

# Rooted in the Americanization Zeal

## The San Francisco International Institute, Race, and Settlement Work, 1918–1939

*Andrew Urban*

The Chinese and Japanese come from the Asiatic zone ineligible to citizenship. This means that the impulse to serve them has never been rooted in the Americanization zeal which has played so large a part, spoken or unspoken, in the attitude of Americans toward other transplanted folk.

—Letter from Ethel Bird of the National Services Division of the YWCA to Mrs. Emily Price, Member of the Executive Board of the San Francisco International Institute, March 9, 1934

### INTRODUCTION

This essay will explore how the work and philosophy of the International Institute, a settlement house located in downtown San Francisco, relates to the larger historiography that has attempted to understand the role of settlement houses and social work in regard to race and cultural pluralism. As a settlement house that directed its resources toward San Francisco's Asian immigrants as well as the city's American-born Asian population, the International Institute offers a unique look into how race informed "Americanization" work and imbued it with unavoidable contradictions.

The settlement house movement that emerged in the first part of the twentieth century defined among its primary goals the making of good American citizens who would contribute to the nation and become part of its social fabric. As the San Francisco International Institute noted in its 1934 Annual Report, "The International Institute thinks of itself as society's agent in trying to help the foreign-born and their children become so adjusted in and identified with American life that they will cordially cooperate as responsible citizens."<sup>1</sup> In another document articulating why it was worthy of receiving funding from San Francisco's municipal philanthropic organization, the Community Chest, the Institute would state as its purpose, simply, "the protection and integration of foreign born and racial groups into our civilization."<sup>2</sup>

The International Institute's self-described goals of making "responsible citizens" and facilitating "integration" were not applied universally to all of the nationality groups that

the organization worked with in San Francisco. As the quote at the beginning of this essay illustrates, Asian immigrants living in the United States were "ineligible" for naturalization. In seeking to help assimilate immigrants into the nation, the International Institute was nonetheless limited to the prevailing legal definition of which groups were racially eligible for incorporation into the nation. As Annie Clo Watson, Executive Secretary of the San Francisco International Institute, would note in speaking before the National Conference of Social Work, no amount of Americanization work could change the fact that Asians were "a permanent body of non-citizens, who cannot hold property and establish homes for their families, who are cut off from the institutions of government, who are socially, culturally, and legally isolated."<sup>3</sup> In extending its services to the American-born Chinese population in San Francisco—citizens by birth—the International Institute performed a different type of Americanization work that framed citizenship as being contingent on cultural qualities. In this manner as well, the International Institute grappled with how race informed fitness for national inclusion.

### BACKGROUND OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTES

In 1918, the International Institute in San Francisco opened its doors, joining nineteen other Institutes already in operation across the United States. Conceived of as a department of the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), individual Institutes were affiliated with both the national organization of the YWCA, to which they reported and on which they relied on for funding, as well as local branches of the YWCA in the cities where they operated. In San Francisco this meant that the International Institute worked closely with both the Chinese YWCA and Japanese YWCA (often referred to as the Chinese and Japanese Centers), despite maintaining its own offices and a separate staff.

The San Francisco International Institute was modeled as a settlement house; although its employees did not reside in its main building, the Institute was located in downtown San Francisco at 1860 Washington Street and maintained an

open-door policy to the communities it served. The International Institutes oriented their work around the idea that the different nationality communities possessed specific needs, and as a result, assigned programs and staff by nationality. In 1923, for example, the Institute employed on its staff a Greek visitor, a Spanish-speaking visitor (working primarily with the city's Mexican population), a Russian visitor, in addition to a Japanese visitor and three Chinese visitors, one of whom worked as a full-time liaison at the Chinese Center.<sup>4</sup> Visitors had the job of cultivating contacts among individuals representing the different nationality communities of the city, promoting the Institute's groups and clubs, as well as responding to needs in the areas of employment, medical care, and interpretation and translation.

The Institute's headquarters at 1860 Washington Street provided a common venue for the different nationality groups that the organization worked with in San Francisco. The Institute believed that events held in the main building fostered a cosmopolitan appreciation between nationality groups, as well as among native-born Americans who could attend and learn "to understand the foreigner" and avoid being "guilty of American arrogance." In accordance with the philosophy of many prominent individuals within the settlement house movement, the Institute in San Francisco theorized that Americanization could occur ostensibly without erasing the cultural traits immigrants brought with them to the United States. Rather, the Institute sought to foster a type of cultural pluralism and served as "sympathetic interpreters of those traditions, social laws, beliefs, and customs valid in the homeland, and also fundamentally valid here," while also facilitating the "slow wearing away of those customs and habits which are of the surface, and are the badge of ignorance; and which can bring only grief and failure in America."<sup>5</sup>

#### THE SETTLEMENT MOVEMENT AND THE RACIAL IDEOLOGIES OF SOCIAL WORK

In looking broadly at settlement house work and issues of race, most scholars have focused on how mainly Protestant settlement workers interacted with predominantly Catholic and Jewish European immigrants. In addition, scholars have explored how settlement houses responded to the "Great Migration" of African Americans into Midwestern and Eastern cities. Settlement workers understood the differences of Italians and Russian Jews, for example, to be racial.<sup>6</sup> Nonetheless, despite examples of biological racism—the belief that race was an innate genetic quality—most settlement houses advocated a definition of "race" that, in line with the liberal sociologists of the era, considered it to be a cultural and contingent category of identity that would yield to and eventually allow for assimilation into a pluralistically American culture. Edith Terry Bremer, the founder of the national federation of International Institutes and a friend and associ-

ate of Jane Addams, articulated this belief: "We are committed to the philosophy that all races of men are intrinsically of equal worth and that the economic and social arrangements should be such as to permit each to work out its own unique life and contribution to mankind."<sup>7</sup>

Settlement houses were often located in white immigrant neighborhoods that, while segregated, bordered on areas inhabited by African Americans. Like the European immigrants that settlement houses were initially created to serve, African Americans coming north in the early part of the twentieth century also faced difficulties in finding housing, jobs, and acceptance from already established and often hostile communities. With these factors in mind, it would seem that the settlement houses would extend an invitation to African American migrants to participate in programs and services, alongside their original mission to assist European immigrants.

This was markedly not the case in the majority of instances. Most settlement houses accepted the commonly held perception that there should be a natural social space between African Americans and whites. Although there were some exceptions, most settlement houses banned African Americans from their programs, often in the process spinning off segregated and autonomous branches to deal with African Americans who sought inclusion. In extreme cases, settlement houses closed down rather than integrate. As Thomas Philpott comments cynically of the settlement houses, "their specialty as social workers was to appreciate neighborhood realities."<sup>8</sup> As institutions with budgets, reliance on outside funding, and a need to attract as many participants as possible, settlement houses believed it was a risky prospect if not outright organizational suicide to try to serve both constituencies. As Robert Woods and Albert Kennedy noted in their influential book, *The Settlement Horizon*, "Large groups of colored people in a neighborhood predominantly white may force a settlement, against its inclination, to choose between the two. In this case the soundest practice is to establish a separate branch."<sup>9</sup> This mentality led to the creation of African American settlement houses with limited access to resources and for the majority, short life spans as "separate and unequal" institutions.<sup>10</sup>

Although settlement houses geared toward white immigrant populations took into account what they believed to be the practical outcomes of racial integration, they also justified their refusal to work with African American through a racialized understanding of what they considered to be African Americans' cultural limitations. Even though social workers were relatively progressive in eschewing popular theories of the time that presented race as being biologically determined, they understood race, as a cultural manifestation, to be deep-rooted and inherited. Jane Addams herself, the most famous of settlement workers, felt, as Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn argues, that slavery had "obliterated morality, family integrity, social organization, and even culture and civilization itself." Due

to the traumas and lasting effects of slavery, in Addams' estimation, African Americans ranked significantly lower than European immigrants in terms of their potential to assimilate. Whereas Addams felt that Greek and Italian immigrants had illustrious cultural pasts to draw upon and utilize in their adaptation to American society, she felt that African Americans were hopelessly disadvantaged in this regard.<sup>11</sup>

In San Francisco, while the International Institute did not establish separate houses to maintain segregation between whites and Asians, race played a constant factor in its day-to-day operation. Comparable to the manner in which settlement houses downplayed the racial difference of African Americans yet nonetheless isolated their needs as belonging to a race apart, Asians in San Francisco were never simply just another nationality group. How white, native-born Americans compared the capacity of Asians to assimilate to that of Europeans cannot be analyzed without understanding how different races have been socially constructed in the United States. As Henry Yu points out in his discussion of the Survey of Race Relations that was conducted by the University of Chicago Sociologist Robert Ezra Park in the 1920s, "Park was not coming all the way out to the West Coast just to argue that anti-Asian prejudice was the same as other forms of prejudice."<sup>12</sup>

Kay Anderson has theorized that the long history of white fascination with Vancouver's Chinatown does not mean that the neighborhood possessed an inherent "Chineseness" prompting such intense attention. Rather, "in an important and neglected sense, 'Chinatown' belongs as much to the society with the power to define and shape it as it does to its residents."<sup>13</sup> Representations of Chinatown as an exotic, foreign location in the heart of San Francisco with roots in the "Orient," coexisted with the neighborhood's real isolation. Prevented from living in ethnically mixed neighborhoods like members of the various white European nationality groups, the physical barriers of Chinatown reinforced and gave salience to the barriers associated with a racial identity. The Institute highlighted the role white intermediation could play in making Chinatown safe and accessible to the city's white population. As the minutes of a 1924 meeting at the International Institute note, the YWCA's presence at the Chinese Center reassured the "very many tourists who call at Chinese headquarters; sometimes they have a sort of hazy idea that something uncanny is lurking in the background but when they see the triangle over the door, their fears are dispelled."<sup>14</sup>

#### FROM GROUP WORK TO CASEWORK

From its beginning, the International Institute divided its work with San Francisco's various nationality groups into two main categories: group work and casework. Group work took the form of organizing activities such as promoting

the Father-Daughter banquet (a competition hosted by the Institute that brought together different nationality groups), offering English language courses to foreign-born women, and providing classes that centered on domestic skills considered essential to the "respectable" American woman, such as cooking, sewing, and lessons in personal hygiene. Group work of this nature had been the traditional domain of the YWCA for many years, although through the International Institutes it was directed exclusively at foreign-born women and their daughters. Casework comprised providing assistance in settling domestic disputes, attempting to mediate intergenerational conflicts between native-born children and their foreign-born parents, and offering legal advice on questions regarding citizenship, deportation, and immigration.<sup>15</sup>

Although both group work and casework had the putative goal of helping to make "good" Americans, the varied methods involved in each type of social work ultimately fomented irreconcilable tensions between the San Francisco Institute and the YWCA, which would result in the Institute declaring its independence from the national organization in 1934. With the break, the San Francisco International Institute joined a number of other Institutes nationwide that had already established autonomy. In a 1930 speech, the Institutes' National Director, Edith Bremer, foreshadowed separation by voicing some of the concerns that would emerge explicitly in years to come:

Personally, it always seemed to me that central to the question of the future of International Institutes lay this other question—what is the greatest need among the foreign peoples today?—is it for an agency championing their interests in a more general way? or is it for one working especially for women? with particular attention to the transition taking place in the homes? Do women represent the most handicapped group, socially speaking, within the immigrant nationalities?

For Bremer, at least at the time, the answer was "yes." Whereas members of the International Institutes' staff sought to become increasingly involved in the politics and legalities of immigration, by refocusing their attention to incorporate in their work the needs of immigrant men and families through casework, Bremer articulated a continuation of group work. As Bremer exclaimed, "Many a woman owes her first personal release to a church bazaar! Why shouldn't these oncoming 'newer Americans' have the soul luxury of participating in some sort of genuine 'social' service?" Bremer believed that wresting immigrant women from their restrictive cultures and engaging them in "American" activities was the most important service that white, native-born women could perform.<sup>16</sup>

Eventually, the desire of Institutes located in cities with large Catholic, immigrant populations, alongside the goal to serve men and families, provided the main reasons for leaving the YWCA.<sup>17</sup> When it became apparent that the San Francisco International Institute would split from the national YWCA, members of the Institute's executive board

sought to maintain its direct link with the local Chinese and Japanese YWCAs so as to preserve access to their largest constituencies. This initiative would ultimately meet in failure, as both the Chinese and the Japanese Centers voted to remain branches of the YWCA. As Ethel Bird of the National Services Division of the YWCA explained to the Institute's Board, in part this reflected the Protestant orientation of the San Francisco YWCA branches, which dictated that the majority of Asians and Asian Americans in contact with the Institute through the YWCA were those who had converted to Protestantism. In addition, Bird pointed out that, "In San Francisco the erection by the Y.W.C.A. of the two lovely buildings tends to emphasize the Chinese and Japanese as racial groups. The lack of buildings, as for example in Oakland, has meant that Chinese and Japanese were drawn in as nationalities into an international grouping with Portuguese, Mexican, and Italian."<sup>18</sup>

The Chinese Exclusion Act, passed in 1882, ensured that the Chinese community in the United States would experience a steady decline among not only new immigrants, but also as a result of the departure of those who chose to resettle in China.<sup>19</sup> This decline, coupled with the persistence of Chinatown as a well-demarcated physical community, informed not only the decision of the Chinese Center to stay part of the YWCA, but, to a larger context, the manner by which the needs of the Chinese were defined. The Chinese in San Francisco were treated as a community with boundaries, resources, and customs that could not necessarily be worked upon to fit a larger conceptualization of the social order, but one that remained essentially outside the (white) social order altogether. The tensions that defined the Chinese community in which the International Institute had contacts and worked with—Protestant, yet ineligible for citizenship, a national community yet permanently racial in that its members could not realize what were considered to be the tangible benefits of Americanization—dictated the limits of the goals the International Institute wished to affect.

Ethel Bird of the national YWCA would remind the San Francisco International Institute that its efforts toward the Chinese could not be "rooted in the Americanization zeal" but were better served by the "missionary zeal."<sup>20</sup> The Chinese could be converted but not made Americans. Group work, which focused on the "betterment" of individual women, coincided with the missionary effort to inculcate Christian mores. Casework toward the Chinese and Japanese communities inevitably confronted legal barriers that race posed. Although the International Institute would maintain associations with the Chinese and Japanese Centers, the decline in the number of Chinese and Japanese individuals it worked with in years subsequent to the separation and its shift toward casework is revealing. While in 1923 the Institute recorded 456 contacts through group work or household visits with Chinese individuals, and 382 with Japanese, by 1934, those numbers were 85 and 17 respectively.<sup>21</sup>

## THE "SECOND GENERATION"—SOCIAL WORK AND AMERICAN-BORN CHINESE

Despite defining its mission as being geared toward members of nationality groups whose foreignness required assistance in adaptation to American life, the San Francisco International Institute focused a great deal of attention on the plight of American-born children of Chinese immigrants. The so-called "second-generation Chinese" warranted great scrutiny in the minds of the staff workers who believed that members of this cohort required special needs in order to be made American. In determining whether the second-generation Chinese would be recognized culturally as citizens, white Americans scrutinized their families, religious beliefs, and other practices to make sure they were free of "Oriental" influences.

As Mae Ngai has argued in presenting the concept of "alien citizenship," the racial ideas encoded in immigration laws and restricted naturalization bestowed upon American-born Asians a type of "alien" citizenship that "cast them as permanently foreign and unassimilable to the nation."<sup>22</sup> The very language used in discussions of Chinese Americans reveal the ingrained, racial assumptions underlying what it meant to be American. Although "American" in citizenship, the second-generation Chinese in the United States remained "Chinese." As an (aptly titled) mission worker with the YWCA observing second-generation Chinese "social relations with Americans" noted, "so much of the intercourse between Chinese and Americans is on an artificial basis, i.e. participants of the two groups not being on the same social and educational levels. So often, too, contacts are on the basis of adding atmosphere or color to situation not real nor genuine basis of approach."<sup>23</sup>

In her 1930 "Survey of Chinatown," Rose Chew would note that among the difficulties perceived by young Chinese Americans, respondents to her questionnaires ranked employment as perhaps the greatest hurdle that barred them from integration into the larger social life of San Francisco. As Chew would observe, "the problem is not so acute with the first generation, as the majority of them are absorbed in the various businesses in the community itself," yet their children, fluent in English and recipients of high school and college degrees, felt continually reproached in their attempt to acquire jobs outside of Chinatown. Those among the second generation, especially women, felt that their only options for work were jobs in which they performed the stereotypical role of the "Oriental." As Chew put it:

For the second generation girls, her employment frequently takes her outside the community in work where her costume is a requirement, such as waitresses in tea-rooms and restaurants, stock girls, elevator operators, etc. Herein is also a problem which must be met—the effect of such employment on character—employment dependent primarily upon attractive costumes rather than upon qualifications and ability to do the work.

These racialized expectations were grounded in white representations of how a Chinese woman should act; the second generation, as Chew commented, listened to American music, watched American films, and tended not to join the familial and benevolent associations their parents belonged to. As Chew explained, "A large number of the second generation would find it difficult to give a talk in Chinese."<sup>24</sup>

In 1930, these observations for Chew must have had particular resonance, as a member of the second generation who had successfully gained employment outside the traditional career path of Chinese women. Straddling the divide between Chinatown and the settlement house, where white, middle- and upper-class Protestant women sought to produce knowledge and explain the increasingly "foreign" city around them, Chew occupied the role of translator. Chew came from a very prominent Chinese family in San Francisco, and her father Ng Poon Chew was the editor of a number of local papers. One author in the 1930s would go as far as to state that the Chew family's success "attest[s] to the value of the work which was begun by missionary enthusiasts of the seventies and eighties."<sup>25</sup> Chew's role as an interpreter was not only a means to show-off a "successful" example of assimilation, but also was necessitated by the International Institute's belief that Chinatown remained an impenetrable space hindering Americanization even among the American-born. While the International Institute attributed many of the problems of the second-generation Chinese to discrimination, alternatively, staff members did not feel one could be American in Chinatown. It was a "Ghetto" with "bad housing" and "petty strife," a "dragon devouring itself."<sup>26</sup> Only those who were able to make contact with the surrounding world outside Chinatown were "greatly affected by modern influences, that is, influences other than Chinese."<sup>27</sup>

The Institute's "Chinese Survey of Chinatown" bears a good deal of resemblance to the publications authored by white sociologists and missionaries during the same time period. Revealing the cultural dimensions of citizenship, Albert Palmer attempted to convince his readers through the voice of the Chinese American graduate student he interviewed, that "the Chinese young people are psychologically American," while Allan Hunter wrote of discrimination that, "They go from one disillusioning experience to another. Small wonder that many of those educated American-born Orientals cry out: 'Only in name have we all the citizen's rights; but in fact we are men without a country.'"<sup>28</sup> William Carlson Smith, a close colleague of Park's who also worked on the Survey of Race Relations, subtitled one of the chapters in his *The Second Generation Oriental in America*, "Oriental in Appearance But Not in Reality." Throughout *The Second Generation Oriental in America*, Smith appears to be attempting to compensate for the fact that their race precluded American-born Asians from being recognized as equals, to the point where he emphasizes over and over again their strong work ethic, the lack of crime in Chinatowns and Japantowns, and the ingrained deference Asians have for the authority of elders.<sup>29</sup>

Like the International Institute, however, these commentators on the Chinese second-generation could not escape race even when dismissing its significance. As Henry Yu notes, "Culture, rather than being a mere description of the mores or folkways of a certain group of people, assumed causal force in the sociologists' narratives." For example, Hunter heralded the role Christian social workers could play in guiding American-born Asians through rituals such as marriage, so as to circumvent the prearranged marriages that could not be reconciled with American individuality.<sup>30</sup> For the children of Asian immigrants to become Americans, they had to distance themselves from the customs of their race, which stood as barriers to inclusion.

In the immediate aftermath of the separation between the San Francisco International Institute and the YWCA, much of the work directed toward the Chinese nationality community was cut off altogether. The Institute, beginning in 1935 when Rose Chew was rehired as a temporary caseworker, eventually returned to the issues of the second generation. Yet if the speech Frank Harris, vice president of the Institute's board, gave to the California Personnel Managers' Association Meeting is indicative, the scientific needs and strict empirical logic of casework shifted focus from discrimination to racial explanations of why second-generation members of San Francisco's nationality communities were not finding work. Although Harris acknowledged that prejudice existed among the city's white workers, he commented that:

The personality impression made by some, is not favorable, particularly when they are competing with old-stock Americans, for a job. Their dress may be a bit peculiar. Their personal grooming and personal hygiene may not be up to the American standard. The odor of cooking in the clothing, or of garlicky food in the diet are fatal to office or mercantile employment—particularly when the public is to be met. Then too, there is frequently a faulty personality adjustment to American groups. The person of immigrant background, due to consciousness of language difficulty or other evidence of "foreignness," holds himself aloof, resists friendly advances, and otherwise introverts himself. The reverse of this is found in the person who adjusts to American groups, laughs off ridicule of his foreign characteristics and his name which is hard to pronounce, and makes his way successfully toward integration.

He added,

We need give little thought to the second-generation of English-speaking, Scandinavian, and German nationalities. These, in the second-generation have no language difficulty; they have lost all trace of "foreignness" in appearance and manner; and in general are as fully integrated as they ever can be, limited only by their personalities, as are old-stock Americans. The problem is quite different for the racial groups who do not thus lose their nationality characteristics,—the Orientals, the Mexicans, and of course the Negroes.<sup>31</sup>

Harris was intent to convince the managers he met with that "Orientals," and other racial groups could be transformed into white workers, but only after they had been stripped of their inhibiting cultural qualities.

## CONCLUSION

It is important to note that the International Institute, in a period often marked by virulent, biological racism, stood out as a consistent advocate for amending legislation that barred Asians from naturalization. Before the National Conference on Social Work, Annie Clo Watson urged settlement workers across the country to petition for the revision of exclusion laws to allow for citizenship.<sup>32</sup> During the height of the Great Depression, when both state and federal governments contemplated enacting legislation that would tie relief to legal citizenship, the International Institute attempted to dissuade such policies. In a letter to Dewey Anderson of the California State Relief Administration, the president of the Institute's board of directors pointed out that such laws were "discriminating doubly" against the Chinese and Japanese who had no means of legally acquiring citizenship.<sup>33</sup> In an internal report, the International Institute astutely observed of the relief issue and the fate of all noncitizens during the crisis times of the Great Depression, that "it [is] difficult to see how the interests of the alien can be nicely and neatly separated from those of the citizen."<sup>34</sup>

Still, such positive contributions do not mask that in spite of its rhetoric, the International Institute consciously and inadvertently played a role in the racialization of Asians in San Francisco. In the case of San Francisco's Filipino population, the Institute's role in reinforcing the racial prerogatives of federal immigration laws is even clearer. In 1934, as part of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, which granted the Philippines' autonomy and eventual independence from the United States, Filipinos ceased to be colonial subjects and were allowed free movement between the insular possessions and the mainland, becoming instead barred immigrants from the Asiatic Zone of Exclusion.<sup>35</sup> Despite maintaining a mission that ostensibly sought to help with integration, the San Francisco International Institute, in accordance with immigration officers at Angel Island and the Department of Labor, took responsibility for facilitating the forced repatriation of Filipinos in the Bay Area, a task considered the "high spot of the year."<sup>36</sup> In a confidential supplement to the 1936 Annual Report, an anonymous worker at the Institute described the situation of Mrs. Garay, a Filipino widow living in San Francisco with ten children, nine who were born in the city. According to the report, Mrs. Garay and her late husband were "natives of one of the remote islands of the Philippines where life is backward and living conditions primitive." Insinuating that Mrs. Garay was both promiscuous and indolent, the worker assigned to the case described how she "had at first expressed a desire to [repatriate], but had begun to vacillate when she considered the attractions of a city where there is one Filipino woman to more than 100 men and where half-orphans are provided for rather generously by the State."<sup>37</sup> Although members of the Institute rarely expressed such explicit and cruel racial comments, it nonetheless captures the extreme

divide between the rhetoric surrounding integration and the rhetoric invoking the need for repatriation.

Although the members of the San Francisco International Institute might have truly believed they were fostering a pluralistic model of assimilation for the United States, the pluralistic society they desired had built-in racial boundaries determining who could be legally and culturally included. Social policies toward Asians in San Francisco, such as the ones enacted by the International Institute, could not function in a vacuum, free of the legal codes that defined race. The San Francisco International Institute's "Americanization zeal" had to be recast and even dropped when confronted by Chinese immigrants whose race had left it predetermined as to their ability to be legally or, in the case of the Chinese American-born, socially American.

*Author's Note:* I would like to thank the participants in "Branching Out the Banyan Tree" for their comments and feedback. In addition, at the University of Minnesota, I would like to thank Anna Clark, Doug Hartmann, and especially Erika Lee for their thoughtful suggestions on how to transform this essay from a seminar paper into an article.

## NOTES

1. The papers of the International Institute of San Francisco (SFII Papers) are housed in the Immigration History Research Center (IHRC) at the University of Minnesota, as part of its General/Multiethnic Collection. The IHRC is also in possession of the personal papers of Annie Clo Watson, who served as the San Francisco International Institute's Executive Secretary in the 1930s. Citations in this paper will denote the record group of the collection being cited, box number, file folder, and the page number within the document when given. Annual Report, 1934, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:1:13, 2.
2. "Discussion of the International Institute as a Private Agency in San Francisco, Presented to the Section on Family Welfare of the Relief Council of the Community Chest," May 10, 1934, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:34:9.
3. "Special Nationality Problems of the Pacific Coast—Presented at National Conference of Social Work, Kansas City, Missouri, May 22, 1934," IHRC, Papers of Annie Clo Watson, 54:1:3.
4. Annual Report, 1923, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:1:2.
5. Annual Reports, 1924, 1925, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:1:3, 4. The creation of an international setting was an undertaking the International Institutes took on quite consciously. In the 1925 Annual Report, for example, one of the questions the individual Institutes had to address and report back on to the national organization was how their various programs contributed to "the 'atmosphere' of an 'international' interest." "The International Institutes Founded by the YWCA: Purpose, Program, Organizations and Achievements," 1933, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:14:1.
6. For an example of a work that looks at the racialized response of Jane Addams and Hull House to eastern and southern European immigrants, see Rivka Shpak Lissak, *Pluralism and Progressivism: Hull House and the New Immigrants, 1890-1919* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989). On settlement houses and African American communities, see Elisabeth

- Lasch-Quinn, *Black Neighbors: Race and the Limits of Reform in the American Settlement House Movement, 1890-1945* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), and Thomas Philpott, *The Slum and the Ghetto: Neighborhood Deterioration and Middle-Class Reform, Chicago, 1880-1930* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), both of which focus mainly on the midwest.
7. Edith Terry Bremer, "A Forward Look for International Institutes," 1930, typescript of speech given to the national conference of International Institutes, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:14:2.
  8. Lasch-Quinn, *Black Neighbors*, 22-24; Philpott, *The Slum and the Ghetto*, 301.
  9. Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy, *The Settlement Horizon* (New Brunswick, NJ; London: Transaction Publishers, 1990 [1922]), 337. Interestingly, *The Settlement Horizon* omits any discussion of the "racial" difficulties that might arise when a settlement house was located in a neighborhood consisting of both white and Asian populations. In Eliot Mears's 1928 study, he does note that in San Francisco, the YMCA, which also maintained a separate Chinese branch, had had little luck at integrating its swimming facilities. As a letter from the General Secretary of the YMCA in San Francisco to Mears noted, "Even one [Asian] in the swimming-pool brings resignations from American members." Eliot Grinnell Mears, *Resident Orientals on the American Pacific Coast: Their Legal and Economic Status* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1928), 378.
  10. Philpott, *The Slum and the Ghetto*, 315.
  11. Lasch-Quinn, *Black Neighbors*, 10.
  12. Henry Yu, *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 42, 47.
  13. Kay Anderson, *Vancouver's Chinatowns: Racial Discourse in Canada, 1875-1980* (Montreal, Canada and Buffalo, NY: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991), 10.
  14. "Report of Minutes," January 1924, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:1:3.
  15. Annual Reports, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, and 1930, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:1:3-9. The annual reports provide numerical compilations of the amount of group work and casework staff members were doing respectively.
  16. Edith Terry Bremer, "A Forward Look for International Institutes," 1930, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:14:2. Bremer eventually left the YWCA as well, joining the National Institute for Immigrant Welfare, which became the umbrella organization for International Institutes that had opted out of their affiliation with the YWCA.
  17. "The Place and Future of International Institutes," report made from the committees that met at the national conferences in 1926 and 1927, completed in 1929, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:14:2. In a letter to Elsie Newton, Executive Secretary of the Los Angeles International Institute, explaining why the San Francisco Institute had chosen to become independent of the YWCA, Annie Clo Watson would reiterate the same themes. Annie Clo Watson to Elsie Newton, September 17, 1934, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:10:16.
  18. Ethel Bird to Emily Price, March 9, 1934, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:14:2.
  19. Erika Lee, *At America's Gates: Chinese Immigration During the Exclusion Era, 1882-1943* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 238. Although the San Francisco International Institute also lost its affiliation with the Japanese YWCA, most of its records and files are devoted to its relationship to the Chinese YWCA and what it considered to be the needs of San Francisco's Chinese community.
  20. Ethel Bird to Mrs. Price, March 9, 1934, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:14:2.
  21. Annual Reports, 1923, 1934, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:1:2, 13.
  22. Mae Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), 7-9.
  23. Rose Chew, "Chinese Survey of Chinatown," March 19, 1930, 19, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:14:3.
  24. Chew, "Chinese Survey," 21-23.
  25. Albert Palmer, *Orientalism in American Life* (New York: Friendship Press, 1934), 34.
  26. "Special Nationality Problems of the Pacific Coast."
  27. Chew, "Chinese Survey," 21.
  28. Palmer, *Orientalism in American Life*, 139; Allan Hunter, *Out of the Far East* (New York: Friendship Press, 1934), 43.
  29. William Carlson Smith, "The Second Generation Oriental in America," Preliminary paper prepared for the second general session, Institute of Pacific Relations, Honolulu, Hawaii, July 15-29, 1927, 5, 12-13.
  30. Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 103; Hunter, *Out of the Far East*, 100-103.
  31. "Personnel Managers' Association Meeting," May 26, 1937, speech delivered by Frank Harris, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:1:15.
  32. "Special Nationality Problems of the Pacific Coast."
  33. Mrs. James Reed to Dewey Anderson, January 19, 1939, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:34:13.
  34. "October 1938, Report," 4, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:34:12.
  35. For a detailed history of this chapter on the relationship of the United States and the Philippines, see Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*, 96-126.
  36. "President's Report, February 19, 1935," 2, IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:1:14.
  37. "Confidential Supplement to Annual Report of 1936," IHRC, SFII Papers, 168:1:15.

Copyright of *Chinese America: History & Perspectives* is the property of Chinese Historical Society of America and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.