



Oriental Immigration: The Experience of the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino Populations in the United States

Author(s): Monica Boyd

Source: *International Migration Review*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Spring, 1971), pp. 48-61

Published by: The Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3002046>

Accessed: 25/08/2008 19:54

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cmigrations>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# *Oriental Immigration: The Experience of the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino Populations in the United States*

by  
Monica Boyd \*

## *The Historical Setting*

The first large-scale Oriental immigration into the United States occurred between 1850 and 1860 with the active recruitment of Chinese laborers for the development of the trans-Mississippi frontier. Although nearly half of the early Chinese immigrants did not stay,<sup>1</sup> a total of 408,493 persons born in China<sup>2</sup> were admitted into the mainland United States as visitors, students, immigrants, and returning aliens between 1850 and 1960. The majority of the immigrants prior to 1940 were males and tended to reside near Western ports of entry.

The reaction initially was favorable to the Chinese who provided badly needed manpower. However, opposition to their presence and continued immigration soon developed in the Western states in response to the economic competition of the Chinese with white workers for wage levels and jobs, and the distrust of the different cultural ways of the Chinese.<sup>3</sup> The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 by the United States Congress was the culmination of nearly three decades of anti-Chinese agitation at local, state, and federal levels. The Act did not stop immigration but did upgrade the socioeconomic status of new immigrants by refusing entrance of unskilled laborers. The Act was renewed after the

---

1. R. H. Lee, *The Chinese in the United States of America*, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1960, p. 21.

2. U. S. Department of Justice, *Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service: 1960*, Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960, Table 13.

3. See: M. T. Bennett, *American Immigration Policies*, Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1963, pp. 15-16. Also see: M. R. Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration*, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1909, Chapters 3, 4 and 5; and Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

---

\* Monica Boyd, Department of Sociology, Carleton University, Ottawa.

stipulated 10 year period expired in 1892 and was made a permanent enactment in 1904.<sup>4</sup> It was followed by the Immigration Act of 1924 which stopped large-scale Oriental immigration.

In comparison with their cousins residing on the United States mainland, early Oriental immigrants to Hawaii had little *de jure* and *de facto* opposition to their entry and modes of employment. The lack of opposition reflected both the pattern of racial equality established by early trading contacts between Polynesians and Caucasians, and high rates of intermarriage which resulted in the presence of a considerable group of people with mixed racial ancestry.<sup>5</sup>

As in the mainland United States, the Chinese in Hawaii represented the first group of Asiatics to be recruited as a source of manpower, primarily for the Hawaiian sugar plantations. The first shipload of Chinese contract laborers arrived on Hawaii in 1852 and by 1886 there were 20,000 Chinese in the Islands, one-fourth being plantation laborers.<sup>6</sup> It is estimated that over 46,000 Chinese were brought to Hawaii as laborers, mainly between 1876-1885 and 1890-1897.<sup>7</sup> Annexation of Hawaii in 1898 brought immigration within the jurisdiction of the Chinese Exclusion Act and legally ended large-scale Chinese immigration to the Islands.

Although preceded by the Portuguese, the Japanese were the second Asiatic population to arrive in Hawaii. As a result of an 1884 agreement between Hawaii and Japan, a total of nearly 83,000 Japanese, many under contract to Hawaiian sugar planters, had arrived in Hawaii by 1899.<sup>8</sup> Although immigration of laborers under contract ceased with the annexation of Hawaii to the United States, the annexation had little effect on the total magnitude of Japanese immigration into Hawaii. Between 1886 and 1924, a total of 199,134 Japanese entered Hawaii although over half did not remain.<sup>9</sup>

Like the Japanese in Hawaii, the Japanese on the Pacific Coast constituted the second group of Asiatics to arrive in large numbers. According to various estimates, more than 200,000 aliens entered the United States between 1888 and 1924; thousands of others were admitted

---

4. S. W. Kung, *Chinese in American Life*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962, p. 153.

5. G. E. Simpson and J. M. Yinger, *Racial and Cultural Minorities*, New York: Harper and Row, 1958, p. 541.

6. Kung, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

7. A. W. Lind, *Hawaii's People*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1955, pp. 26-27.

8. E. K. Strong, Jr., *The Second-Generation Japanese Problem*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1934, p. 71.

9. Y. Ichihashi, *Japanese in the United States*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1932, pp. 28-29.

as secondary migrants from Hawaii.<sup>10</sup> The majority concentrated in the three Pacific states of California, Washington and Oregon. In California the Japanese population grew from 1,100 persons in 1890 to over 40,000 in 1910 and to 97,000 by 1930. Much of the growth in the California population after 1910 is attributable to the large scale immigration of Japanese women which occurred after the 1908 Gentlemen's Agreement and before the 1924 Immigration Act.

As the Japanese on the West Coast grew in size and increasingly turned to occupations which placed them in direct competition with white workers, they inherited the anti-Chinese discrimination. Agitation by the Western states first to limit and then to exclude Japanese immigration led to the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1908 between the United States and Japan. Under this agreement, the Japanese government consented to issue passports to the United States only to non-laborers. The chief effect of the Gentlemen's Agreement was to change the type of Japanese immigrant to the continental United States; it did not end immigration or check the West Coast agitation against the Japanese, as evidenced by the legal ineligibility of immigrant Japanese for naturalization<sup>11</sup> and by the Land Laws.<sup>12</sup> Discrimination culminated in the evacuation and interment of over 111,000 West Coast Japanese in the spring and summer of 1942. The relocation geographically dispersed the Japanese throughout the United States and destroyed the pre-war ethnic-supported economic structure.<sup>13</sup> The Japanese in Hawaii were not part of this relocation and on the whole were not as adversely affected by their wartime experiences.<sup>14</sup>

The Filipinos were the last Asiatic group to migrate to the United States and to its possessions in large numbers. Immigration initially began in Hawaii in response to recruitment efforts by sugar and pineapple

---

10. D. S. Thomas, *The Salvage*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952, p. 3. Also Lind, *op. cit.*, p. 29 estimates that 40,000 Japanese left Hawaii for the United States mainland after annexation.

11. F. C. La Violette, *Americans of Japanese Ancestry*, Toronto: The Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1946, p. 4.

12. U.S. Department of the Interior: U. S. War Relocation Authority, *People in Motion*, Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1941, p. 35.

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 47, 49.

14. One reason given for the more favorable treatment of the Japanese in Hawaii is the tradition of harmonious race relations as contrasted with the anti-Oriental atmosphere on the West Coast. Also, over one-third of the Hawaiian population was Japanese. To have policed such a large group would have been extremely costly and would have removed a large proportion of people from the labor force at a time when an increase in production was essential to the war effort. See: C. F. Marden and G. Meyer, *Minorities in American Society*, New York: American Book Co., 1962, pp. 197-198.

planters. From 1907 to 1931 when importation of labor temporarily ceased as a result of the Depression, almost 125,000 Filipinos came to Hawaii.<sup>15</sup> Most of the immigrants did not stay. During the 1920's the movement from Hawaii to the United States increased and was augmented by a stream of direct migration from the Philippines. By 1930 the number of Filipinos recorded by the United States Census as residing in California had grown from 2,000 in 1920 to over 30,000, of which only 1,800 persons were females. No legal restrictions were placed on Filipino immigration which had begun after the 1908 curtailment of Japanese laborers. Prior to 1935, the Filipinos were nationals of the United States and were not subject to quota restrictions.

As can be readily surmised, the early streams of Oriental immigrants mostly consisted of young unskilled males. Female Chinese immigration was sharply curtailed by the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 although immigration of Japanese "picture brides" rose after the 1908 Gentleman's Agreement. In 1920, four years prior to the passage of the 1924 Immigration Act, approximately 529 Chinese and 171 Japanese males resided in California for every 100 females of their respective races. Comparable sex ratios for Hawaii were 222 for the Chinese, 134 for the Japanese, and 403 for the Filipinos.<sup>16</sup>

The occupational composition of early Oriental immigrants reflected both the economy and the racial attitudes of their new surroundings. In California, the anti-Oriental legislative enactments combined with general prejudice and discrimination forced the Oriental population to seek employment that brought them into little direct competition with their white co-workers. Specialization in small service businesses such as laundries and restaurants was characteristic of the early Chinese immigrants. The Japanese also gravitated towards small businesses as well as agricultural activities and became successful as tenant farmers and farm managers. During the 1920's and 1930's the Filipinos were employed chiefly as agricultural laborers.<sup>17</sup>

In Hawaii, the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos were recruited as plantation laborers. As the first of the Oriental groups imported under

---

15. G. P. Judd, IV, *Hawaii*, New York: Collier Books, 1961, p. 138.

16. Published data for Filipinos residing in California are not available. See: U. S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. General Population Characteristics. California*, Final Report: PC (1)-6B, Table 15, *Hawaii*, Final Report PC (1)-13B, Table 15, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

17. See J.H. Burma, "The Background of the Current Situation of Filipino-Americans," *Social Forces*, 30 (October, 1951), p. 43. Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 257; Kung, *op. cit.*, p. 30; Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

contract, the Chinese quickly established themselves in commerce and trade. The pattern set by the Chinese in leaving plantation occupations for higher economic and social gains was followed by the Japanese and to a limited extent by the Filipinos.

These occupational patterns were well established by 1924 when the Immigration Law was enacted. Subsequently, little Chinese and Japanese immigration occurred to alter such patterns. The depression years also discouraged possible immigration from the Philippines. The post World War II years, however, were characterized by a change in immigration laws and an increase in Oriental immigration.

### *Recent Immigration*

As a result of favorable American response to Chinese participation during World War II, the Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed on December 17, 1943, and an annual quota of 105 persons was established. The War Brides Act of December 28, 1945, the G. I. Fiancee Act of June 29, 1946 and the Act of August 9, 1946 facilitated the entrance of Oriental war brides, alien fiancées and fiancés, war grooms and children, by waiving certain visa requirements and permitting entry of these groups as nonquota immigrants. The Immigration and Nationality (McCarran-Walter) Act of 1952 was the first major revision of the immigration laws since the Immigration Act of 1924. The Act of 1952 retained the natural origin principle, but introduced a system of selective immigration by giving a preferential quota of 50 per cent to skilled aliens whose services were urgently needed in the United States, and the remainder of the quota to relatives of citizens and permanent residents. All races were made eligible for immigration and naturalization. China, Japan, and the Philippines were assigned quotas of 100 persons. The Chinese additionally benefited from the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 which authorized the admission of two thousand Chinese refugees.

The impact of the various post World War II immigration laws is easily assessed from Table 1. Only data for the fiscal years 1951-1960 is presented since the postwar Oriental immigration began at different dates prior to 1950, and in the early post-war years was relatively small. As revealed in Table 1, more than three-fourths of the immigrants born in China, Japan, and the Philippines are nonquota. Furthermore, much of the 1951-1960 nonquota entry is composed of wives and/or children of United States citizens.

Given the focus on Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos residing in Hawaii and California, immigration data made specific for each state would be desirable. However, prior to the 1959 annual report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, tabulated state-of-future-residence

TABLE 1  
Type of Immigrant by Place of Birth: 1951-1960

Place of Birth	Number	Type of Immigrant Per Cent <sup>a</sup>			Type of Nonquota Immigrant Per Cent				
		Male	Female	Quota Nonquota	Wife of U.S. Citizen	Husband of U.S. Citizen	Child of U.S. Citizen	Other <sup>b</sup>	
China	32,744	22.5	77.5	22.1	77.9	37.3	4.2	9.7	48.8
Japan	44,674	14.1	85.9	3.1	96.9	71.2	2.5	0.8	25.5
Philippines	18,095	29.1	70.9	6.5	93.5	55.0	6.8	32.2	6.0

<sup>a</sup> Percentages for sex of immigrants are based on race not on place of birth. By race, 31,174 Chinese, 45,474 Japanese and 16,356 Filipinos entered the United States during 1951-1960.

<sup>b</sup> Includes refugees.

Sources: U. S. Department of Justice. *Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service: 1951-1960*. Tables 6 and 10.

by country-of-birth data is unavailable. The 1959 and 1960 tabulations suggest that most of the immigration initially is to the continental United States rather than to Hawaii. During the fiscal years of 1959 and 1960 only 3 and 7 per cent of persons born in China and Japan respectively, listed Hawaii as their state of future intended residence. Thirty-seven per cent of the China-born and 33 per cent of the Japan-born immigrants indicated they plan to reside in California. Data for the Philippines is not tabulated.<sup>18</sup>

Census data for 1960 provide a crude measure of previous state and overseas migration. Table 2 reveals the proportions of persons in Hawaii or California in 1960 who resided elsewhere in 1955. In both states, Oriental women have higher rates of overseas residency in 1955 than do Oriental men. Such findings corroborate with the post-war changes in immigration laws and the resultant inflow of Oriental women. The data in Table 2 also support the above suggestion that most of the Oriental immigration is not to Hawaii. California contains a larger proportion of Orientals with overseas and other state residency in 1955 than does Hawaii. The high proportion of white males and females in Hawaii who resided elsewhere in 1955 undoubtedly reflects the military installations there. Forty-five per cent of the white males age 14 years and over and residing in Hawaii in 1960 were members of the Armed forces.<sup>19</sup>

As a result of these post-war immigration laws along with natural increase, the Oriental population in the United States including Alaska and Hawaii grew from 106,334 Chinese, 285,115 Japanese, and 102,435 Filipinos in 1940 to 237,292 Chinese, 464,332 Japanese, and 176,310 Filipinos in 1960.<sup>20</sup> Of the 1960 populations, Hawaii contains 16 per cent of the Chinese, 44 per cent of the Japanese and 37 per cent of the Filipinos. In contrast, California contains one third of the Chinese population, and approximately two-fifths respectively of the Japanese and Filipino populations. Although the absolute sizes of the Oriental populations are small in both California and Hawaii their proportions of the total varies considerably in the two states. Ninety-two per cent of the population in California is Caucasian while the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino populations together form two per cent. In Hawaii, however,

---

18. U.S. Department of Justice, *Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service*: 1959. Table 12A.

19. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. General Population Characteristics; U.S. Summary. Hawaii*, Final Report PC (1)-13C, Table 52.

20. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. General Population Characteristics; U.S. Summary*, Final Report PC (1) - 1B, Table 45; *Alaska*, Final Report PC (1)-3B, Table 15; *California*, Final Report PC (1)-6B, Table 15; *Hawaii*, Final Report PC (1)-13B, Table 15.

TABLE 2  
In-Migration since 1955 of Population 5 Years of Age and Over: 1960

Sex and per cent residing in a different area in 1955	California			Hawaii				
	White	Chinese	Filipino	White	Chinese	Filipino		
		Japanese		Japanese				
Male, 5 years of age and over	6,391,196	47,574	69,509	38,780	99,506	17,695	90,721	39,710
Other state	14.7	5.2	10.2	6.2	51.3	2.5	1.5	1.5
Abroad	3.0	6.0	8.5	11.1	6.7	1.7	1.9	2.8
Female, 5 years of age and over	6,499,892	35,692	70,485	19,584	76,897	17,079	94,452	21,029
Other state	13.1	5.1	10.5	8.8	45.0	2.2	1.3	2.2
Abroad	2.1	9.2	10.5	19.2	4.5	2.1	2.2	5.8

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Census of Population: 1960. Detailed Characteristics. California*, Final Report PC (1)-6D, Table 100; *Hawaii*, Final Report PC (1)-13D, Table 100; *Subject Reports. Nonwhite Population by Race*, Final Report PC (2)-1C, Tables 52-54.

the white and the Japanese populations each represent roughly one-third of the total, followed by the Filipino and the Chinese populations which respectively form 11 per cent and six per cent.<sup>21</sup>

Of the Oriental populations, the Chinese are the most highly urbanized with over 94 per cent residing in urban areas in Hawaii and California. Comparable figures for the proportion of urban Japanese are 88 per cent in California and 81 per cent in Hawaii. Eighty-one per cent of the Filipinos reside in urban areas in California, but less than two-thirds (63 per cent) live in urban areas of Hawaii. The latter figure is attributable to the relatively high proportion of Filipinos still employed as agricultural laborers (see Table 4). Eighty-six per cent of the white population in California are urban, but the figure drops to 74 per cent for Hawaii, which contains a large proportion of men residing in military installations in rural nonfarm areas.<sup>22</sup>

The 1960 sex and age distributions of the Oriental populations in both Hawaii and California still reflect past immigration streams. During 1940-1960, the inflow of Japanese women along with the mortality of the pre-1924 immigrants lowered the sex ratio from 127 to slightly less than unity. This decrease does not necessarily reflect an increase in the formation rate of Japanese families since many of the war brides married members of other races. Chinese males in California still outnumber the females in 1960 by a ratio of five to four although the sex ratio for Chinese in Hawaii is only slightly above unity. The demographic characteristics of the Filipino population most clearly delineates the effect of previous immigration streams composed chiefly of male immigrants. The sex ratio for this racial group is 184 and 179 in California and Hawaii respectively.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, the median age for males in both states is at least twenty years in excess of the median age of 17.2 years for females residing in Hawaii or California. Comparable median ages for male and female Japanese and Chinese are in the mid-to-late-twenties.<sup>24</sup>

In addition to the age and sex structure, the occupational structure of the Oriental populations also reflects past and current immigration. Table 3 suggests that in accordance with the post World War II

---

21. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. General Population Characteristics. California*, Final Report PC (1)-6B, Table 15; *Hawaii*, Final Report, PC (1)-13B, Table 15.

22. *Ibid. Hawaii*, Final Report, PC (1)-13C, Table 52.

23. *Ibid.*

24. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Nonwhite Population by Race*. Final Report PC (2)-1c, Tables 52-54.

TABLE 3

Occupations Reported by Immigrants by Place of Birth: 1951-1960

Type of Occupation	Born in China	Born in Japan	Born in the Philippines
N	9475	2547	2721
Professional workers	38.9	29.4	51.4
Other white collar workers <sup>a</sup>	28.9	16.5	14.6
Service workers <sup>b</sup>	18.2	5.6	13.8
Other blue collar workers <sup>c</sup>	12.3	17.1	17.5
Farm workers <sup>d</sup>	1.7	31.4	2.7

<sup>a</sup> Includes managerial, clerical and sales workers

<sup>b</sup> Includes private household and other service workers

<sup>c</sup> Includes craftsmen, operatives and laborers other than farming and mining

<sup>d</sup> Includes farmers, farm managers and farm laborers.

Sources: U.S. Department of Justice. *Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service: 1951-1960*. Table 8.

immigration measures, recent Oriental immigrants are skilled workers. Over 60 per cent of those immigrants who were born in China (including Taiwan) and in the Philippines, and who give their occupations, are white collar workers. A slightly lower figure of 45 per cent maintains for those persons born in Japan.

Census data further indicates the impact of past immigration. Although state-specific data is not available, 1960 census data for the Western region reveals that 48, 17, and 78 per cent of the employed Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino males, respectively, age 14 years and over are foreign-born.<sup>25</sup> These figures suggest that the smaller 1960 indices of dissimilarity<sup>26</sup> for the Chinese and Filipino occupational distributions as compared with those for 1940 (Table 4) may be due in

25. *Ibid.*, Tables 34-36, 43-45.

26. The index of dissimilarity indicates the extent to which the distribution of a variable has to be altered in order for that variable to be equally distributed in two populations. In our analysis the index measures the percentage of people in one racial group who would have to change their occupational category for their occupational distribution to be identical with the occupational distribution of the white population. See O.D. Duncan, and B. Duncan, "A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes," *American Sociological Review*, 20 (1955) pp. 210-217.

part to recent immigration rather than assimilation processes among second-generation Orientals.<sup>27</sup>

We observe from Table 4 that the occupational dissimilarity between white and Filipino males has decreased the most from 1940 to 1960 followed by that of the Japanese and Chinese. In terms of the magnitude of the dissimilarity however, between the white and Oriental occupational distributions, the Chinese for both areas and decades have the smallest indices, and the Filipinos the largest. These magnitudes undoubtedly reflect the earlier immigration and the longer residency of the Chinese in Hawaii and California as compared with the later arrival of the Japanese and the Filipinos. With the exception of the Filipino population in 1960, indices of dissimilarity are smaller for Orientals in Hawaii than in California. These smaller differentials possibly reflect the more harmonious racial relations established in the Islands which mitigated the occupational specialization found earlier in California.

Although space has necessitated the collapsing of the standard eleven occupational categories tabulated by the United States Census Bureau, the occupational specialization of the Oriental groups and the changes over the decades can be readily observed from Table 4. As of 1950 in California and 1940 in Hawaii, the Chinese have a larger proportion of workers in white collar jobs than do white, Japanese, and Filipino males. Of greater interest, however, is the concentration of the California Chinese and Filipino workers in service occupations and the concentration of Japanese workers in agricultural occupations as compared with the occupational distributions of white males. With the exception of the Filipino population these patterns of occupational concentration are not maintained to as great an extent by Orientals residing in Hawaii. In view of the earlier findings that early Orientals in California adjusted to a hostile environment by filling specialized occupational niches, it is plausible that such specialization could still be occurring. Such specialization may not necessarily reflect current discrimination but rather the values attributed to these occupations by the Oriental populations as a result of their historical experiences.

---

27. Although census data by age groups is not available for Orientals reporting an occupation, it appears that even the younger age groups likely to be in the labor force contain a large proportion of foreign-born. Of the males age 25-34 and residing in the Western region in 1960, 8 per cent of the Japanese, 40 per cent of the Chinese, and 44 per cent of the Filipinos are foreign-born. In view of the extensive discussions on the assimilation of immigrant groups, it would be highly desirable to examine the socioeconomic characteristics of the foreign-born and native-born Orientals. Unfortunately, the 1960 *Census Special Report on Nonwhite Races* does give state-specific information on native-born as distinct from foreign-born.

TABLE 4  
Occupational Categories and Indices of Dissimilarity for Males,  
Age 14 Years and over Reporting Occupations in 1940, 1950, 1960

Race and Occupation <sup>a</sup>	California			Hawaii		
	1960	1950	1940	1960	1950	1940
White						
Professional worker	14.7	10.3	8.1	18.8	(d)	10.3
Other white collar worker	28.9	29.4	30.3	33.0		31.4
Service worker <sup>b</sup>	6.2	6.7	7.2	5.7		13.5
Other blue collar worker	45.0	45.2	43.0	38.3		36.3
Farm worker	5.2	8.4	11.4	4.2		8.5
Chinese						
Professional worker	18.0	6.3	3.3	17.2	(d)	5.7
Other white collar worker	34.5	38.5	31.3	38.2		43.4
Service worker <sup>b</sup>	33.5	29.7	38.4	7.4		12.3
Other blue collar worker	11.9	20.8	18.7	35.8		31.5
Farm worker	2.1	4.7	8.3	1.4		7.1
Japanese						
Professional worker	15.6	4.4	2.6	10.4	(d)	3.8
Other white collar worker	21.5	17.6	22.1	26.2		19.2
Service worker <sup>b</sup>	4.8	8.7	8.4	5.4		8.4
Other blue collar worker	26.4	29.9	19.8	51.3		41.5
Farm worker	31.7	39.4	47.1	6.7		27.1
Filipino						
Professional worker	4.9	0.8	0.6	1.8	(d)	0.4
Other white collar worker	10.4	4.6	2.1	6.4		2.6
Service worker <sup>b</sup>	37.8	25.1	28.3	11.0		5.8
Other blue collar worker	36.1	14.0	6.5	55.6		20.5
Farm worker	10.8	55.5	62.5	25.2		70.7
Index of Dissimilarity <sup>c</sup>						
Chinese	26	32	35	11	(d)	16
Japanese	28	44	40	16		25
Filipino	43	66	76	16		25

<sup>a</sup> See Table 3 for occupational categories.

<sup>b</sup> The 1940 occupational distribution for white males in Hawaii is biased by inclusion of members of the Armed Forces in the service workers category. Using A. Lind's figure of 26,233 servicemen in Hawaii in 1940 (*Hawaii's People*, p. 68) and adjusting for per cent nonwhite the civilian occupational distribution was estimated. The estimate is approximate, and it is likely that a higher percentage of white males are listed as having service (civilian) occupations in 1940 than exists in actuality. The other alternative, however was to leave the occupational distribution as reported in the 1940 census with 55 percent of the white male population in service occupations.

<sup>c</sup> Indices of dissimilarity calculated on nine categories of professional and technical workers; managers excluding farm; clerical workers; sales workers; craftsmen, operatives; service workers including private; laborers other than farm; farmers and farm managers; farm laborers.

<sup>d</sup> Not available in occupational categories comparable with 1940 and 1960 data. Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Census of Population: 1960. Detailed Characteristics. California*, Final Report PC (1)-60, Table 123; Hawaii, Final Report PC (1)-13D, Table 123; *Subject Reports. Nonwhite Population by Race*, Final Report PC (2)-1C, Table 34. *Census of Population: 1950*, Vol. II, part 5, Table 77; *Special Report*, P-E, No. 3B, Table 11; *Sixteenth Census of Population: 1940*. Vol. III, part II, Table 3; *Special Report: Hawaii*, Table 14; *Special Report: Characteristics of the Nonwhite Population by Race*, Table 18.

Support or negation of these hypotheses, however, awaits an indepth survey of Oriental-American communities. This study is limited to an examination of the immigration patterns of Oriental Americans in order to illuminate historical and recent demographic trends. The study has shown that Oriental immigration to both Hawaii and California consisted of successive waves of Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino immigrants and that immigration of each group dropped drastically during or after the 1920's. Furthermore, unlike the European immigration, the initial Oriental immigration did not involve the large scale movement of entire families. Subsequent restrictive immigration measures further hindered Oriental family formation in the United States. The effects of the relative low rates of female immigration may still be seen today in the sex ratio and age distributions of the Oriental populations.

In addition, the changing nature of Oriental immigration after World War II is shown by the greater proportion of child and female immigrants. Post World War II immigration also appears to be of a higher socioeconomic standing, as measured by occupation given upon entry into the United States. This higher status of the Oriental immigrant is undoubtedly reflected in the converging occupational distributions of white and Oriental males between 1940 and 1960 although the absolute impact of Oriental immigration upon the changing occupational distributions remains to be quantified by future studies.

#### Résumé

Utilisant des publications du Bureau de Recensement et du Service d'Immigration et de Naturalization des États-Unis, cette étude traite des détermine les patterns d'immigration des trois plus nombreux groupes orientaux résidant aux États-Unis: les Chinois, les Japonais, et les Philippines. L'auteur dirige son analyse sur les orientaux résident en Californie et à Hawaii et compare les expériences sociales de groupes identiques existant en différents milieux culturels.

La Californie et Hawaii servent d'états d'entrée et de résidence pour les populations chinoises, japonaises et philippines, mais différent l'un de l'autre quant à l'accueil fait aux nouveaux immigrants.

#### Resumen

Basándose en datos del Censo de los Estados Unidos y del Servicio de Inmigración, se examinan en este artículo las características de tres grandes grupos de Orientales residentes en los EE.UU.: Chinos, Japoneses y Filipinos. Se comparan las experiencias sociales de estos tres grupos en ambientes culturales distintos, a saber, California y Hawaii. Ambos estados de la Unión Americana se han distinguido como lugares de entrada y residencia para esos tres grupos ya mencionados, pero su actitud receptora hacia esos nuevos inmigrantes ha sido muy diversa.

## Zusammenfassung

Berichte der Zensus Büros und Einwanderungs- und Naturalisierungsdienste der Vereinigten Staaten wurden benützt, als wir eingehend das Einwanderebild der drei grössten morgenländischen Gruppen, die in den Vereinigten Staaten wohnen: die Chinesen, die Japaner, die Philippiner, studierten. Während wir die Orientalen die in Kalifornien und Hawaii wohnen, studierten, verglichen wir zugleich den gesellschaftlichen Verkehr gleichrassischer Gruppen in den verschiedenartigen Milieus. Kalifornien und Hawaii dienen beide als Empfangsstaaten und Wohnsitz für Chinesen, Japaner und Philippiner, unterscheiden sich aber sehr von einander in ihrer Einstellung zu den neuen Einwanderern.

---

Official Journal of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association

Publication officielle de la Société canadienne de sociologie et d'anthropologie.

© Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association / Société canadienne de sociologie et d'anthropologie 1970. All rights reserved.

Published by / Paraît à The University of Toronto Press, Toronto  
Volume 7, no. 2, May 1970 / mai 1970

---

**THE CANADIAN REVIEW  
OF SOCIOLOGY  
AND ANTHROPOLOGY  
LA REVUE CANADIENNE  
DE SOCIOLOGIE  
ET D'ANTHROPOLOGIE**

Five Papers on Social Class in Canada / Cinq essais sur la classe sociale au Canada

ARTICLES / ARTICLES

Working Class Politics: An Interpretation of the Quebec Case	Maurice Pinard
Social Class and Opportunity in Canada	Bernard R. Blishen

RESEARCH NOTES / NOTES DES RECHERCHE

Ethnic Penetration into Toronto's Elite Structure	Merrijoy Kelner
Adolescence, Social Class, and Occupational Expectations	Edward Harvey Lorna R. Harvey
Social Class and Achievement Orientation	S.D. Lawlor

COMMENT / COMMENTAIRE

On the Question of Developing a Sociology of the Canadian Family: A Methodological Statement	Parvez A. Wakil
--	-----------------

Books Received / Livres reçus

---

Editor / Rédacteur: Frank E. Jones / McMaster University  
Rédacteur adjoint / Associate Editor: Marc-Adélar Tremblay / Université Laval

---