due to their industry, economy, ingenuity, and enterprise. (pp301)

ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- James Johnson (**Representative, California, D**) introduced joint resolutions which provides that “any State suffering injury from filthy habits, degrading vices or customs

practiced by Chinese residents thereof may, if such habits, vices, or customs become a nuisance, protect itself by state legislation, notwithstanding the existence of any treaty between the United States and the Chinese Government”

- **William Mungen** (**Representative, California, D**) introduced a joint resolution that permitted each state in the Unions to prohibit the residence of Chinese or total exclusion of Chinese for the purpose of protecting laboring and producing classes against Chinese immigration. (pp338)

Congressional Globe, 41st Congress, 3rd Session (pp88)

ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- **James Johnson** (**Representative, California, D**) proposed the abrogation of the Burlingame Treaty

Congressional Globe, 42nd Congress mostly focused on supports for Chinese: indemnity education funds and providing educational supports for Chinese.

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 2, Part 1 (December 1, 1873 to January 29, 1874) (pp716)

ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- **Horace Page** (**Representative, California, R**): I ask unanimous consent to offer the following resolution: Resolved That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be, and is hereby, instructed to report to this House at the earliest practicable moment, if expedient. a concurrent resolution advising an opening of negotiations by the President of the United States with the Emperor of China, with a view to such a modification of articles 5 and 6 of the existing treaty between the two nations as to check or altogether **prevent Chinese immigration to the United States.** (pp716)

NON-ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- **Charles Wesley Willard** (**Representative, Vermont, R**): I object. I have no objection to the reference of the resolution, but I object to its being adopted. (pp716)
- **Horace Page**: I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There was no objection, and the resolution was so referred. (pp716)
- **Thomas W. Ferry** (**Senator, Michigan, R**) presented the petition of Charles Nobler and other, citizens of Michigan, praying that the "Chinese indemnity fund," so called, be appropriated for the education of the Chinese on the Pacific Coast; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (pp568)
- **William A. Buckingham** (**Senator, Connecticut, R**): "I also present the memorial of Cyrus Winthrop and other citizens of Connecticut, asking that the fund in the Treasury of the United States, known as the Chinese indemnity fund be appropriated for the education of Chinese youth in the 'Pacific States. I take this occasion to say that if that fund is not returned to the Chinese Government, I know of no better use that can be made of it than that indicated by these memorialists. I move the reference of the memorial to the Committee on Education and Labor." (pp568)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 2, Part 1 (December 1, 1873 to January 29, 1874)

A LITTLE BIT ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- Charles Clayton (**Representative, California, R**): “resolutions of the San Francisco Lyceum of Self-Culture, for the appointment by Congress of a commission of inquiry into the condition of the Chinese in this country, and the influence they exert upon white labor-Committee on Education and Labor”. (pp795)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 2, Part 2 (January 29, 1874 to March 5, 1874) (pp1463)
ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- Aaron A. Sargent (**Senator, California, R**): “I present to the Senate two volumes containing the signatures of 16,638 persons, residents and citizens of the State of California, in which they ask the Senate to pay attention to the condition of the treaty between the United States and China, and see if by some appropriate legislation, or by a modification of that treaty, the evils which they depict, of an influx of Chinese into this country, may be prevented. The matter is of very great local importance, and perhaps it is to be regretted that it is so local in its character that its importance cannot be fully estimated in other parts of the country.

We have in the State of California, as represented by these petitioners, and I presume that they approximate the truth, some sixty thousand Chinamen. These Chinese do not readily, and perhaps not at all, assimilate with our people. They do not come here to be citizens of the United States; they do not seek to be citizens. With one or two exceptions, out of one hundred thousand, they have never applied to be citizens. By their religion or their superstition their bones, even, are returned to China after their death. They work at very moderate prices. They underbid and undersell all other kinds of labor. They necessarily thereby drive out other laborers, skilled and unskilled. They are exceedingly simple in their requirements for a living, living upon a few handfuls of rice per day. If they have children they do not send them to school. They live in overcrowded habitations upon the streets of our cities, a dozen or twenty of them perhaps in a small room. By this means the health of the cities is imperiled. By this means, also, there are dangers created of conflagrations, which sometimes burst out in the Chinese quarters of our cities and towns, and are very destructive in their effects.

I wish to call the attention of Senators to the fact that California and the Pacific States and Territories are simply the gateway which lets in the influx of Chinese population. We have now, as these petitioners say, some sixty thousand of them. They have reached somewhat further East, carrying, not civilization, as other immigrants bring, but pagan customs through the Territories. . By and by, on account of the exhaustless supply of. this class of immigrants, or coolies, for many of them are imported as coolies, and our laws do not reach the difficulty and prevent the importation of coolies, the other States will find themselves crowded, and our workingmen are crowded, by the presence of Chinese in great numbers. By and by it will become a national question. Perhaps then it may be too late for the remedy which now might be effectual.

Now, sir, I do not remark upon the humanitarian side of this question. I do not desire especially to dwell upon the consideration that it may be convenient for the overcrowded races of China-overcrowded so much that by a natural law almost they resort to infanticide to keep down overpopulation-to pour themselves upon America. It may be that there is something in that consideration; but there is also much in the other consideration that there should be some means of our own national defense.

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 2, Part 3 (March 5, 1874 to April 11, 1874) (pp2166 and 2299)
ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- William Irwin (**President of the California State Senate pro tempore, D**) and Morris Estee (**Speaker of the California State Assembly, R**) urged Horace Page (**Representative, California, R**) and John Hager (**Senator, California, D**) to present concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of California, for the discouragement of Chinese immigration and revision of the Burlingame Treaty:

Whereas the great influx of Chinese into the State of California has proved detrimental to the moral and material well-being of our industrial classes, by forcing on them a competition at wages below the cost of subsistence to men of our own origin, who have families depending on their labor for support and education...

Mongolian labor has driven from employment large numbers of our people, by a competition which has been prolific of idleness, vice, and suffering among our people, thereby assisting to fill our jails, poor houses, and hospitals with unwilling inmates

Our own citizen labor is unable to compete with this servile labor, because what will sustain a Chinaman will not sustain our citizen laborer. If a citizen can afford to work for fifty dollars a month, a Chinese will do it for thirty dollars; if the citizen labor comes down to thirty dollars a month, Chinese labor will come down to twenty dollars; and if citizen labor comes down to twenty dollars, the Chinese will come down to ten dollars, and then they will make money. That is the condition there, so that there is no fair competition.

NON-ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- Justin S. Morrill (**Senator, Vermont, R**) and Hannibal Hamlin (**Senator, Maine, R**) objected John Hager (**Senator, California, D**)'s request of unanimous consent to revision of the Burlingame Treaty, which will check importation into the United States of Chinese females for immoral purposes, and of Chinese males as coolies, or for the purpose of fulfilling servile-labor engagements. (pp2301)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 2, Part 5 (May 19, 1874 to June 15, 1874) (pp4535)
ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- Horace Page (**Representative, California, R**) mentioned "importation of coolies" again by stating "Experience of more than twenty years has taught us that those of the Chinese who come here, voluntarily or otherwise, do not assimilate with us in one single particular; that a resident of so many years among a people who are inferior to none on earth in morality, virtue, and intelligence, whose halls of learning, and houses of worship are the pride of the country, has failed entirely to redeem them." "the condition of the slaves in the South was never so devoid of the elements of civilization as that of the Chinese in this country today."
- The Chinese are constitutionally and by race an inferior people to any of the nations of Europe. (pp4535)
- John K. Luttrell (**Representative, California, D**) proposed white labor should not be replaced by Chinese labor. However, Joseph Rainey (**Representative, South Carolina, R**) opposed it (pp4966)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 3, Part 1 (December 7, 1874 to January 28, 1875)

ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- Horace Page (**Representative, California, R**) submitted a resolution to prevent Chinese immigration (pp19)
- John Hager (**Senator, California, D**) encouraged the President to renegotiate the Burlingame Treaty with China (pp96)
- Horace Page (**Representative, California, R**) introduced a bill providing for the exclusion of Chinese from the benefits of the naturalization laws of the United States (pp224)
- Aaron A. Sargent (**Senator, California, R**) stated that it would be disastrous to the interests of civilization and good government on that coast to have Chinese naturalized, and therefore, and for that reason only, resisted the striking of the word "white" out of the naturalization laws. (pp227)
- Samuel S. Cox (**Representative, New York, D**) supported the Horace Page (**Representative, California, R**) anti-Chinese proposal (pp436)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 3, Part 2 (January 28, 1875 to February 23, 1875)

- Page Act (HR 4747), which banned the importation of forced labor and Chinese women, was passed with two-thirds voting in the affirmative) (pp1599)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 3, Part 3 (February 23, 1875 to March 3, 1875)

ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- William Stewart (**Senator, Nevada, R**) presented a resolution of the Legislature of Nevada, instructing the Senators and Representatives from that State to modify the existing treaties with China so as to prevent the importation of Chinese, male and female, under servile contracts.(pp1787) (the first senator I could find who changed his stand on the Chinese issue)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 4, Part 1 (March 5, 1875 to February 10, 1876)

ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- William A. Piper (**Representative, California, D**) proposed to modify existing treaties with the Chinese empire and suppress Chinese immigration (pp300). He received no objection. (pp900)
- John K. Luttrell (**Representative, California, D**) introduced a bill to prevent the naturalization of Chinese and Mongolians (pp477)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 4, Part 3 (March 28, 1876 to May 5, 1876)

- Horace Page (**Representative, California, R**) proposed the POTUS should renegotiate the Burlingame Treaty with China (two-thirds voting in favor) (pp2158)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 4, Part 4 (May 5, 1876 to June 22, 1876)

- John H. Mitchell (**Senator, Oregon, R**) stated that “the effect of Chinese immigration upon the Pacific coast is to degrade the industry of the country to subordinate the labor of the honest, hardworking, free American citizen to that of the dishonest, servile legions of a rice-eating and heathen race”. The remedy of the evil of Chinese immigrants would be absolute prohibition of the Chinese immigration (pp3099-3100)

- John P. Jones (**Senator, Nevada, R**) presented a petition of citizens of Lyon County, Nevada, praying Congress to adopt some legal measures to prevent the further immigration of Chinese

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 4, Part 5 (June 22, 1876 to July 29, 1876)

- When Aaron A. Sargent (**Senator, California, R**) preached the idea of total Chinese exclusion again, Morgan C. Hamilton (**Senator, Texas, R**) spoke against the idea (pp4419)
- When Aaron A. Sargent (**Senator, California, R**) suggested Chinese are both slaves and criminal, Timothy O. Howe (**Senator, Wisconsin, R**) opposed such a notion.(pp4421)
- A joint Select Committee was established to investigate Chinese immigration.
- Oliver H. P. T. Morton (**Senator, Indiana, R**), Aaron A. Sargent (**Senator, California, R**), Henry Cooper (**Senator, Tennessee, D**) were appointed as members of Joint Committee on Chinese Immigration in the Senate. (pp5080)
- Edwin R. Meade (**Representative, New York, D**), James Wilson (**Representative, New York, D**), and William A. Piper (**Representative, California, D**) were appointed as members of Join Committee on Chinese Immigration in the House (pp5697)
- Samuel S. Cox (**Representative, New York, D**) suggested that Chinese “are a menace to our industry and grain upon our resources” and modification of the Burlingame Treaty

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 5, Part 3 (February 20, 1877 to March 3, 1877)

ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- Report of the Join special Committee of the House to Investigate Chinese Immigration acknowledged that the Pacific States benefits from the cheap Chinese labor, but the present or future moral or political welfare could be damaged by Chinese. “The Mongolian race seems to have no desire for progress and to have no conception of representative and free institutions.” “Many people of the Pacific coa.st believe that this influx of Chinese is a standing menace to republican institutions upon the Pacific and the existence there of Christian civilization.” (pp2004)
- Edwin R. Meade (**Representative, New York, D**) “Appropriately enough the personal habits of our visitors formed an important feature of the investigation, and that the Chinese, at least a large proportion of those that come to this country, are neither virtuous nor cleanly, was abundantly proven.” (pp117) “Coolie immigration a-s a labor question in this country would alone impart to it a political complexion, and in this respect, it has lost none of its importance by reason of the action of both political parties, that conspicuously have entered a race to demonstrate which shall go furthest and tarry longest in opposition to the Chinese immigrant, but the further phase of its political character is with what political rights and privileges this class is in the future to be invested.” (pp118)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 7, Part 1 (December 3, 1877 to February 13, 1878)

ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- Charles M. Shelley (**Representative, Alabama, D**) introduced a bill to regulate Chinese immigration

- Aaron A. Sargent (**Senator, California, R**) introduced a bill to restrict the immigration of Chinese. (pp81)
- John K. Luttrell (**Representative, California, D**) introduced a joint resolution relative to Chinese immigration and modification of the Burlingame treaty. (pp98)
- John K. Luttrell (**Representative, California, D**) introduced a bill to prohibit the employment of Chinese or Mongolians upon any public works of the United States (pp271)
- John K. Luttrell (**Representative, California, D**) introduced a bill to prevent the naturalization of Chinese or Mongolians (pp271)
- Newton Booth (**Senator, California, AM**) asked for the passage of the bill introduced by Charles M. Shelley (**Representative, Alabama, D**) (pp301)
- Thomas Wren (**Representative, Nevada, R**) introduced a bill to restrict the immigration of Chinese to the United States (pp318)
- Horace Davis (**Representative, California, R**) introduced a bill to restrict Chinese immigration (pp383)

NON-ANTI-CHINESE PASSAGES

- Jay A. Hubbell (**Representative, Michigan, R**) and Milton Sayler (**Representative, Ohio, D**) opposed John K. Luttrell (**Representative, California, D**)'s proposal because they worried about the breach of the Burlingame Treaty (pp503)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 7, Part 2 (February 13, 1878 to March 25, 1878)

John K. Luttrell (**Representative, California, D**) and Aaron A. Sargent (**Senator, California, R**) made lengthy anti-Chinese comments.

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 7, Part 3 (March 25, 1878 to May 1, 1878)

John K. Luttrell (**Representative, California, D**) and Aaron A. Sargent (**Senator, California, R**) made lengthy anti-Chinese comments again

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 7, Part 5 (June 5, 1878 to June 20, 1878)

Horace Davis (**Representative, California, R**), John K. Luttrell (**Representative, California, D**) brought up the modification of the Burlingame Treaty by citing lengthy harmful effects of Chinese immigrants (pp4331 and 4335))

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 8, Part 1 (December 2, 1878 to February 3, 1879)

- Oregon instructed Richard Williams (**Representative, Oregon, R**) and La Fayette Grover (**Senator, Oregon, D**) to propose prohibition of Chinese immigration.
- Albert S. Willis (**Representative, Kentucky, D**) reported a bill that would restrict the number Chinese immigrants to fifteen for every vessel coming to US and advocated restriction on Chinese immigration (pp799)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 8, Part 3 (February 24, 1879 to March 3, 1879)

Chinese issues became one of the central topic in this volume

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 9, Part 1 (March 18, 1879 to May 13, 1879)

- John Goode Jr ([Representative, Virginia, D](#)) introduced a bill to restrict Chinese immigration pp614)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 9, Part 2 (May 13, 1879 to July 1, 1879)

- James H. Slater ([Senator, Oregon, D](#)) proposed the modification of the Burlingame Treaty. (1507)
- Martin Maginnis ([Delegates, Montana Territory, D](#)) proposed to restrict Chinese immigration

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 10, Part 3 (April 1, 1880 to May 5, 1880)

Campbell P. Berry ([Representative, California, D](#)) introduced a bill to restrict Chinese immigration (HR 5058)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 11, Part 2 (January 25, 1881 to February 17, 1881)

- William Irwin (Governor, California) presented California's vote on Chinese immigration (pp1495):
 - For Chinese immigration: 883
 - Against Chinese immigration: 154,638
 - Voters who did not express any wish on the subject: 5,884

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 13

This volume has a lot of anti-Chinese message, mostly from congressmen and senators of California. Those messages were very instigative against Chinese and manifested in voting record of the Chinese Exclusion Act

Voting Record

41st Congress 1st session, March 4, 1869 to April 10, 1869 (pp202)

- James Johnson ([Representative, California, D](#)) asked for the passing the resolution for the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States this House never intended that Chinese or Mongolians should become voters.
- Voting results: <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/41-1/h33#details> (Yea, 42; Nay, 106; No Vote, 48) Virtually all Rs voted Nay (4 Rs voted yea), and Ds voted Yea (2 Ds voted Nay)

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 8, Part 1 (December 2, 1878 to February 3, 1879)

- A Bill Restricting the immigration of Chinese to the United States
- Voting results: <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/45-3/h293> [Yea, 155 (102D, 51R, 2ID; Nay, 72 (16D, 56R); Not voting, 61 (31D, 30R)) Vetoes by the president and failed to reach 2/3, the bill was rejected

Cong. Rec. (Bound) - Volume 8, Part 2 (February 3, 1879 to February 24, 1879)

- To amend h.r. 2423, by requesting the president of the U.S. to notify the Chinese emperor that the treaty permitting Chinese subjects to immigrate into the U.S. is pernicious, that same should be modified as of Jan. 1, 1880, and that upon refusal, the U.S. to proceed by law to prevent such immigrations to the U.S. as of that date, and treat the treaty as ended.
- Voting Result: <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/45-3/s423> [Yea, 31 (19R, 11D); Nay, 33 (15R, 18D); not voting, 11(4R, 7D)]

The Chinese Exclusion Act Vote

House Voting Result: <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/47-1/h83> (lot of republicans voted YEA)

Senate Voting Result: <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/47-1/s370>

APPENDIX B:

Postbellum Electoral Politics in California and the Genesis of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882

Results with Voter Turnout

Our proposed narrative for the genesis of the Chinese Exclusion Act is that the Civil War forced a changed in electoral strategy by Democrats who had to convince California to vote for them (and peel off the state from the Republican coalition). This was done by invoking anti-Chinese rhetoric. In our article, we phrased our results in terms of the absolute margin of victory in a county to speak to the greater competitiveness created by the shift. However, this implicitly assumed that all that mattered was rhetoric in convincing voters to shift sides. Another way that things could have become more competitive is by convincing marginal voters to turn out to vote. At footnote 19, we mentioned this possibility and discussed the results of a regression with turnout as a dependent variable. That regression suggested a result consistent with our other findings. However, we mentioned that they were “census-related reasons” that made it difficult “to compute a strong and reliable turnout rate”.

What are those reasons? First, the turnout needs to be expressed as a rate of the voting population eligible in that election. Because of the censuses being available for 1860, 1870, and 1880 we cannot compute a rate of turnout as a share of eligible voters at the time of the election (except for 1880 when the census and the election coincided). This first issue could be somewhat circumvented with the use of some control variables for population growth in the county between the two censuses. However, the second issue is far more problematic. The age breakdown by gender *and* race is not readily available in a usable form at the county level. Because a large share of the Chinese was foreign-born who could never become citizen (and that population was skewed towards being male), the voting age public in counties with large Chinese population is going to be overestimated. This means that the turnout rate is going to be underestimated (i.e., because the denominator produced by the voting age public is going to be overestimated). Combined, these issues make it hard to compute a turnout rate.

Nevertheless, we conducted a repetition of our baseline results with turnout expressed as a share of the non-Chinese population in the nearest census. We added a control for a county's non-Chinese population growth rate between two censuses to deal indirectly with the issue of not having a reliable denominator to express the eligible voting base.¹ The objective is to see if areas with larger Chinese/White ratio had greater turnout. Table 1 below shows these results. It suggests that the turnout rate was greater in areas with large Chinese populations. Finding the opposite would (i.e., lower turnout where there was a large Chinese population) would have essentially invalidated our argument (i.e., voters did not care about the topic).

¹ A faster growth rate from 1870 to 1880 (e.g., Alameda county had an annualized growth rate of 10%) means that the turnout should be understated relative to a county with a slower growth rate.

Table B1: OLS results for turnout rate

VARIABLES	-1 Model 1 1880	-2 Model 2 1880	-3 Model 3 1876	-4 Model 4 1876	-5 Model 5 1872	-6 Model 6 1872	-7 Model 7 1868	-8 Model 8 1868
Chinese/White Ratio, 1880	0.229***	0.217***	0.0938***	0.0903***				
	-0.0544	-0.0484	-0.0235	-0.0231				
Log of Manufacturing Wages, 1880	3.012	1.161	3.261	2.885**				
	-2.474	-2.327	-1.946	-1.368				
Log of Population, 1880	-0.906	-1.678*	-2.014***	-2.450***				
	-0.863	-0.969	-0.648	-0.598				
Log of Manufacturing Output PC, 1880	-1.306*		-0.117					
	-0.651		-0.662					
Non-Chinese Growth Rate 1870 to 1880	-1.206	-4.618	-61.89***	-61.87***	19.63	19.85		
	-9.507	-10.24	-5.84	-5.958	-13.09	-12.64		
Manufacturing/Farm Ratio , 1880		0.00859		0.0381**				
		-0.0205		-0.0158				
Chinese/White Ratio, 1870					0.267***	0.264***	0.198**	0.195**
					-0.0294	-0.0304	-0.088	-0.0899
Log of Manufacturing Wages, 1870					-1.771	-1.257	3.664	3.384
					-2.139	-1.913	-2.669	-2.422
Log of Population, 1870					-1.431***	-1.639***	-0.504	-1.004
					-0.395	-0.498	-0.8	-1.091
Log of Manufacturing Output PC, 1870					0.44		-0.266	
					-0.464		-0.847	
Non-Chinese Growth Rate 1860 to 1870						0.0564		0.0948
						-0.0403		-0.0752
Manufacturing/Farm Ratio , 1870							-107.0***	-106.9***
							-21.36	-19.85
Constant	16.07	29.84***	23.26*	29.04***	38.61***	39.02***	8.939	13.95
	-13.3	-9.99	-13.8	-10.2	-10.62	-10.44	-14.11	-13.83
Observations	49	49	49	49	48	48	42	42
R-squared	0.561	0.5	0.647	0.658	0.535	0.534	0.823	0.825

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

APPENDIX C:
*Postbellum Electoral Politics in California and the Genesis of the Chinese
 Exclusion Act of 1882*
 Additional Results with Shift-Share Instruments

Table C1: First Stage Results Associated with Section 4.2.5. in the Article (Endogeneity Concerns)

VARIABLES	(1) Model 1 1880 Census Chinese-White Ratio	(2) Model 2 1880 Census Chinese-White Ratio	(3) Model 1 1870 Census Chinese-White Ratio	(4) Model 1 1870 Census Chinese-White Ratio
Shift-Share Instrument, 1880	60.52*** (18.30)	57.67*** (18.70)		
Log of Manufacturing Wages, 1880	-5.784 (5.177)	-1.913 (4.756)		
Log of Population, 1880	-1.417 (0.912)	-0.300 (1.245)		
Log of Manufacturing Output PC, 1880	2.898*** (0.992)			
Manufacturing Farm Ratio, 1880		0.0222 (0.0283)		
Shift-Share Instrument, 1870			205.5*** (28.95)	205.7*** (30.31)
Log of Manufacturing Wages, 1870			4.115 (3.085)	3.074 (3.029)
Log of Population, 1870			-0.622 (0.998)	-0.500 (1.285)
Log of Manufacturing Output PC, 1870			-0.958 (0.904)	
Manufacturing Farm Ratio, 1870				-0.0318 (0.0745)
Constant	42.82 (26.45)	19.99 (25.32)	-10.17 (13.63)	-8.710 (14.40)
Observations	43	43	42	42
R-squared	0.629	0.591	0.743	0.739

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table C2: Test for weak instrument (tied to table 9)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
VARIABLES	1880	1880	1876	1876	1872	1872	1868	1868
Robust F-Stat	(1,38)	(1,38)	(1,38)	(1,38)	(1,37)	(1,37)	(1,37)	(1,37)
	10.93	9.51	10.93	9.51	50.39	46.07	50.39	46.07
Prob > F	0.0021	0.0038	0.0021	0.0038	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

APPENDIX D:

*Postbellum Electoral Politics in California and the Genesis of the Chinese
Exclusion Act of 1882*

Additional Results with Swing of Votes (with Elections of 1856,
1860, 1884 and 1888)

Table D1: Replication of Results from Swing-Related Specification but for pre-Civil War and post-Chinese Exclusion Act elections (1856, 1860, 1884, 1888).

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Model 1	Model 1	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
VARIABLES	$\Delta(1856-68)$	$\Delta(1860-68)$	$\Delta(1884-68)$	$\Delta(1884-68)$	$\Delta(1888-68)$	$\Delta(1888-68)$
Chinese/White Ratio, 1860	0.251 (0.173)	0.361*** (0.115)				
Log of Population, 1860	-0.0445 (0.0386)	-0.0433** (0.0248)				
Log of Manufacturing Output PC, 1860	0.0301 (0.0213)	-0.00373 0.0273				
Log of Manufacturing Wages, 1860	0.037 (0.0464)	0.0860** (0.0393)				
Chinese/White Ratio, 1880			-0.000985 (0.000631)	-0.000977 (0.000669)		
Log of Manufacturing Wages, 1880			0.00112 (0.0416)	0.00253 (0.0347)		
Log of Population, 1880			0.0132 (0.0113)	0.0140 (0.0141)		
Log of Manufacturing Output PC, 1880			0.000882 (0.0144)			
Manufacturing/Farm Ratio, 1880				-2.82e-05 (0.000362)		
Chinese/White Ratio, 1890					-0.00304 (0.300)	0.0672 (0.315)
Log of Manufacturing Wages, 1890					0.0392 (0.0326)	0.0103 (0.0296)
Log of Population, 1890					0.0291** (0.0140)	0.0291** (0.0134)
Log of Manufacturing Output PC, 1880					-0.0235* (0.0128)	
Manufacturing/Farm Ratio, 1890						-0.000516** (0.000230)
Constant	0.307 (0.445)	0.000823 (0.234)	-0.105 (0.235)	-0.117 (0.232)	-0.426** (0.211)	-0.337 (0.207)
Observations	39	41	49	49	49	49
R-squared	0.109	0.253	0.050	0.050	0.144	0.117

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1