

IMMIGRATION

AND OTHER INTERESTS OF
PRESCOTT FARNSWORTH HALL



COMPILED BY
MRS. PRESCOTT F. HALL

The Knickerbocker Press
NEW YORK
1922



Prescott F. Hall



This book

I dedicate to the small group of
Immigration Restriction League men
with whom

PRESCOTT FARNSWORTH HALL

worked so long, so painstakingly, and
so earnestly, and to whom
he threw the torch

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	vii
PRESCOTT FARNSWORTH HALL	xiii
SELECTION OF IMMIGRATION	1
THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN IDEALS	23
THE BUILDING SITUATION IN BROOKLINE	35
BRIEF IN FAVOR OF THE NUMERICAL LIMITATION BILL	44
EUGENICS, ETHICS AND IMMIGRATION	52
IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION AND WORLD EUGENICS	67
ARISTOCRACY AND POLITICS	72
IMMIGRATION AND THE WORLD WAR	78
THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF IMMIGRATION	85
BIRTH CONTROL AND WORLD EUGENICS	98
REPRESENTATION WITHOUT TAXATION	105
THE PERSONAL SIDE	119

FOREWORD

BY MADISON GRANT

THE opportunity seldom offers of paying a tribute to a friend who has passed away without receiving from his fellow countrymen in this life the recognition that was his due, but fortunately for the welfare of the nation there are still among us

Men who do their work and hold their peace
And have no fear to die.

Such a man was Prescott F. Hall and the writer doubts whether Prescott Hall himself appreciated the magnitude of his work or the debt of obligation he placed upon his countrymen. Certainly during his life he showed no signs of it nor indicated the slightest impatience at the scant appreciation by the nation at large for his work.

The League for the Restriction of Immigration was not only of Prescott Hall's creation but it was he who kept it alive during the long decades of apathy and neglect from its friends and hostility from its enemies.

Thanks to Mr. Hall's work, never did a legislative measure receive such huge majorities time and again, when restrictive bills differing in form but of similar purpose finally came before Congress.

Three times restrictive measures were vetoed by Presidents of profoundly different characters and acting on profoundly different motives. The first veto was by President Cleveland, who was impatient at the so-

called Corliss amendment, which had been improperly tacked on the bill as a rider. He lived to repent his action when he saw his hasty veto had opened the flood gates of the Polish Ghettos into the United States, draining that great swamp of human misery into the Eastside of New York to spread throughout the United States. In the closing years of his life, President Cleveland manfully admitted in this veto he had made a terrible blunder.

During President Roosevelt's administration the racial elements seeking to force their way into this country knew that there was no chance of a veto from that sturdy American and they took refuge in the ingenious scheme of postponing the issue by a prolonged investigation under the control of a notorious advocate of free admission. This committee, after studying the subject here and in Europe, finally recommended a Literacy Test as the best practical means of restriction. This Literacy Test was later embodied in a bill and passed by the House and Senate and sent to the President. President Taft did not understand the issues involved, was confused by conflicting advisors and finally vetoed the bill.

When Mr. Wilson was elected it was realized that we had in the White House for the first time a man who openly sympathized with the races seeking admission. President Wilson himself did not come from native American stock and consequently had little pride in American antecedents or traditions and readily adopted an international point of view.

The Literacy Test finally passed both Houses by an enormous vote but President Wilson promptly vetoed it. His veto was over-ridden in both Houses and became law. This was Mr. Wilson's first real defeat by a heretofore subservient legislature. In the closing days

of his administration another restrictive bill even more potent than the Literacy bill, was passed by both Houses and sent to him. Not daring to veto it because he knew that it would be re-passed by more than the needed two-thirds vote, he took refuge in the device of a pocket veto, which proved effective and defeated the bill.

In the next administration a similar bill was passed by the House of Representatives 276 to 33 and by the Senate 78 to 1 and was promptly signed by President Harding.

During this long fight from Cleveland to Harding the guiding hand was that of Prescott Hall, who ceaselessly, untiringly and skilfully labored year after year until he finally steered the ship safely to port. He lived to see not only the success of his work but the acceptance throughout the country of the principles he fought for.

It took the Great World War to arouse America to the danger of free immigration, whereas Prescott Hall had foreseen it for thirty years or more. It was he who pointed out that the alien in our midst remained an alien, sometimes a good alien, more often a bad alien but always an alien.

All this now seems quite obvious but it is only lately that America has awakened to the fact that there were two distinct sections of population within our boundaries, one native American and the other hyphenate-American, some of the latter in sympathy with the native Americans and others thinking that they could improve our institutions and Constitution into conformity with the new standards of Eastern Europe.

When the writer looks back on his long years of association in this great work with Prescott Hall he realizes the latter's unfailing steadfastness in a struggle which often seemed hopeless. It is hard to understand

how he was able to endure the strain, but endure it he did, and to the day of his death asked for nothing for himself and everything for his country. In so doing he gave his countrymen the hardest of all tasks, namely, to ask them to save themselves from themselves and it is for those of us who are left to carry on his work.

Prescott Hall was the first to demonstrate that when immigrants of a low standard enter an American community it paralyzes the birth rate of the higher stock and that each immigrant that lands supplants and replaces a native American.

With this in mind the question of restriction becomes, not a question of Labor Supply, nor of Steamship Rates nor of "Refuge for the Oppressed" but solely the question of whether we are willing to have our own stock replaced by the peoples of southern and Eastern Europe and of Western Asia. There is no problem of equal importance before this nation. If America goes wrong and allows our native Nordic stock to be replaced by half Asiatic mongrels the hope of the world is gone.

This issue Prescott Hall saw and saw with the vision of a prophet a full generation ahead of his countrymen. Unlike most prophets he lived to see his prophesy come true and his fellow countrymen awakened to the danger.

Prescott Hall served America well. He asked no reward and I know of no one of our generation to whom America owes so much. There are very few of us, who, when our turn comes, will have the satisfaction that Prescott Hall had in his last hours in knowing that his work had been well done.

The lonely sentry of the outposts has been relieved but he "kept the faith" and more than that can no man do.

PRESCOTT FARNSWORTH HALL

His Life, His Activities, His Writings

PRESCOTT FARNSWORTH HALL

HIS LIFE, HIS ACTIVITIES, HIS WRITINGS

PRESCOTT F. HALL was born in Boston, Mass., in 1868. After preparation at Noble's School in Boston he entered Harvard, graduating from the College in 1889 and from the Law School in 1892. He then entered the office of Hon. Robert M. Morse and afterwards that of Ball & Tower. From July, 1894 to August, 1904 he practised law with offices at 53 and later at 89 State Street. In 1904 he formed a partnership with Edward A. Adler under the name of Adler & Hall with offices at 60 State Street. From 1896 to 1904 he was a member of the executive committee of the Democratic Club of Massachusetts, and in 1901 was elected its secretary. 1902-1904 he was the Chairman of its Executive Committee. 1902-1904 he was also a member of the Executive Committee of the New England Democratic League. In 1904, he became a Republican, and was a member of the Republican Club of Massachusetts. For some time he was a member of the executive committee of the New England Free Trade League and chairman of its publication committee. He was a member of the Executive Committee of the Economic Club of Boston from its foundation, and Vice-President since 1914. In 1896 he was a delegate to the gold Democratic convention at Indianapolis, and was a member of the National Democratic State Committee. Later he acted as New England Secretary for the Executive Committee of the

Monetary Convention of which Mr H. H. Hanna was chairman, and did considerable work in the way of bringing influence to bear upon the Congressmen from New England for the reform of currency. In May, 1894 he became one of the founders of the Immigration Restriction League, designed to secure the exclusion of the most undesirable immigration and the better enforcement of the immigration laws. He was secretary of this organization from 1896 and prepared much of its statistical literature. In 1905 he was chairman of Massachusetts Delegation to the National Immigration Conference. In 1902-1903 Mr. Hall was president of the Brookline Education Society, and from 1901 was a member of the corporation of the Franklin Square House working girls' hotel. In 1903 he was secretary of the School Committee of Brookline, Mass. From 1913 he was Chairman of the Immigration Committee of the American Genetic Association. He was also for several years interested in investigations in psychical research, and in philosophy. He was a member of the Union Club of Boston. During most of his life he resided in Brookline. His family was one of the old-time families which spent the winters in Boston and summers in Brookline. Latterly the Boston house was given up.

He published the following books and articles:

BOOKS

Reference List of Wills construed by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts (1896).

Massachusetts Law of Landlord and Tenant (1899); *Supplement* (1903); 2d ed. (1908).

Practice Schedule of Massachusetts (1902).

Examination of Land Titles in Massachusetts (1902).

Massachusetts Business Corporations (1903); 2d ed. (1908); 3d ed. (1917).

Immigration and its Effects on the United States (1906); 2d ed. (1908).

ARTICLES

"Voluntary Assignments and Insolvency in Massachusetts," *8 Harvard Law Review*, 265 (1894).

"The Federal Contract Labor Law," *11 Harvard Law Review*, 525, (1898).

"Proximate Cause," *15 Harvard Law Review*, 541 (1902).

"Italian Immigration," *163 North American Review*, 252 (1896).

"Immigration and the Educational Test," *165 North American Review*, 393 (1897).

"Present Status of Immigration Restriction," *18 Gunton's Magazine*, 305 (1900).

"New Problems of Immigration," *30 Forum*, 555 (1901).

"Selection of Immigration," *24 Annals American Academy of Political & Social Science*, 167 (July, 1904).

"Standardizing of Psychological Research Records," *Annals of Psychological Science* (1908).

"Eugenics, Ethics, & Immigration," Publication, *Immigration Restriction League*, No. 51 (Dec., 1908).

"Article of Immigration," *Cyclopedia of Social Science* (1908).

"Fire Test Experiments," *Journal American Society for Psychological Research* (1910).

"Account of Sittings with Mrs. Keeler. *Journal of American Society for Psychological Research* (1911).

"Future of American Ideals," *North American Review* (Jan., 1912).

"Recent History of Immigration and Immigration Restriction," 21 *Journal of Political Economy*, 735-51 (Oct., 1913).

Review of "Immigration and Labor," by Isaac A. Hourwich in *American Economic Review* (1913).

Article on "Immigration" for *Brookline Press* (1913).

"Experiments with Mrs. Caton" (*Proceedings American Society for Psychical Research*, March, 1914).

Article on "Immigration" for *Cyclopedia of Social Reform* (1915).

Review of Fairchild's "Greek Immigration" in *American Economic Review* (1915).

"Experiments in Astral Projection," 12 *Journal American Society for Psychical Research* (Jan., 1918).

Review of Jenks & Lauck "The Immigration Problem," 4th ed., *American Economic Review*.

"Immigration Restriction and World Eugenics," 10 *Journal of Heredity* (reprinted as Publication, *Immigration Restriction League* No. 71.) (1919.)

"The Harrison Case," 13 *Proceedings American Society for Psychical Research* (1920).

Review of Samuel P. Orth's "Our Foreigners" for *American Historical Review* (1920).

Review of 10 books for American Society for Psychical Research (1920).

"Immigration and the World War," 93 *Annals American Academy of Political and Social Science* (1921).

Review of 5 books for American Society for Psychical Research (1921).

Mr. Hall was a member of the following clubs and societies:

Union Club of Boston.

Twentieth Century Club.

Massachusetts Reform Club.

Republican Club of Massachusetts.
 Immigration Restriction League.
 American Academy Political and Social Science.
 Brookline Education Society.
 First Parish Club of Brookline.
 Economic Club of Boston.
 Brookline Friendly Society.
 Civic Federation of New England.
 New England Education League.
 Bostonian Society.
 Trustee Franklin Square House.

The notices and letters, and extracts from letters, which follow, will show further both the very wide range of Mr. Hall's interests and activities and some of the results which they produced. No letter refers to a service which he rendered the Town of Brookline by his work for the law which forbids the erection of wooden apartment houses within the limits of the town; but the address itself which he delivered against the so-called wooden "three-decker" will testify to his zeal and activity in that direction. Though Mr. Hall, so far as is known, wrote no article on music, that was none the less one of his very greatest interests throughout life. He was a finished pianist, and often when he was in the mood would devote an entire evening to piano-playing. His interest was deep, too, in the other fine arts. His taste may not have been always orthodox (he was too independent and original a thinker for that); but in general it was keenly appreciative of what was best in sculpture, architecture, painting and literature.

CONCERNING PARK STREET CHURCH

In the early part of 1900, the Park Street Church and Congregation, of Boston, had decided that owing to the

depleted numbers in the Congregation and the apparent hopelessness of the situation, it would be best to move Park Street Church to some other location, and action was taken which would have resulted in a demolition of the present edifice. Mr. Hall, with his loyalty to Boston, her institutions, and her best architectural examples, threw his whole energy into an effort to prevent what he thought and felt to be a most unfortunate move. He was successful in securing a temporary injunction, until a more definite action could be taken, with the result that the Church was kept at its present location.

Again, in 1906, when Dr. Conrad assumed the Pastorate of Park Street Church, he called on Mr. Hall for his assistance in securing funds for the rehabilitation of the Church. Mr. Prescott F. Hall, Mr. Joseph Lee and Mr. Edward R. Warren co-operated with Dr. Conrad in securing ten thousand dollars for the complete renovation of the Church. Mr. Hall was intensely active in this movement and to him great credit is due for what was then accomplished. His wisdom has been vindicated in that the Church congregations for the past fifteen years have guaranteed the future of the Church for a long time to come. Dr. Conrad has repeatedly expressed his high esteem and great appreciation of Mr. Hall and the assistance he rendered.

FROM A LETTER OF A BROOKLINE PHYSICIAN

No one could have known Prescott Farnsworth Hall from his boyhood, through his years at college, and then on through his professional life, without being impressed by the fact that in him was merged the analytical mind in a supersensitive body.

The why and wherefore of things always interested

him and the solution of difficult problems was his greatest delight. He might justly be called a student in all fields. Especially is this true in the field of medicine. In his college days he seriously considered entering the medical profession; and always he read the best medical journals and knew all the present-day theories concerning diseases, medicines and germs.

It can be truly said of him that the mind ruled the body and the latter was unequal to the strain.

FROM ANOTHER DOCTOR FRIEND

I have never known a layman and, indeed, I have never known a medical man who had such singular wealth of knowledge of the domain of Medicine in its broad sense.

He was conversant with the status of Medicine as it was presented in the current literature to a phenomenal degree. He was abreast of the very latest progress in Biology. Of human Psychology he conversed with a breadth of understanding and thorough grasp of his subject that used to make me gasp for breath. He seemed able to instantly grasp the thought of the writers and investigators of the day, almost before they had uttered it, and then to seize their standard of results and carry it on triumphantly ahead of the very originator!

Psychology, as applied to Medicine, had a great lure for him and he brought to its discussion a mind whose acumen was extraordinary. Like all men who are possessed of great lucidity of thought, and a memory of marvelous retentiveness, he handled the vast knowledge gleaned as a master-workman would his tools and it was a joy as well as a marvel to me to get glimpses into the innumerable chambers of his knowledge which he seemed to enter with the utmost security and familiarity.

He had the investigating and analytical mind to an exceptional degree. All things were of interest and to them all he seemed to give a tolerant ear. He was essentially a listener.

FROM A SCIENTIFIC FRIEND

I count my meeting Mr. Hall one of the most pleasant experiences of my life. Perhaps that feeling arose from the fact of his being such an ardent student, unafraid to delve into any science that would add to his already great store of knowledge.

It was a delight to discuss the many problems of my scientific researches with him. In all cases, however different these problems were, his mind grasped not only the details, but it would add many facts concerning them that always surprised me, indicating an extremely unusual knowledge obtained only through great application.

The great problem that brought us together was nearly always . . . that much misunderstood and unjustly ridiculed one known as the fourth dimension. His ability to grasp this problem was an amazing thing to me, and more than in any other way indicated a very unusual mentality.

FROM DR. WALTER FRANKLIN PRINCE,
Head of the American Society for Psychical Research

Mr. Hall's participation in psychical research was only incidental to his more engrossing occupations, and yet it was keen and did good service. He entered fully into its spirit, which may be thus expressed: all undetermined phenomena are worthy of investigation, and investigation consists in dogged study of facts, and in following the trail of facts, indifferent to its destination.

Probably his interest in this subject was of longer standing than I am aware, but I find it manifested in the *Journal of the American Society for Psychological Research* in 1908, wherein he reported some incidents obtained by him, and also an investigation made by him of a singular case of Fire Tests, a physical phenomenon. The latter is a very model for a report of this character. It covers all the important particulars desirable to bring out with a thoroughness which would do credit to a professional scientist, in clear, definite and precise language, and in the fewest possible words.

In April, 1911 the *Journal* printed his "Some Account of Sittings with Mrs. M. E. Keeler." In this he says: "The author is not a spiritualist, and is not thus far convinced of the genuineness of any of the communications"—meaning those received through this medium. I do not know that he ever was thoroughly convinced that any communications come from spirits, though it is certain that he was impressed by much of the evidence, and fairly certain that he was in sympathy with Hamlet's oft-quoted aphorism. At any rate, he was ready to make any investigations for which he had time, or to conduct any personal experiments, which offered a chance for furthering knowledge of the various subjects embraced in psychical research. He tried out the directions of the medium just named, to see if he could develop "astral projection." The results, as well as the statements of Mrs. Keeler which he thought worthy to be compared with statements by other psychics, he further reported in the *Journal* of November, 1912, November, 1916, and January, 1918. He insists, here and elsewhere, on the importance of comparative study of alleged communications, teachings, etc., in order to observe what I am accustomed to call the "spectrum" lines running through them, or the

lack of these, as the case may be. He was willing to experiment in his own person as to the possibility of the development of certain peculiar powers of the Yoga description, without any antecedent convictions in their practicability. He did not regard that the promises held out to him were more than imperfectly realized. Nevertheless he attained to some singular psychological, or perhaps we had better term them psychological, results, which he had the courage, which is curiously rare, to publish for what they might be worth.

In the *Proceedings* of the same Society for 1914 may be found the Burr experiments with Mrs. Caton, a report of some one hundred and fifty pages, edited by Mr. Hall. It is cautious, critical, judicial. Again he adverts to the fact that the value of carefully made and recorded experiments is likely to increase as the experiments accumulate in number, from the light that they will throw on one another. His orderly mental habit is manifested strongly in his painstaking handling of the material in this report. They are classified according to their nature, and each division is prefaced by a lucid statement which is not intended to save the reader from the task of thinking for himself, but which removes from the path of clear thinking those obstacles which are often allowed to remain by editors who have less mastery of analysis and synthesis.

In the *Proceedings* of 1919 he edited the lengthy Harrison case of purported communications of evidential quality, with his usual care and clarity, and concludes with what is a laborious and critical task, a statistical summary of the material.

During the last year it was my good fortune to secure Mr. Hall's help in writing book reviews, and these, some of which are yet to appear, are admirable in their lucidity, critical acumen and erudition. Probably the

last literary work he did, an invalid but with unclouded intellect, was the preparation of reviews of the books I sent him.

His correspondence, both with Dr. Hyslop and myself, equally displays the independence and versatility of his mind. One of his letters is accompanied by a suggested standardized report blank for reporting cases of physical phenomena which is the best of its kind which I have seen. There can be little doubt that, had Prescott F. Hall given his attention predominantly to psychical research, he would have achieved a notable career in that field.

REV. GEORGE WINSLOW PLUMMER

Head of the Rosicrucian Society

It was my good fortune to be intimately acquainted with Prescott Hall, although I met him personally at his home in Brookline but once. I use the term "intimately" advisedly, for two men will often express themselves and their inner natures and interests more completely in an intimate correspondence, than by actual contact.

My acquaintance with Prescott Hall may be said to date from early March in 1918 and continued to his transition in 1921. It is one of the rare associations the writer has been permitted to enjoy in this entire life expression, for the continuous contact with his keen, analytical mind was a source of constant practical benefit and an incentive to progress.

What was Hall's greatest interest in life? Who knows? Was he himself quite sure? His was the type of mentalism that found every phase of human interest matter for his analysis. As a critic he was unusually keen, analytical and correct. His criticisms and re-

views were always to the point, often cutting, sometimes sardonic, never unjust or captious.

In the domain of Economics, Eugenics, Immigration and other departments of vital statistics he was a recognized authority. But it was as a student of mysticism and occult science that the writer knew him best, being fields of thought in which we were mutually interested and in which we had much in common.

In his researches in this realm of knowledge, Prescott Hall made many adventures. It is safe to say that there was not a single avenue of investigation left unexplored by him. He was not of the credulous type of mind,—far from it. He subjected every phase of psychic and mental phenomena from Yoga practice to Spiritualism to the most caustic and critical examination and his powers of discrimination were nowhere so well recognized as in this uncharted ocean of the unknown forces of Nature and Man. His association with Professor Hyslop and other eminently creditable investigators in Psychical Research was undoubtedly of greater value to them than to himself, for Hall assumed nothing, took nothing for granted, but gave credence only to what he could prove, and even then reserved a large percentage of judgment, feeling that later investigations would clarify many points which were in his life time and are still, those of controversy and not accepted facts.

Prescott Hall was a wonderful personality, a man highly and intensely individualized, yet free from the noxious egoism that has embarrassed so many other of the world's intellectual workers and the circumstance of the single personal contact the writer had with him will ever be remembered. It was at the conclusion of a long motor trip back from the Shrine of Ste. Anne de Beaupré at Quebec, and we were engrossed in a lengthy discussion of the alleged miraculous healing that is

claimed for the Shrine. His conceptual explanation of the occurrences at Beauré based entirely upon accepted psychological laws was vigorous and logical and although the writer did not at the time wholly coincide with his opinion, later events have made him more inclined to do so.

I am glad to have known Prescott Hall. It was a privilege. His suggestions and opinions have been invaluable to me in my own work and his passing leaves one almost with the feeling as though a vacuum had been created in the social fabric, the feeling that the space he occupied even corporeally, can never be filled by another.

FROM A LETTER OF A CO-WORKER OF THE IMMIGRATION
RESTRICTION LEAGUE

Prescott and I were schoolmates, College classmates, and ever since graduating saw each other frequently. For over twenty-five years we worked together, intimately, whole-heartedly, and with never the slightest disagreement on immigration. Back in school-days I came to know his extraordinarily logical, clear, effective mind, and in all the later years I never ceased to marvel at his wonderful grasp of essentials and at his ability to express his views, always sound and logical, either verbally or in print. I have never known just such an intellect as his. I do not remember any occasion when we failed to work in perfect harmony together.

He was, from the very first, the backbone, the main-spring, the absolutely reliable *one* man of our League. We always knew that he had every bit of information we needed; that his advice was always right; that he was always ready to do every job that would help our cause. To him, this country owes far more than to anyone else

every improvement in our immigration laws. He did the work of ten men, and did it patiently, uncomplainingly, effectively. I know that restrictionists all over the United States who know his name and recognize what he did, will feel, as I do, that the guiding spirit is gone.

Take comfort in the thought that Prescott did such splendid, important and patriotic work. He has well earned his rest.

FROM THE SIXTH ANNUAL BULLETIN
Class of 1889 of Harvard College, 1920-1921

PRESCOTT FARNSWORTH HALL died at Brookline, Mass., May 28, 1921. He was born September 27, 1868, at Boston, Mass., the son of Samuel and Mary Elizabeth (Farnsworth) Hall. He prepared for College at G. W. Noble's School in Boston. In College, he attained high rank as a scholar, and was a member of the Hasty Pudding, O. K. Signet, Finance Club, Philosophical Club, Deutscher Verein, and St. Paul's Society. . . . In 1894 he was one of the founders . . . of the Immigration Restriction League, of which he was its Secretary for many years. His thorough research, his book and numerous articles on Immigration made him a leading authority on the subject; to his persistent work is due much of the improvement in the legislation of the United States on immigration; and he may be justly regarded as the chief factor in the enactment of the educational test for immigrants. He was Chairman of the Committee on Immigration of the Eugenics Section of the American Genetic Association for many years. He also took a great interest in psychical research and occult matters, as to which he wrote many articles. He took an active part in politics at one time, being Secre-

tary in 1901 and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Democratic Club of Massachusetts from 1902 to 1904; and he served on the Brookline Town Committee in 1903. He was a member of the Bostonian Society, the Rosicrucian Society, the American Society for Psychical Research; he was Vice-President of the Economic Club of Boston in 1914; President of the Brookline Education Society in 1903. His legal writings are considered as standard authority. . . .

For the past five years he suffered greatly from ill health and withdrew himself largely from participation in Class reunions. . . . He married at Denver, Colo., October 17, 1908, Eva Lucyle Irby, of Virginia who survives him.

The following fine tribute by Joseph Lee, '83, was published in the Boston *Herald*, June, 1921:

"Although Prescott F. Hall was practically unknown to the public, he had when he died probably done more to affect for the better the future of this country than almost any man of his generation.

"He saw nearly thirty years ago what others began to see during the war, that the most important question for this country was the kind of human material of which its future citizenship should be composed, and that its mission was not to be an asylum and a breeding ground for the defective and the oppressed—the beaten members of the beaten races—but to be an example of successful democracy and of the attainment to a high standard of character and happiness. He saw that it would benefit a nation very little if it gained a wide reputation for philanthropy and lost its own soul.

"Mr. Hall, accordingly, initiated the agitation for restricting immigration that was to occupy the greater part of his time and all of his heart during the rest of his life. The final success of the Literacy Test in 1917 marked

the close of what must have been, I think, the longest legislative fight on record. The adoption of the present more satisfactory percentage bill came just in time for him to hear of the victory before he died.

“During all these years Mr. Hall kept track of immigration laws and of their administration and their results in a most able and painstaking manner, and was the backbone of the agitation for restriction on the technical and legal side. Without him the gates would have still been unguarded and the deterioration of our human standard would still be at the flood.

“Mr. Hall’s work was unknown, unpaid, unrecognized. It was a sheer labor of love, the love of country and consideration for the future of mankind. But it achieved success, and that was, after all, the only recompense that he desired.”

THE FOLLOWING ARTICLES ARE SELEC-
TIONS FROM MR. HALL'S PUBLISHED
AND UNPUBLISHED WORK

SELECTION OF IMMIGRATION ¹

THE two factors of race migration and race survival have had most potent effects upon the world's history. But, while these factors are conspicuous when we look backward through the centuries, we often fail to appreciate the importance of their influence in the immediate past and in the present. The immigration question in this country has never had the attention paid to it which its importance entitles it, but has been sometimes the scapegoat of religious and racial prejudices, and always in recent years an annual sacrifice to the gods of transportation.

The causes of such indifference are not far to seek. In the early days of this country the people were busy with other matters. Immigration was small, and not especially objectionable in quality. Later, the doctrines of the *laissez faire* school, and the obviously narrow and prejudiced theories of the Know Nothing movement, helped to continue the existing status of free movement. More recently, a misapprehension of the doctrine of "survival of the fittest" has led many intelligent citizens to adopt an easy-going optimism, in many respects kindred to the benumbing fatalism of Oriental peoples. This misapprehension is caused by the fact that the doctrine of the "survival of the fittest" is usually stated in a catchy and condensed formula, with the authority of modern science, and accepted without

¹ Reprinted from *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* for July, 1904.

critical understanding. The doctrine is that the fittest survive; fittest for what? The fittest *to survive in the particular environment in which the organisms are placed.* The only teleological valuation in this formula is the almost mechanical one of survival in time. Those who survive need not be the fittest for any other purpose whatsoever, except the continuation of life and reproduction. Were the citizens of the Netherlands inferior to the soldiers of Alva, or many of the victims of the French Revolution to those who slew them? Were the Polish patriots inferior to their Russian conquerors, or are the Finns inferior to those who are now engaged in taking away their constitutional rights? Yes, but only in the matter of survival in time. But if the duration of human life on this earth is limited, as we are told it is by the same scientists who lay stress upon the "survival of the fittest," the mere success in duration for any race seems of no great value in itself, and may it not be worth while to consider other valuations as we go along, so that the whole world history shall be as valuable as possible from all points of view?

I have dwelt on this point because, while the value of artificial selection in breeding animals, in producing seedless fruits and new grains, in fact in nearly every department of life, is now generally recognized; and while some advanced persons are talking of regulating marriage with a view to the elimination of those unfit *for other purposes than mere survival*; yet most people fail to realize that here in the United States we have a unique opportunity, through our power to regulate immigration, of exercising artificial selection upon an enormous scale. What warrant have we for supposing that the Divine Power behind things does not intend human reason to be applied to these matters as well as hunger, steam, steel, and the lust for gold?

In such cases as the present an appeal is usually made to the fathers of the Republic, and to the argument that they recognized the right of every human being to migrate wherever he chose, and to produce as many children as he pleased, and, in general, to pursue happiness by living the kind of life that suited him. However the fathers may have been influenced by the French political theories of their time, they were practical men with much common sense, and it is by no means certain that if they were present to-day, the vastly changed conditions would not lead them to hold the views of the present article. Washington writing to John Adams in 1794, said:

“My opinion with respect to immigration is that except of useful mechanics and some particular descriptions of men and professions, there is no need of encouragement, while the policy or advantage of its taking place in a body (I mean the settling of them in a body) may be much questioned; for by so doing they retain the language, habits and principles, good or bad, which they bring with them.”

Can there be any question how Washington would feel about excluding the thousands of immigrants who have recently come to create and to occupy the slum districts of our Northern and Eastern cities?

But even the prophetic vision of Washington could not possibly have seen the unparalleled change in the conditions of immigration from his day to ours. From 1821, when statistics were first kept, to 1900, a total of 19,115,221 immigrants has come to our shores; and the annual immigration has increased from 9,127 in 1821 to 857,046 in 1903. The modern immigration problem, however, dates from 1870; and it is necessary to emphasize this point because much of what is said in recent

4 IMMIGRATION AND OTHER INTERESTS

discussion ignores the profound change which has taken place in the character of immigration since that date. It may be frankly admitted that this country owes a large share of its development, its wealth, its power and its ideals, to the early immigration as well as to the best part of the later immigration; but any arguments based upon the effects of early immigration cannot be applied to the new comers as self-evident truths, for the data are by no means the same.

However much social prejudice there may have been against the Irish and German immigrants of the forties and fifties, and while even that immigration tended to diminish the native stock as I shall show later, it still remains true that prior to 1870 immigration was chiefly of races kindred in habits, institutions and traditions to the original colonists. Mr. Lodge said upon this point in addressing the Senate, March 16, 1896:

“It will be observed that with the exception of the Huguenot French, who formed but a small percentage of the total population, the people of the thirteen colonies were all of the same original race stocks. The Dutch, the Swedes and the Germans were simply blended with the English-speaking people, who like them were descended from the Germanic tribes whom Cæsar fought and Tacitus described. During the present century, down to 1875, there have been three large migrations to this country in addition to the always steady stream from Great Britain; one came from Ireland about the middle of the century, and somewhat later one from Germany, and one from Scandinavia, in which is included Sweden, Denmark and Norway. The Irish, although of a different race stock originally, have been closely associated with the English-speaking people for nearly a thousand years. They speak the same language, and during that long period the two races have lived side by side and to some extent have intermarried. The Germans and Scandinavians are again

people of the same race stock as the English who built up the colonies. During this century then, down to 1875, as in the two which preceded it, there had been scarcely any immigration to this country except from kindred or allied races, and no other which was sufficiently numerous to have produced any effect on the national characteristics, or to be taken into account here."

How marked the change in nationality has been since 1869 is shown by the fact that in 1869 less than one per cent. of the total immigration came from Austria-Hungary, Italy, Poland and Russia, while in 1902 there were over seventy per cent.; on the other hand, in 1869, nearly three-quarters of the total immigration came from the United Kingdom, France, Germany and Scandinavia, while in 1902, only one-fifth was from those countries. Or, to put it in another way: in 1869 the immigrants from Austria-Hungary, Italy, Poland and Russia were about one one-hundredth of the number from the United Kingdom, France, Germany and Scandinavia; in 1880, about one-tenth; in 1894, nearly equal to it; in 1902 three and one-half times as great. In 1903 the largest element in immigration was the South Italian with 196,117 souls, and the next largest was the Polish, with 82,343.

It does not, therefore, at all follow that because this country has been able to assimilate large numbers of kindred races in the past, it can in the future assimilate vastly larger numbers of races alien in customs, traditions and ideals. Immigration in 1903 amounted to over 850,000 persons. In 1923 or 1943 it may be two million a year, and the mere fact that the two million may bear no larger proportion to the total population of that day than the immigration did to the population in 1870 is no guaranty of our power of assimilating such a number of such races, especially when our total popu-

6 IMMIGRATION AND OTHER INTERESTS

lation will contain such a large proportion of these very races which are difficult of assimilation. Within the last year or two there has been a marked increase in the number of sailings from Europe, and especially from the Mediterranean ports. Recently, the White Star Line has established a Mediterranean service, the Cunard Line has a guaranty of thirty thousand emigrants per year from Austria-Hungary, and a new line has been established between Odessa and New York; also the steamers which formerly ran between Austria and Central America now are to run to New York. There are increased sailings of the North German Lloyd and Hamburg-American lines, and the size of all new vessels has enormously increased. All these steamship lines are in the business for profit, and immigrants, who require no loading and unloading, are by far the most profitable cargo. The thousands of agents of these lines all over Europe, Asia Minor and Northern Africa are bound to create all the business they can for their respective lines, and naturally they are concerned only with the selection of such applicants for tickets as will not certainly be rejected under the laws of this country.

The influence of these conditions upon the quality of immigration has been forcibly expressed by General Francis A. Walker, formerly Superintendent of the Census, as follows:

“Fifty, even thirty, years ago, there was a rightful presumption regarding the average immigrant that he was among the most enterprising, thrifty, alert, adventurous and courageous, of the community from which he came. It required no small energy, prudence, forethought and pains to conduct the inquiries relating to his migration, to accumulate the necessary means, and to find his way across the Atlantic. To-day the presumption is completely reversed. So thoroughly has the Continent of Europe been crossed by railways, so

effectively has the business of emigration there been exploited, so much have the rates of railroad fares and ocean passage been reduced, that it is now among the least thrifty and prosperous members of any European community that the emigration agent finds his best recruiting ground. . . . Illustrations of the ease and facility with which this Pipe Line Immigration is now carried on might be given in profusion. . . . Hard times here may momentarily check the flow; but it will not be permanently stopped so long as *any difference of economic level* exists between our population and that of the most degraded communities abroad."

Speaking of the probable effect of recent immigration General Walker continues:

"The entrance into our political, social and industrial life of such vast masses of peasantry, degraded below our utmost conceptions, is a matter which no intelligent patriot can look upon without the gravest apprehension and alarm. These people have no history behind them which is of a nature to give encouragement. They have none of the inherited instincts and tendencies which made it comparatively easy to deal with the immigration of the olden time. They are beaten men from beaten races; representing the worst failures in the struggle for existence. Centuries are against them, as centuries were on the side of those who formerly came to us."

The main point to remember in regard to recent immigration is that much of it is not *voluntary* in any true sense of the term. The limits of this article do not permit a detailed statement of the facts supporting this allegation, but anyone who will read in the report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration for 1903 the remarks of Special Inspector Marcus Braun, who has just been upon a tour of investigation in Europe, will find abundant evidence. The same thing was brought

8 IMMIGRATION AND OTHER INTERESTS

out in the investigations of our Industrial Commission. The race migration at present going on is not, therefore, even a "natural" movement. It is an artificial selection of many of the worst elements of European and Asiatic populations by the steamship companies.

It is significant that no general immigration legislation was found necessary until some years after the newer kind of immigration had begun to come hither. The first general immigration act was passed in 1882 and imposed a head tax of fifty cents; the contract labor acts were passed to prevent the immigration of the cheapest mining labor in 1885 and 1887; the general law was revised in 1891; an administrative act was passed in 1893; the head tax was raised to one dollar in 1895; and a general codifying act was passed in 1903, raising the head tax to two dollars. These Acts were passed in pursuance of the principle that the nation, as an attribute of its sovereignty or under the commerce clause of the Constitution, has a right to exclude or to expel from its borders any aliens whom it deems to be dangerous to the public welfare. This principle has been sustained by several decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the most recent one being in the case of *Turner, the Anarchist*.

So far from it being an established principle of our country to admit any and all persons desiring to come, it was early recognized that Congress has complete control over this matter, and Congress has established numerous classes of persons to be excluded. (1) An Act of 1862 prohibited the importation of Oriental "coolie" labor, and the later "Chinese Exclusion Acts" have rigorously enforced this principle. The Act of 1875 added (2) convicts, except those guilty of political offenses, and (3) women imported for immoral purposes. The Act of 1882 added (4) lunatics, (5) idiots, (6) persons

unable to care for themselves without becoming public charges. The Act of 1887 added (7) contract laborers. The Act of 1891 added (8) paupers, (9) persons suffering from loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases, (10) polygamists, (11) "assisted" immigrants, *i. e.*, those whose passage has been paid for by others, unless they show affirmatively that they are otherwise admissible. The Act of 1903 added (12) epileptics, (13) persons who have been insane within five years previous, (14) professional beggars, (15) anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all government or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials, (16) persons attempting to bring in women for purposes of prostitution, (17) persons deported within a year previous as being contract laborers.

It is apparent that, however formidable the foregoing list of excluded persons looks upon paper, it practically is by no means an adequate protection to the country. Out of the 857,046 immigrants arriving in 1903, only 9,316, or a trifle over one per cent., were debarred or returned within one year after landing. In previous years the percentage has usually been less than this. The theory of the law is that the transportation companies will not sell tickets to persons liable to be excluded, and this undoubtedly keeps some undesirables away. But, after all, the present system of excluded classes utterly fails to attack the main problem of the proper selection of immigrants. In the Report of the Commissioner-General for 1903, the Commissioner at New York speaks of this matter as follows:

"I believe that at least two hundred thousand (and probably more) aliens came here, who, although they may be able to earn a living, yet are not wanted, will be of no benefit to the country, and will on the contrary be

a detriment, because their presence will tend to lower our standards; and if these two hundred thousand persons could have been induced to stay at home, nobody, not even those clamoring for more labor, would have missed them. Their coming has been of benefit chiefly, if not only, to the transportation companies which brought them here."

It is probable that most citizens would agree on a definition of "undesirable" immigration. At any rate, for the purposes of this paper, I shall call that immigration undesirable which is ignorant of a trade; which is lacking in resources; which has criminal tendencies; which is averse to country life and tends to congregate in the slums of large cities; which has a low standard of living and lacks ambition to seek a better; which fails to assimilate within a reasonable time, and which has no permanent interests in this country.

Now how far does our recent immigration fulfil this definition? It is to be remembered that in 1903 about three-quarters of it came from Southern and Eastern Europe and Asia; 65 per cent. of it was destined for the four States of Illinois, Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania. Over 80 per cent. was totally unskilled or had no occupation at all. On the average, each immigrant had only \$19 with him, and many only one or two dollars. Those from Southern and Eastern Europe admitted an illiteracy of 39.7 per cent., as against 3.9 per cent. for those from Northern and Western Europe. The true illiteracy was probably much higher for the former class, as they are known to be coached on this subject in view of the agitation for an illiteracy test, and whenever the writer has made practical examinations of immigrants he has found considerable misrepresentation in this regard. Taking up first the matter of distribution, we see a marked difference between the

immigration prior to 1870, which built up the Northwest, and the races which now come to us. The census of 1900 shows that in the 160 principal cities of the country there were only $\frac{1}{5}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$ of the Scandinavians, less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of the British, and about $\frac{1}{2}$ of the Germans, as compared with over $\frac{3}{5}$ of the Irish, Italians and Poles and $\frac{3}{4}$ of the Russian Jews. Of the Poles in Illinois, 91.3 per cent. were in Chicago; in New York State, 75.5 per cent. were in New York City and Buffalo; in Michigan and Wisconsin, over $\frac{1}{2}$ were in Detroit and Milwaukee. Of the Italians in Illinois, 72 per cent. were in Chicago; of those in New York State, 79.8 per cent. were in New York City. Of the Russian Jews in the United States, 71.8 per cent. were in six States, as compared with 54 per cent. in 1890. Of the Russian Jews in Illinois, 84.2 per cent. were in Chicago; of those in New York State, 93.7 per cent. were in New York City; of those in Pennsylvania, 56.8 per cent. were in Philadelphia. Only 3.9 per cent. of the Poles, 4.4 per cent. of the Hungarians and 8.7 per cent. of the Russian Jews live in the Southern or Western States.

The Seventh Special Report of the United States Commissioner of Labor shows that Southeastern Europe has furnished three times as many inhabitants as Northwestern Europe to the slums of Baltimore, 19 times as many to the slums of New York, 20 times as many to the slums of Chicago, and 71 times as many to the slums of Philadelphia. In these same slums the illiteracy of Northwestern Europe was 25.5 per cent., that of Southeastern Europe 54.5 per cent. or more than double, while the illiteracy of the native American element in the slums was only 7.4 per cent.

The concentration of these large bodies of ignorant foreigners in the slums of our Eastern cities is a serious matter. Forming racial settlements, they do not tend

to assimilate, but, as Washington predicted, keep to their native customs and standards of living. They cannot even read the newspapers, board of health notices and trade journals printed in their own language, and as a necessary consequence are slow to become acquainted with any other standards except those of their immediate neighbors. The census of 1890 seems to show that, taking an equal number of the foreign element and of the native element, the foreigners furnish $1\frac{1}{2}$ times as many criminals, $2\frac{1}{3}$ times as many insane, and 3 times as many paupers as the natives. It is not strange that there should be many foreign-born paupers when we consider that the South Italians bring on the average \$8.84, the Hebrews, \$8.67 and the Poles, \$9.94 each, as compared with \$41.51 brought by the Scotch, \$38.90 brought by the English and \$28.78 brought by the Germans. The statistics as to the nationality and parentage of dependents and delinquents in the various States are as yet too incomplete for very accurate conclusions, but it is evident that the present laws do not exclude the unfit. In the final report of the Industrial Commission, p. 967, it is stated that "the second generation, *i.e.*, the native children of foreign parents, furnish the largest proportion of commitments and prisoners of all race elements in the population." According to a recent investigation in New York State there were 13,143 persons of foreign birth in the public institutions of that State. Recent testimony of the New York State Lunacy Commission was to the effect that the State of New York is paying \$10,000,000 annually for the support of the alien-born insane alone. Two of the largest hospitals in New York City have been obliged to suspend part of their activities on account of the burden of the foreign patients. The point of this is that things were not thus until the change of national-

ity took place. One of the managers of the House of Refuge in New York City writes:

“I notice the large number of children that are placed in charitable institutions for no crime or misdemeanor, but to relieve their parents of their support. They are principally from Southern and Eastern Europe.”

In 1902 the number of arrests of Greeks in New York City exceeded the entire Greek population of the city for the year 1900; $\frac{1}{8}$ of the foreign whites in the United States over ten years of age cannot speak English, and of these 89 per cent. are over 20 years of age; that is to say, they are not likely to receive any schooling. Considering New York State alone, these persons who cannot speak English are chiefly Italians, Russian Jews and Austro-Hungarians.

In addition to perpetuating a low standard of living and a willingness to underbid native labor, this ignorance has a bad side politically. On the one hand, it means an indifference to civic matters, and a lack of knowledge of and interest in our institutions; and, on the other hand, it means bad material out of which to make citizens. The average percentage of British, Germanic and Scandinavian aliens among the males of voting age in 1900 was 11.5; of the Slav, Latin and Asiatic aliens, 45.3. Of these aliens, $\frac{7}{10}$ had been in this country long enough to be naturalized. This in the face of the great inducements to naturalization held out by political party leaders, and the fact that many municipalities insist on the employment of citizens only upon public works. It has recently been estimated that there are fifty thousand fraudulent naturalization papers held in New York City alone. However this may be, it is evident that many of our present immigrants are not the stuff of which patriots are made. This is a highly

dangerous condition in a country where we are once for all committed to the principle of government by force of numbers.

Some persons who are in favor of indiscriminate immigration admit, as indeed they must, the force of facts like those recited above; but they say the whole matter is a question of distribution. Let us get these people out of the cities, they say; let us put them upon the unsettled regions of Texas or Oklahoma, and the results will be very different. In regard to this plan several things may be said. (1) The immigrants will not go there of their own accord, as appears from what has been already said. Most of them cannot afford to go inland if they would. (2) The experience of the Hebrew Charities on a small scale shows that even where colonization is successful—and in many cases it has been an utter failure—it is altogether too expensive to be applied on a large scale. (3) If it could be applied to those already in the city slums, the slums would fill up faster than they could be bailed out, unless we adopt some further regulation of immigration as to newcomers. (4) It is, therefore, proposed to bar aliens not destined to an interior locality. But it would require a policeman for each immigrant to see that he did not sell his ticket on landing, and that he actually went to his destination. (5) Even if our recent immigrants were able and willing to go to the West and South, *these States do not want them*. In 1896 every one of the associations formed to encourage immigration into the Northwest petitioned Congress for an illiteracy test for immigrants and stated that they did not want Southeastern European immigrants. A Government Commission in 1896 took steps to ascertain the wishes of the States in this matter by communicating with their governors, labor commissioners and other officials. Of 52 replies received all expressed a

preference for native born or Northwestern Europeans, chiefly for British, Germans and Scandinavians. There were only two requests for Southeastern Europeans and these were for Italian farmers with money. Within a month the Immigration Restriction League has repeated the experiment of the Government Commission, and the thirty replies received to date are most instructive. Of the States desiring immigrants practically all wish native born, or immigrants from Northern Europe, Britain, Germany and Scandinavia. All are opposed to having the slums of Eastern cities dumped upon them. In regard to immigrants not desired, three States desire no immigrants at all; two, no foreign born. Five desire no Southern and Eastern Europeans. Eight wish no illiterates. Of the rest, immigrants settling in cities, the Latin races, persons who cannot speak English, Asiatics, and in general any but the best classes of immigrants, are objected to.

Before considering remedies for the existing state of things, I wish to return to what was said at the outset and to emphasize the most important reason of all for further selection in admitting immigrants. The late Bishop Brooks, who was a large-hearted man if there ever was one, in a public address used these words:

“If the world, in the great march of centuries, is going to be richer for the development of a certain national character, built up by a larger type of manhood here, then for the world’s sake, for the sake of every nation that would pour in upon us that which would disturb that development, we have a right to stand guard over it. . . . We have a right to stand guard over the conditions of that experiment, letting nothing interfere with it, drawing into it the richness which is to come by the entrance of many men from many nations, and they in sympathy with our Constitution and laws.”

Now in order to develop our institutions in the spirit of those who built them up we must guard our power of assimilation, and not only refuse to take in immigrants whom we cannot assimilate, and refuse to take any immigrants in faster than we can assimilate them, but we must see to it that we ourselves and those whom we assimilate shall continue to exist and to hand on the torch of civilization to worthy successors. All statistical discussions of immigration and its effects are defective in two respects. First, under our census system the children of immigrants are classed as native Americans. Second, no account is taken of the children which are never allowed to be born. In other words, the question is not really between us and the immigrants now coming, but between their children and the children of future immigrants and our children. To put the matter concretely, the greatest danger of unselected immigration is its effect upon the native birth rate.

Take a teacher in New York City with a high standard for himself and his children. He has but two because he cannot give them what he wants to give them in education and the decencies of life. Compare him with a Southern Italian or a Syrian living not a mile away who has ten children, and who brings them up regardless of any high standard of living, any education they get being paid for by other people. Once on a time half of these would have died. Now, with our improved public sanitation, they live. Perhaps, as stated above, some of these children are supported at the public expense until they are able to go into a sweatshop. There can be no doubt which is the higher type of citizen or of family, yet the higher barely tends to perpetuate itself and the lower "survives" to five times the extent of the higher.

Of course the falling of a birth rate may be due to

many causes which I have not time here to discuss. But in general it is caused by the desire for the "concentration of advantages," and one of the principal provocatives of this desire is the effects of immigration. Consider for a moment the typical town of a hundred years ago with its relatively homogeneous society. The young men drive the omnibus and tend the store. Everybody knows them, and, while not ranking with the judge, or the parson, or the doctor, they are in general as good as anybody. Now suppose a small factory is started and some of the village girls are employed there. For a time no great change occurs. Then a number of unskilled immigrants settle in the town. Being unskilled they naturally take up the easiest kind of manual labor. At first they are regarded as curiosities. More come, enough to form a class. They naturally group more or less by themselves. They do not enter into the existing clubs and amusements of the town. After a time they constitute the larger part of the help in the factory. Being poor, they live in the cheapest location and in the most frugal style. The natives gradually withdraw from social contact with them, the girls dislike to work with them in the factory, the boys do not want to be with them in the fields and the mills. After such a caste system invades a town the natives are unwilling to marry, or, if they do marry, to have children, unless they can be sure of enough means to secure employment for their children in an occupation where they will not be classed with the immigrants. The girls no longer go out to service, but go into bookkeeping, or certain kinds of stores; and the boys are sent to the High School or, if possible, to college. At any rate, the children of the natives seek only the so-called better grades of employment. After a time there is an invasion of French Canadians or Italians into the town, and the same proc-

ess tends to operate in the case of the earlier immigrants.

That this is no flight of the imagination but an actual description of what happens is testified by many students of the question. The writer has personally inquired as to the cause of the small families in various parts of our Eastern States and has been repeatedly told by parents that this social reason was the controlling one in their own families. Dr. Roberts and Dr. Warne report the same thing in the mining regions of Pennsylvania. General Walker says:

“The great fact protrudes through all the subsequent history of our population that the more rapidly foreigners came into the United States, the smaller was the rate of increase, not only among the native population of the country as a whole, including the foreigners. . . . If the foregoing views are true, or contain a considerable degree of truth, foreign immigration into this country has, from the time it assumed large proportions, amounted not to a reënforcement of our population, but to a replacement of native by foreign stock.”

The Industrial Commission also says in its report, p. 277:

“It is a hasty assumption which holds that immigration during the nineteenth century has increased the total population.”

R. R. Kuczynski has shown that in Massachusetts the foreign-born mother has two-thirds more children than the native-born mother, and three-fifths more children living.

Now in many discussions of this question it is said that the natives are displaced by the foreigners, but are “crowded up” into higher occupations. I do not believe

that this can be shown to be true, even of the natives in existence at the time the process operates. Some are undoubtedly crowded up, some are crowded out and go elsewhere, many are crowded down and become public charges or tramps. But the main point is that the native children are murdered by never being allowed to come into existence, as surely as if put to death in some older invasion of the Huns and Vandals.

In this question of immigration we are dealing with tremendous social forces operating on a gigantic scale. How careful should we be, then, to turn these forces in the right direction so far as we may guide them. It is no doubt true that hybridization has often produced better stocks than those previously existing; and some infusion of Mediterranean and Alpine blood into the Baltic immigration of the last century may perhaps be a good thing. But if we were trying such an experiment on plants or animals would we not exercise the greatest care to get the best of each stock before mixing them? And has it not been said that human beings are of more value than many sparrows? The success of the American Republic is of more value to the world than the good of a few thousand immigrants, whose places are filled up at home almost before they reach this side of the Atlantic. It is by no means certain that economic reforms would not already have taken place in Europe which have been delayed because those countries have had the safety valve of emigration to the United States, and have thus been able to keep up the frightful pressure of militant taxation in their own domains.

If we are to apply some further method of selection to immigrants, what shall it be? The plan of consular inspection in Europe, once popular, has been declared impracticable by every careful student of the subject. A high headtax might accomplish something, but it is

not a discriminating test, and hits the worthy perhaps harder than the unworthy.

Two plans have been suggested. One, more in the nature of a palliative than a cure, is to admit immigrants on a five-year probation, and to provide that if within five years after landing an immigrant becomes such a person as to be within the classes now excluded by law, whether the causes of his changed condition arose prior or subsequent to his landing, he shall be deported. There are various practical difficulties with such a plan, the chief one being that of identification, but, in view of the decision in the Turner case, such a plan would probably be held to be constitutional.

The other plan is to adopt some more or less arbitrary test, which, while open to theoretical objection—as any practicable test must be—nevertheless will on the whole exclude those people whom we wish excluded. It must be a definite test, because one trouble with the “public charge” clause of the present law, under which most exclusions now occur, is that it is so vague and elastic that it can be interpreted to suit the temper of any of the higher officials who may happen to be charged with the execution of the law. As I have elsewhere repeatedly shown those persons who cannot read in their own language are, *in general*, those who are also ignorant of a trade, who bring little money with them, who settle in the city slums, who have a low standard of living and little ambition to seek a better, and who do not assimilate rapidly or appreciate our institutions. It is not claimed that an illiteracy test is a test of moral character, but it would undoubtedly exclude a good many persons who now fill our prisons and almshouses, and would lessen the burden upon our schools and machinery of justice. In a country having universal suffrage it is also an indispensable requirement for citizenship, and

citizenship in its broadest sense means much more than the right to the ballot. The illiteracy test has passed the Senate three times and the House four times in the last eight years. It has been endorsed by several State legislatures, a large proportion of the boards of associated charities of the country, and by numerous intelligent persons familiar with immigration matters, including the State associations for promoting immigration above referred to. This test has already been adopted by the Commonwealth of Australia and by British Columbia, and would have certainly been adopted here long since but for the opposition of the transportation companies.

It is no doubt true that many of the newer immigrants are eager to have their children educated, and that many of these children are good scholars. But this fact strikes us the more forcibly because it is the one ray of hope in a dark situation. I do not know that anyone has ever claimed that these foreign-born children are superior in any way to native-born children, and the latter acquire the most valuable part of civic education by hearsay and imitation in their own homes, while the foreign born have their only training in the school. Furthermore, everyone admits the enormous burden of educating such a large mass of children, illiterate as to even their own language. This is in addition to the burden of the adult illiterates imposed on a country which already has its problems of rural and negro education. There is no doubt that an illiteracy test would not only give us elbow room to work out our own problems of education, but would greatly promote elementary education in Europe. Why should we take upon ourselves a burden which properly belongs to the countries from which these immigrants come?

Whatever view we may take of the immigration ques-

tion there can be no doubt that it is one of the most important, if not the most important, problems of our time, and, as such, it deserves the careful study of all our citizens. We are trustees of our civilization and institutions with a duty to the future, and as trustees the stocks of population in which we invest should be limited by the principle of a careful selection of immigrants.

THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN IDEALS¹

GOBINEAU once said, "America is likely to be, not the cradle of a new, but the grave of an old race." Is there, indeed, a danger that the race which has made our country great will pass away, and that the ideals and institutions which it has cherished will also pass?

It seems to be generally agreed that down to the period of fifteen years or so after the close of the Civil War there was a fairly definite American type, which had expressed itself, not so much in literature or art, as in politics and invention, and in certain social ideals. Washington and Lincoln, however different in some respects, both represented a certain type of English civilization, and both stood for certain political, social, and ethical points of view. The original settlers of this country were mainly Teutonic, belonging to what is now called the Baltic race, from Northern Europe, which has always been distinguished for energy, initiative, and self-reliance. Impatient of much government, relying upon self-help rather than the paternalism of the State, this race was none the less firm in its allegiance to certain pretty definite religious and social standards. It insisted from the beginning on general education, and where opportunities for schooling were wanting there was nevertheless a wide training given by interchange of ideas in the home, on the farm, in the church, and in the town meeting. In town affairs every citizen was expected to take part, and usually did so, thus conferring

¹ Reprinted from *The North American Review*, January, 1912.

a benefit on the community and receiving something in exchange. The result of this common racial origin and of these relatively homogeneous institutions was, as I have said, the amalgamation of the people into a fairly definite national type.¹

What has happened since then? To-day, less than one-half of our people are descendants of the original stock and of the early settlers. Since 1820, we have received from Europe and Asia some twenty-eight millions of people. About one-third of these came prior to 1880 and were of races kindred to those already here; in other words, they had a common heritage of institutions if not of language, and were assimilated into the general population with comparative ease. The other two-thirds, the eighteen millions who have come since 1880, have been, on the other hand, of entirely different races—of Alpine, Mediterranean, Asiatic, and African stocks. These races have an entirely different mental make-up from the Baltic race; they bring with them an inheritance of widely differing political and social ideals, and a training under social and political institutions very different from ours. The Slavic races, for example, differ from the Teutonic in temperament as much as the emotional nations of the Mediterranean. The South Italian, which constitutes the largest element in our present immigration, is one of the most mixed races in Europe and is partly African, owing to the negroid migration from Carthage to Italy. The modern Greek is by no means the Greek of the time of

¹ Perhaps the best statement of the proper conditions of race mixture is in Houston Stewart Chamberlain's *Foundations of the XIXth Century*, vol. 1, chap. iv, "The Chaos." He points out that the successful cases of amalgamation have been those where there has been an immigration of kindred races only, and such immigration has continued for a comparatively brief period and then ceased. This was precisely the situation in the United States prior to 1880.

Pericles, either in race or temperament. The Hebrew, which constitutes the next largest element of immigration, in spite of long residence in Europe is still, as it always has been, an Asiatic race; while the Syrians, Chinese, Japanese, and Hindus are still more removed from the civilization of Northern Europe and America.

This movement of peoples from the Old World to the New is on a scale unprecedented in history, and its effects cannot fail to be profound and far-reaching. What will they be?

Americans have hitherto paid very little attention to this question: first, because they have not considered the difference between hostile and peaceful invasions in history; and second, because they fail to observe that recent immigration is of an entirely different kind from that which our fathers knew. The earlier immigration having been of kindred races and having produced no profound changes, our people became used to the phenomenon and took it as a matter of course. At the present time, most of us consider that the movement now going on is similar to that which has been, and anticipate results no different from those previously observed.

If the million people coming every year came not as peaceful travelers, but as an invading hostile army, public opinion would be very different to what it is; and yet history shows that it has usually been the peaceful migrations and not the conquering armies which have undermined and changed the institutions of peoples. To take the classical error on this subject, we have been told repeatedly that, on the one hand, it was the conquering Goths and Vandals, and on the other hand, their own vice and luxury, which cost the Romans their empire. The real cause of the fall of Rome was neither of these things. It was the constant infiltration into

Roman citizenship of large numbers of "barbarians"—that is, of races alien in instincts and habits of thought and action to the races which had built up the Roman Empire. For a time, indeed, the mold of political structure and social habit, though cracking, did not break; but the newcomers assimilated the Romans faster than they were themselves assimilated, and in time the mold broke in pieces. In precisely the same way some provinces of France are to-day becoming German, and others Italian, while the Germans are consciously making use of this method in their attempt to Prussianize Poland.

The "barbarians" of the present time, however, do not come from the plateaus of central Asia or from the jungles of Africa; they are the defective and delinquent classes of Europe—the individuals who have not been able to keep the pace at home and have fallen into the lower strata of its civilization.

Formerly, America was a hard place to get to, and a hard life awaited those who came, although the free and fertile land offered rich prizes to those with the energy to grasp them. To-day, the steamship agent is in every little town in Europe; fast steamers can bring thousands in a few days, and wages, often indeed not enough for an American to live decently on, but large in the eyes of the poor European peasants, await the immigrant on landing. There is, moreover, abundant testimony to the fact that much of the present immigration is not even a normal flow of population, but is artificially stimulated in every possible way by the transportation companies which have many millions invested in the traffic.

Now there are two hopeful attitudes with regard to the possible dangers from this "peaceful invasion." One of them is that we can continue, as we have in the

past, to assimilate all this material and turn it into good American citizens. This was the general attitude until recently, and is still the attitude of the average man who does not fear the future. The other attitude is that, although perhaps we cannot do this, although the aliens may to some extent assimilate us, yet the seething of the melting-pot will remove the dross and turn out a product, possibly new, but at any rate as good, if not better, than the old.

It is important to consider the truth of these points of view, because the social and political institutions of any country depend upon the type of its citizenship and are molded by it. Ruskin long ago observed that the only real wealth is human character, and what boots an extended railroad mileage or the fact that all our coal and minerals are dug up or all our trees cut down some years or decades sooner, if at the end our democracy goes to pieces? We have heard much lately of the conservation of natural resources, but the conservation of ideals is surely much more important.

Those who believe that we can assimilate all the aliens who may come usually qualify their belief by saying that, although we may not succeed entirely with the parents, we can succeed with the children, and that the salvation of the situation is the public school. They also point out that many immigrants have had little opportunity for improvement in their own countries and may develop rapidly in a new environment. Now just as the Latin races make a fetish of the State, we Americans are apt to make a fetish of education, and we constantly fail to discriminate between education as the molding of character and education as the imparting of information. Far the larger part of a child's education comes from his home and his companions, rather than from his schooling. Emulation and imita-

tion are the two mainsprings of his growth. We should never forget the somewhat hackneyed truth that education, in general, brings out what is in the man, be it good or bad, and seldom puts much there which was not there before. For this reason it is very questionable whether the small amount of schooling the children of most aliens receive plays a very large part in the total of influences brought to bear upon them; and it is still more debatable whether it appreciably alters their characters, or does anything more than bring out their inherited instincts and tendencies. Undoubtedly immigrant children crowd our schools because it aids them in the struggle for existence, and is usually paid for by someone else. Undoubtedly, also, many of them obtain high marks and show considerable capacity for storing up information.

Nevertheless, as has been said, schooling is but a small part of the influences to which the child is subject, and the tendency of recent immigrants to crowd into the cities and to settle in racial groups means that a very large part of the influences affecting the children will be those of their neighbors and co-workers of the same race. As in John Bunyan's parable, a small quantity of oil poured secretly and steadily upon a fire will cause it to withstand a large quantity of water poured upon it from all directions. Moreover, to a great extent this water of public-school education will fail to quench hereditary passions, because the latter are so strong that the former will be vaporized, so to speak, and pass off without closely touching them. Dr. Gustav LeBon, in his *Political Psychology*, has thus expressed this phase of the matter:

“Education merely sums up the results of a civilization; the institutions and the beliefs representing the needs of such civilization. If, then, a civilization does

not harmonize with the ideas and sentiments of a people, the education setting forth this civilization will remain without effect upon it; in the same way that institutions corresponding to certain needs will not correspond to different needs."

The result in such a case will be, not a true amalgamation of races, but a mixture of peoples as in Austria-Hungary, living side by side, sharing certain interests in common, but never wholly merging into a general national type.

This is, indeed, what many educators like Dr. Charles W. Eliot expect and rejoice in. Dr. Eliot does not share in the second view—that the melting-pot will fuse the various races into one. And he rejoices because, in his view, half-breeds of any races are inferior to their parents, just as alloys of metals are not as valuable as the metals themselves. And he is right. The evidence on this point is convincing. Dr. Alfred P. Schultz, in his *Race or Mongrel*, gives numerous examples drawn from history, one of the most conspicuous being that of the Jews, who, wherever they have kept their racial purity, have kept also their fine qualities of energy, push, and mental alertness, but have deteriorated rapidly when intermarried with other races. Humboldt and Darwin have declared the same truth. Agassiz, in a well-known passage, says:

"Let any one who doubts the evil of the mixture of races and who is inclined from mistaken philanthropy to break down all barriers between them come to Brazil. He cannot deny the deterioration consequent upon the amalgamation of races, more wide-spread here than in any country in the world and which is rapidly effacing the best qualities of the white man, the Indian, and the negro, leaving a mongrel nondescript type deficient in physical and mental energy."

The same thing has happened in Cuba, in Mexico, and other countries to the south of us. But is there any danger of this occurring in the United States? It has not occurred in the past because the only race outside of the Teutonic immigrants present in large numbers has been the negro, and the Baltic races have an insurmountable prejudice against intermarriage with the black races. The Mediterranean and Asiatic races, on the other hand, have much less of this feeling. The negro strain in the South Italians has been already mentioned, and there are some examples of intermarriage between negroes and Jews. What would happen if a large Mediterranean population should be colonized in our Southern States and should interbreed with the negro population it finds there? This is not an imaginary possibility, for the dark-skinned races are more likely to settle in the southern part of this country; indeed, it must be so if Major Woodruff is correct in his view that the blond races cannot permanently live south of the fortieth parallel on account of the effects of the light on their nervous systems. Let us assume that some interbreeding with the negroes takes place. Will the descendants of the emotional, fiery Italians submit to the social judgment that a man with a sixteenth or a thirty-second part of negro blood is a colored man who must occupy a position socially, if not politically, inferior? Assuredly not, and thoughtful Southerners are already alarmed by this prospect and have announced through many of their industrial conventions that they do not desire the immigration of southeastern Europeans. The Western States feel the same way about Asiatics, both for racial and economic reasons.

Even if the result of the immigration of southeastern Europeans to the South should not immediately be an interbreeding, the result may be to add other problems

to the one we already have there. Mr. Booker T. Washington, who has recently been investigating conditions in Europe, expresses this view when he says:

“I greatly fear that if these people should come in large numbers and settle in colonies outside the cities, where they would have comparatively few educational advantages, and where they would be better able and more disposed to preserve their native customs and languages, we might have a racial problem in the South more difficult and more dangerous than that which is caused by the presence of the negro.”¹

But whether the result be an amalgamation or a mixture, it is evident that the nation will be profoundly altered by the addition of large numbers of persons with alien habits and ideals, and that the social and political structure will be changed accordingly. Dr. LeBon, in the work above quoted, says:

“A preponderating influence of foreigners is a sure solvent of the existence of States. It takes away from a people its most precious possession—its soul. When aliens became numerous in the Roman Empire it ceased to be.”

And again:

“It was a very sure instinct which taught the ancients the fear of strangers: they well knew that worth of a country is not measured by the number of its inhabitants, but by the number of its citizens.”

Can we not already see certain effects of the newer immigration upon our social life? In many places the

¹ The first part of this quotation is almost the exact language used by George Washington in a letter to John Adams, November 27, 1794. Of course, he was speaking of the relatively homogeneous immigration of his day.

Continental Sunday, with its games and sports, its theatrical and musical performances, and its open bars, is taking the place of the Puritan Sabbath. In some of our factory towns there are many operatives living under the system of free marriage, and in at least one place the method of building tenements has been altered to correspond to this system. Professor Commons notes that we have already begun to despotize our institutions in order to deal with large masses of citizens not capable of intelligently supporting representative government. We see, also, the phenomena of political parties and groups on racial lines, with their own newspapers in foreign languages, seeking representation as racial units precisely as in Austria. These groups have already taken a conspicuous part in opposing immigration legislation, already existing or proposed, which makes it more difficult for their friends and relatives to come here; and, under our political system, these foreign-born groups already hold the balance of power in many places. This means that they often divide, not on public policy, but on some matter of racial advantage. In any case they do not and cannot combine to make parties like those of the older population.

All these changes may be good or bad, but they cannot fail to impress us; and, if these changes rise above the swirling mass of events and catch our eyes, we may be sure that more profound changes are in process beneath the surface.

We have to contend not only with alien habits and ideals, and with the fact that these differences cannot be effaced by education in one or even two generations, but also with the fact that we are getting a great many immigrants who are below the mental, moral, and physical average of both our country and their own. A recent writer in a leading German review has said:

"The immigration of the last decade has increased the number of hands, but not the number of heads, in the United States." While this may be an extreme statement, there is the unanimous testimony of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, the Commissioner at the Port of New York, and the Immigration Commission, which has recently spent several years studying the matter, to the fact that for one immigrant whose defects are so marked as to put him in the classes excluded by law there are hundreds, if not thousands, who are below the average of our people, and who, as George William Curtis put it, are "watering the nation's life blood."

Recent investigations in eugenics show that heredity is a much more important factor than environment as regards social conditions—in fact, that in most cases heredity is what makes the environment. This is confirmed by the practice of the insurance companies which attach the chief importance to the hereditary characteristics of an individual. If this position is sound, education and distribution can only palliate the evils and delay fundamental changes. As Professor Karl Pearson says: "You cannot change the leopard's spots, and you cannot change bad stock to good; you may dilute it, possibly spread it over a large area, spoiling good stock, but until it ceases to multiply it will not cease to be."

Intelligent foreigners, like Bourget, H. G. Wells, and LeBon, are continually surprised that Americans pay so little regard to these matters. Already our neighbor to the north has become much more strict as to those she admits than we are; and, in fact, the Dominion is now rejecting at the border many whom we have admitted. And in our own practice we are not very logical, for we are much more stringent in regulations as to importing cattle, sheep, hogs, dogs, and horses than we are as to

human beings. The English sparrow and the gypsy moth were not considered dangerous when first imported, but by their multiplication have done serious damage. The history of the Jukes family in New York State shows how much harm can be done by immigration of a single pair of defectives.

The foregoing is not intended to be a pessimistic wail. Our people are successful in part because they are optimistic, and in general they have little use for prophets of evil. Nor has the writer forgotten for a moment either what the country owes to past immigration, or that much of the present immigration is desirable and valuable. But our optimism should not be blind. Sumner once said of Garrison that he would go straight ahead even if the next step were over a precipice. If there is a precipice ahead we should avoid it while there is time, not merely for our own sake, but that the United States may continue strong to uphold the cause of democracy and liberty throughout the world.

THE BUILDING SITUATION IN BROOKLINE¹

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Some of the other speakers to-night will give us, I hope, the benefit of experience in other towns, notably Mr. Parker, of the Housing Committee of the Massachusetts Civic League, who will be here presently. Meanwhile I wish to outline a little of the situation as it is to-day in Brookline.

It is a commonplace of history that geography has a great deal to do with the development of community life, and Brookline is divided, I think, because many or most of us live along certain radial streets leading out of Boston. One result of that is that we do not get together in many things as could be wished, and one object of the Civic Society is to overcome that difficulty and bring people together on questions of this sort. However, whatever the explanation may be, Brookline has been very slow about adopting some things, and one of them is in relation to the building law in regard to wooden tenements. Brookline has been four years behind other communities in recognizing what the Delphic Oracle told the Athenians a great many years ago, that the way to destroy a nation is by the use of wooden walls. Although the wooden walls of Themistocles happened to be on the water, they were, nevertheless, three-deckers and did great service. Brookline is

¹ An address before the Brookline Civic Society, May 31, 1916. Reprinted from the *Brookline Chronicle* of June 3, 1916.

the thirty-sixth town, chronologically speaking, to forbid wooden walls. Only Cambridge, Somerville, Waltham, and Needham, and parts of Boston, are behind it on this subject, and Cambridge hopes to pass an ordinance very soon.

The present Brookline law defines tenements as apartment houses for more than two families or for two families above the first floor, and including lodging houses, hotels, and what were originally called tenement houses. Since last year all tenement houses are to be second class, that is brick. First class construction is fireproof throughout; second class houses have wooden or frame interior and brick outside walls; the third class construction means wooden walls and wooden frames. The only third class houses to-day which can be erected are single and two-family houses, and the second class covers tenements of not more than three stories and of not more than four stories if certain partial fireproofing is used, also apartment houses of three stories with six apartments and of four stories with eight apartments if certain fireproofing is used in those. All other apartment houses must be first class.

It is interesting to know that there are not over six first class apartment or tenement houses in this town at present. That surprised me and I think will surprise you. Last year we asked for this amendment prohibiting wooden walls. We might have asked for the general town law, but we did not because the law contains many provisions some of which are not considered as good as the Brookline building law, and it was thought better not to adopt it in its entirety. The result of the delay in this matter is that twenty-three towns have got ahead of us in adopting the Town Tenement House Act. These towns are Arlington, Bedford, Belmont, Braintree, Concord, Dedham, Hingham, Lexington,

Lincoln, Millis, Milton, Nahant, North Andover, Reading, Stoneham, Swampscott, Walpole, Watertown, Wenham, Weston, Weymouth, Winthrop, and Wakefield. This Act requires all tenement houses over two and one-half stories or for more than two families to be fireproof, and Winchester, Medford, and Malden also require apartment houses to be fireproof. Now the result of this action in the surrounding towns is the invasion of Brookline by jerrybuilders, so-called. These people come into a town which has not adopted the law to protect itself by legislation: this has been the result in other places.

Last year a member of the Economics Department of Harvard University made a special study of the Town Tenement House Act, and went about among the towns and inquired about the workings of the Act. He found that in nearly all cases the Act was adopted to prevent invasion from outside. Thus Arlington adopted it on account of people coming in from Cambridge and Somerville; Belmont adopted it to prevent people coming from Waltham; Swampscott adopted it to prevent people coming from Lynn; Salem adopted it because people came from Wenham and Beverly. The builders in most cases who erect cheap buildings live outside the town. They do not as a rule build for owners in the town. This is also true of Brookline: in other words, builders who live somewhere else, chiefly in Chelsea and Dorchester, find that they are able to buy land and build at fairly cheap prices in Brookline. They come in and put up such buildings as they want, not for sale to Brookline people but in order to sell the lands and buildings as a speculation for the best price they can. The builders claim that this is "improving" the land, although that is a gift like the Trojan horse; but we have at least insisted that the Trojan horse shall

not be made of wood, but shall be of clay outside instead.

What was the building situation in Brookline in 1914? We had a total of 294 buildings during the year, and I may say that there has been a great boom in building recently. The total cost of these buildings was \$2,172,000.

In 1915 there were 232 wooden buildings erected and 174 brick buildings or 406 buildings altogether, as compared with 294 the year before; and the total cost was \$4,132,050 as compared with \$2,172,000 the year before. In other words the value of buildings last year was nearly double what it was in 1914.

Now, of apartments alone in 1915, 140 permits were issued for wooden three-deckers. Of these 96 were revoked and six surrendered, making 102 representing a value of \$724,000. There were actually erected, therefore, only 38 wooden three-deckers last year, and of all the apartments erected last year there were one of the first class, 99 of the second class—these buildings had brick walls—and 38 of the third class,—a total of 138 apartment houses as compared with 194 other frame buildings which were not apartment houses.

For this year so far there have been 32 permits issued for second class apartments, and none for first class. And of the 32 permits 29 are three-deckers; one of which was a nine-apartment house and two were six-apartment houses. As I said before, at present there are not over six apartment houses of first class construction in town, even among the larger high buildings which are numerous along Beacon Street and other parts of the town. That being the situation and the wooden three-decker being cut off, unless something is done there will be a very large increase of the brick second class apartment house, and large areas of Brookline will be built of the

three-apartment houses in the same way as the Back Bay region between the Fenway and Boylston Street and Huntington Avenue and on Huntington Avenue coming towards Brookline, and out towards Allston and Cambridge.

All the arguments used against wooden three-deckers apply to the three-decker of brick, except that as to appearance. There is first the argument as to the effect on land values,—the fact that the apartment house, whether the walls are brick or wood, where numbers are brought into a single house, causes the neighborhood immediately to depreciate. The value of houses and lands depreciates and therefore the taxable values are reduced. The fact that the brick apartment house brings in, in many cases, a class of people who do not have the same permanent interest in the town as those who own their own single homes and perhaps do not take as much interest in town government and affairs,—the fact which I spoke of before, that the town loses a considerable sum in taxable value owing to the depreciation of the land value in houses and lands which are affected by the new class of people and the increase in town expenses which are necessary to provide accommodation in school and fire and police departments,—all such drawbacks of this large tenement house population are not balanced by the increased personal property which this population brings in. It is perfectly true that anybody who pays rent pays a certain amount of tax in that rent, but it is also true that the man who owns his own single house pays taxes on his house and land and also in most cases pays a personal tax beside, so that the tax which the tenement house brings in the form of additional rent probably does not bring the town nearly the same return for the increased outlay which would be the case with people owning their own homes.

Now in the towns that have adopted the Town Tenement House Act there has been a great satisfaction with the result. The same member of the Economics Department of Harvard College of whom I spoke interviewed numerous people in Lexington, Belmont, and other places. Several people in Lexington said the Act was the minimum of what should be done in house erection; and one of the Belmont inspectors, and a leading real estate man, said that low price housing for wage earners could be satisfactorily worked out under the Town Tenement House Act. Another building inspector said that buildings not constructed under that Act are economic waste which sooner or later falls on the poor man. The general testimony was that while first class construction costs 20 to 30 per cent more than second class construction it has not checked legitimate building in those towns.

I will not take time to go into the figures here. We have them from Belmont, Watertown, Arlington, and a number of other places for a number of years; but it appears that except in Winthrop, which is under special conditions, the values have increased—very much increased, and the property has likewise increased. In other words, the adoption of the Act rather encouraged persons to go into towns and those already there were encouraged to build more valuable structures. The Act has not been a detriment but a benefit to the towns.

Of course in the case of fireproof buildings the insurance risk and fire risk is much less also. One possible objection is made to this movement requiring all tenement houses three stories or more to be fireproof, and that is this: it is true that if a man is to build a first class building it will be cheaper for him to build a high building than a low one, therefore if we adopt this provision it will tend to send apartment houses up in the air. In

fact I was told this morning that one or two of the building companies were anxious to have such an amendment go through, with the idea of building high structures with small kitchenettes. Whether that is a sincere expression of their idea I doubt. But experience in other places has not borne out the idea of danger in that direction. If there is a danger then we must take up the question of the limitation of height. The Planning Board is now considering the question of revising the rules. If we should find there are too many high apartment houses, houses running up too high, we must revise the building restrictions to take care of that. Such a prohibition in Chicago for the last ten years as to four stories or more has kept Chicago down to a three-story city. They have a provision that all tenement houses of four stories or more in the residential section shall be fireproof. The result has been that it has practically kept that section of the city down to a three-story level in nearly all cases, so we have considerable doubt whether if such an amendment were adopted it would result in sending buildings to any extent up in the air.

The real question is, What sort of development do we want in Brookline? The question of the poor man is not really involved in this case, because in the first place the poor man does not live in the kind of brick tenement which is erected now in the second class, at least until it has become relatively old and undesirable. Also the question of the poor man can be solved in other ways. When I studied the matter last year in reference to wooden buildings I felt that it was possible to build brick buildings of two or two and one-half stories on low-priced land which could compete with the wooden three-apartment house and also with the brick three-apartment house. But in some way or other that matter can undoubtedly be taken care of. So far as the argu-

ment sometimes made is concerned, that we should consider our building laws with reference to the greatest number of people that can possibly get into Brookline, I have never been able to understand such a point of view. Of course we all realize that certain persons who work for us in various ways have to be housed reasonably near by, but there is no very great difficulty on that score as yet, and in the near future we hope that certain experiments now under way will demonstrate that it is possible to erect neat, attractive, workingmen's cottages to rent from \$18 to \$20 per month which will take care of such working people as we have got here. Many of them do not need to be here. Many of them have come in the past from Roxbury and other places to work in Brookline. That was the case with the Holtzer-Cabot people, a large number of whom came from Roxbury.

But at any rate there does not seem to be any necessity for letting things drift. It seems to me that we ought to take up this subject and consider what sort of development we want in Brookline, and that in view of the action taken by the surrounding towns, unless we do something of this sort we shall immediately become the dumping ground for all the cheaper builders and cheaper dwellers, comparatively speaking, who live in cheap buildings. Of course there are many desirable people who live in cheap buildings—I do not deny it—but taking it in a large way, which is necessary in dealing with this subject, I think it may be said that unless we take some action we shall deteriorate our land values and buildings and to some extent deteriorate the average population. What will be proposed next fall to the town will be what I have indicated, namely, requiring tenement and lodging apartments of three stories or more to be fireproof. That will bring the town into harmony

with the Town House Tenement Act although we do not formally adopt the Act. It is a question of what Brookline people really want, and it devolves upon you to give consideration to the matter and decide about it.

BRIEF IN FAVOR OF THE NUMERICAL LIMITATION BILL ¹

*(66th Congress, H. R. 10837, contained in Publication No. 69 of the League;
see also § 9 of H. R. 12320, introduced by the Chairman of the
House Committee on Immigration, Feb. 4, 1920)*

The League's bill limits the number of aliens from any nation who may come in, during any year, to such percentage between twenty and fifty of the number of males of such nationality naturalized in the United States at the date of the preceding census, as the Secretary of Labor may fix, having regard to labor conditions here.

Aliens returning from a temporary visit abroad, aliens coming to join certain relatives, and certain classes of professional persons may enter in addition to the maximum fixed by the bill.

The bill does not apply to natives of the Western Hemisphere; and leaves Oriental immigration to be regulated as at present.

A. Further restriction of immigration both as to quantity and quality is essential to the preservation of American ideals and institutions.

Prior to 1880, immigration was chiefly from races akin to the original settlers in race, institutions and historical background. Since 1880, the opposite is the case. In 1880, 65 per cent of the total immigration came from Northern and Western Europe. In 1914, the last year of large immigration before the war, 68 per cent of the total immigration was of the Slavic and Iberic races of Eastern and Southern Europe. Whatever the merits of these latter races of immigrants, they are not familiar with democratic institutions, are largely ignorant of the

¹Publications of the Immigration Restriction League, No. 73.

English language, and until the Act of 1917 were more than one third illiterate even as to their town language.

As Gustav Le Bon says, too large a preponderance of foreigners (meaning those foreign in ideas and customs) destroys that most vital possession of a nation—its own soul. The downfall of nearly every great civilization has been due in large part to the peaceful invasion of large numbers of persons having different aims and customs.

B. Further restriction of immigration, both as to quantity and quality, is essential to the Americanization of immigrants already here and those to be admitted hereafter.

To attempt to assimilate the enormous immigrant population already here, to teach it our language and something of our history and government, above all, to imbue it with our traditions and ideals, in the face of an additional immigration of a million or more a year, is a hopeless task. It is like trying to keep a leaking boat dry without stopping the leak.

Adequate assimilation means not only great labor and expense, but it requires time. It requires something more than evening classes for adults, and flag exercises in the schools. Many aliens are settled in communities where they hear only their own language, and read, if they are able to read, only newspapers in that language. The most potent assimilative force is contact and exchange of ideas with the native population. This requires time, even in the case of the children. Meanwhile we need elbow-room to make adequate progress with those already here; as is shown in League Publication No. 74 by Robert De C. Ward.

C. The preservation of American institutions and the assimilation of immigrants demand that the bulk of further immigration should be of kindred races.

It is obvious that those whose home government, institutions and habits are more akin to our own will most easily fit into our life here and be the easiest to assimilate socially, economically and politically.

D. The proposed bill operates along the same lines as the reading test in the Act of 1917, but is needed to supplement that test.

In the opinion of government officials and expert students of the matter, the reading test has proved to be one of the most valuable features of the law. In 1917, the total number of illiterates over fourteen years of age admitted was 35,510; in 1918, the total number of illiterates admitted over sixteen years of age, under the exceptions in the law, was 3,772. This reduction was effected chiefly in the aliens from Southern and Eastern Europe, where the rate of illiteracy is high. The reading test has also proved valuable in excluding feeble-minded and other defective persons who might not have been excluded without it.

But the effect of the reading test will presently diminish; partly through the natural spreading of education to the countries backward in that respect, partly because those same countries will make special efforts to promote elementary education. This latter effect of the law is noticeable in Italy, where, since the passage of the test, preparations are being made to make reading available to all intending emigrants. The increase in popular education abroad is one of the beneficial results of our present immigration law.

Therefore some measure operating along the same

lines is needed to supplement the reading test before the latter begins to lose its effect.

E. The proposed bill, while reducing the total volume of immigration, reduces it chiefly as to those countries of Eastern and Southern Europe whose emigrants are less easily assimilated here.

As stated above under A and B, what is needed is that aliens shall not be allowed to come in faster than they can be assimilated. This implies a reduction of the total number from the million a year who came to us before the war; and especially a reduction in such a way that the bulk of immigration shall be of the kindred races of Northern and Western Europe.

The proposed bill, under its maximum provision of 50 per cent, would have had the following effect in a year of normally large immigration like 1914:

	<i>Actually admitted</i>	<i>Admissible under bill</i>
Northern and Western Europe.....	189,177	1,090,500
Southern and Eastern Europe.....	945,288	279,288

In other words, the total European immigration would have been reduced to 43 per cent of the actual volume by reducing the immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe to 29 per cent of its actual volume.

The proposed bill, under its minimum provision of 20 per cent, would have had the following effect in 1914:

	<i>Actually admitted</i>	<i>Admissible under bill</i>
Northern and Western Europe.....	189,177	436,200
Southern and Eastern Europe.....	945,288	111,715

In other words, the total European immigration would have been reduced to 26 per cent of its actual

volume, by reducing the immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe to 12 per cent of its actual volume.

It will be noticed that the number, admissible under the bill, from Northern and Western Europe, is much larger than actually came in 1914, and than is likely to come in any future year.

It is possible that some increase of these races might take place when they are no longer so subject to the overwhelming competition of the races from Southern and Eastern Europe. In the past, such competition has been a powerful factor in checking immigration from Northern and Western Europe. But much increase is not likely, and if it took place, being of kindred races it would be more easily assimilated.

F. The proposed bill would discriminate against those less assimilable.

Most of the arguments in favor of the reading test (set forth in Publications Nos. 56 and 63) support this bill also. The races of Eastern and Southern Europe are relatively illiterate; and investigation has shown that illiteracy goes hand in hand with various other undesirable qualities which make assimilation difficult.

The recent immigration, for example, does not distribute itself over the country to build up new communities, as did the earlier; but tends to congregate in certain States, in the large cities of those States, and in the congested districts of those cities.

The *Census of 1910*, Volume I, *Population*, page 814, showed that the States of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania contained 67.8 per cent of all the Roumanians in the United States; 64.0 per cent of all the Hungarians; 58.4 per cent of all the Italians; and 55.7 per cent of all the Russians. This compares with 34.8 per

cent of the English, 33.8 per cent of the French, 30.2 per cent of the Germans and 13.2 per cent of the Swedes.

Volume I, page 818, showed that 78.6 per cent of those from Eastern and Southern Europe live in cities as compared with 68.3 per cent of those from Northern and Western Europe. Volume I, page 1273, shows that, of those unable to speak English, 69.2 per cent live in cities.

In 1900, Chicago contained 91 per cent of all the Poles in Illinois, and 84 per cent of all the Italians. New York City contained 47 per cent of all the Poles in the State, 80 per cent of all the Italians and 94 per cent of all the Russian Jews. The *Seventh Special Report of the United States Commissioner of Labor* (1894, p. 44) showed that natives of Austria-Hungary, Italy, Poland and Russia constituted 6 times their normal proportion in the slums of Baltimore, 7 times in Chicago, 5 times in New York and 26 times in Philadelphia.

This tendency to slum life is largely due to ignorance of gainful trades, and in part to lack of savings. The *Report of the Industrial Commission* showed that in 1900, while the British and Germans brought with them \$30 to \$40 per capita, the Southern Italians, Poles and Hebrews brought less than \$10.

G. The basis of exclusion in the bill, namely an annual immigration limited to from 20 to 50 per cent of the males of any nationality naturalized at the date of the last census, is a sound one.

The best test of assimilation and of the desire of those of any race to throw in their lot with us permanently is the degree to which they become naturalized. Races who do this are in general those most nearly kindred to us, as appears from the following table.

The *Census of 1910*, Volume I, page 1072, gave the

50 IMMIGRATION AND OTHER INTERESTS

proportion of foreign-born males of voting age who were naturalized, for the nations specified, as follows:

<i>Northern and Western Europe</i>		<i>Eastern and Southern Europe</i>	
Germany.....	69.5	Turkey in Europe.....	43.0
Wales.....	69.2	Roumania.....	28.8
Ireland.....	67.8	Russia.....	26.1
Sweden.....	62.8	Portugal.....	24.9
Switzerland.....	61.8	Austria.....	24.6
Denmark.....	61.6	Turkey in Asia.....	21.2
Norway.....	57.1	Italy.....	17.7
Netherlands.....	56.8	Spain.....	16.4
France.....	49.6	Hungary.....	14.3
Belgium.....	43.0	Greece.....	6.6

H. This bill does not in any way repeal or modify the present laws excluding Oriental immigration. It is entirely different from the so-called "Gulick" bill.

This League believes that, whatever the merits of the Chinese, Japanese and Hindus may be, the public opinion of this country is entirely justified in demanding that they be substantially excluded, as at present, and not allowed to come into economic competition here with our manual workers. It has therefore opposed and now opposes the Gulick bill, which repeals all specific Oriental exclusion and retains as the only barrier a percentage limitation. Although the Gulick bill is also a numerical limitation plan, its basis for exclusion is different from that of the League's bill; and, in the opinion of experts, the Gulick plan might allow several million Orientals to be here at the end of fifty years. We have had a troublesome experience with the African races, and we ought not to risk any repetition of this trouble with the Asiatic races. It may be noted that the exclusion of Orientals from Australia, New Zealand and Canada is much more rigid than from the United States.

The League's bill should not be associated with the Gulick bill. They are entirely different propositions.

I. The time to adopt adequate measures of restriction is now.

The war acted for several years as the strongest kind of a check upon all immigration. The best expert opinion is that immigration will increase very rapidly from now on. For some years to come, work of reconstruction may tend to keep at home the better sorts of workmen in Northwestern Europe. On the other hand, the disturbed political conditions in Eastern Europe, and the destruction of many homes, will tend to uproot many families and make them more ready to try life on another continent. The steamship companies, who know that immigrants are the most profitable cargo they can carry, will be eager to turn this feeling of unsettlement to their profit by inducing as many as possible to come hither. Those having the least stake in their own country, and those not likely to have a large interest in any country are the easiest to persuade.

We should therefore be prepared for a largely increased immigration, probably of a lower grade than heretofore; and should adopt adequate legislation now, before the rush begins.

Issued by the Immigration Restriction League, 11 Pemberton Sq., Boston, Mass.

EUGENICS, ETHICS AND IMMIGRATION¹

THE word "Eugenics" has appeared in periodical literature only within the last ten years, chiefly through the writings of Sir Francis Galton and of Karl Pearson, professor of mathematics in the University of London. The thing itself is, indeed, not new. The effort to improve the breeds of men has been expressed in many ways from early times. Not to mention the exposure of weakling children by the various races, restrictions on marriage of one kind or another have been imposed by almost all peoples.

Since Christianity and civilization have emphasized the worth of the individual, the voluntary elimination of the unfit has been limited to the execution of offenders against political or religious laws, and the forced segregation of certain other classes, like paupers, insane persons, idiots and lepers.

The attempt to improve race stocks in recent times has, therefore, taken the form, not of killing off the less fit, but of preventing their coming into the State, either by being born into it or by migration. Eugenics includes, not only the prevention of unfit, but the conscious attempt to produce the more fit; indeed, it is in the latter sense that the word is most often used. Strictly speaking, however, it must include all attempts to improve the physical equipment of the individual in so far as he acquires it by heredity.

The recent emphasis upon eugenics is a direct out-

¹ Publications of the Immigration Restriction League No. 51.

come of modern science. On the one hand, Darwin and his followers have shown us the methods and the possibilities of the production of new species of plants and animals. This knowledge has been applied, in countless ways,—to improve breeds of sheep and cattle, to develop race horses, to create new and improved kinds of grains, grasses and fruits. The marvellous work of Luther Burbank and others has opened our eyes to what can be done along these lines. So much has been done, indeed, that it would not be too much to say that artificial selection has been applied to almost every living thing with which man has close relations except man himself; and people are now asking why the breeding of the most important animal of all should, alone, be left to chance.

On the other hand, the weakening of theological dogma, resulting from the spread of science, has turned men's gaze in large part from the next world to this. The centre of effort has in large part been shifted from preparing for death to enlarging life, from cultivating holiness to producing wholeness. Comte, Herbert Spencer, in fact nearly all modern philosophers, have laid emphasis on making this world better, without reference to what may happen in any other world. The culmination of this movement is found in such men as Nietzsche, Bernard Shaw and President Roosevelt. The Christ ideal is no longer one of religious contemplation, but of human perfection; the superman, working in a strenuous life to produce a better world here and now, is the one who attracts the admiration of men to-day.

Science has aided this movement in another way by showing that, in the last century, too much emphasis was laid upon environment and too little upon heredity. Education, environment, can develop and modify;

they cannot create. Modern biology shows how different organisms react upon the same environment; and that, by selecting individuals who react in certain ways, more can be accomplished than by merely changing environment of the total number.

And thus it has come about that at last men are asking how the advent of the superman can be hastened, and are beginning to discuss the application of artificial breeding and selection to mankind itself. Nietzsche's definition of marriage, as the union of two with the object of producing beings higher than themselves, is beginning to be seriously considered.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Europe attempted to improve its race stocks by the exportation of the less desirable individuals. Each country had its penal colonies, and in addition used the United States as a dumping ground for its convicts, paupers and insane. The immigration laws of the United States, which purport to exclude some twenty-one classes of mentally, physically, morally and economically undesirable persons, were originally intended to protect the country from the dumping process above described. But, inasmuch as they operate equally in the cases of assisted and of normal immigration, they really go further than this; and, so far as they are enforced, tend to eugenic results by selecting the better classes of aliens for the fathers and mothers of future citizens.

Within the United States, in addition to the usual segregation of criminals and insane, we hear from time to time suggestions as to sterilizing certain classes of the unfit or regulating the marriage of those afflicted with hereditary diseases. Until public opinion has been much more educated in this matter, however, little is likely to be done on these lines. The clause of the Constitution of the United States forbidding "cruel and

unusual punishments" is likely to stand in the way of measures of sterilization like those enacted in Indiana; and it may be questioned whether marriage regulations will have any effect other than to increase illegitimacy, except among the more intelligent and public spirited, who would probably act in the same way without legislation. Marriage regulations in Europe, as applied to men in the army, have never been very successful; and in Bavaria, for example, worked such harm that they had to be modified.

One of the chief troubles with the extension of eugenic ideals is the fact above mentioned that the very people who most need them are the last to be influenced by them. Thus, according to Professor Pearson, more than one half the births in Great Britain occur among less than one sixth of the population, and the latter are composed of the less intelligent portion of the community; and not only less intelligent, but less developed physically. It is on account of this last fact that we hear so much now about the physical deterioration of the British people, as shown in the examination of recruits for the army. Nature abhors extremes, and weeds out both the laggards and the pioneers.

This tendency of the less intelligent to multiply more rapidly becomes doubly important in a country where, in some years, immigration ranges from one to one and one quarter per cent of the population,¹ and is chiefly made up of the working classes. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that a mixture of race stocks may be desirable, it is apparent that the individuals who are to be the progenitors of the mixed stock should, at least, be as good, mentally and physically, as the average of

¹ It is true that the "net addition to population" by immigration, in any year, is less than this; but returning aliens may leave children behind them, and, in any case, exert a profound influence on the community.

those already here, if there is not to be a gradual degeneration of our people.

PRESENT LAWS NOT SUFFICIENT

The fact is, that our immigration laws, as at present administered, do not screen out the unfit so as to preserve the *status quo*, to say nothing of promoting eugenic improvement. Dr. Darlington of the New York City Board of Health has pointed out¹ that over 80 per cent of the aliens certified by the examining surgeons as being of poor physique or as having some physical abnormality were landed recently at Ellis Island. According to the Surgeon-General, 3774 aliens were certified at Ellis Island from July 1 to December 31, 1907, as having physical disabilities affecting their capacity for self-maintenance; and, during the same period, 3073 of such aliens were admitted. Of 4846 certified during the year 1904, or remaining over from the previous year, 3478 were landed.

The result of this laxness is shown in the further facts cited by Dr. Darlington, that the 40 per cent of foreign-born school children in New York City furnished, in 1906, over 70 per cent of the defectives in the schools; while in 1902 a foreign-born population of New York City, constituting a little over one third of the total population of New York City, furnished 89 per cent of the deaths from tuberculosis, and, in 1904, 60 per cent of the insane patients.

It further appears that the races which have recently begun to come to us, some of which are coming in large numbers, are those which have the largest proportion of serious physical defects. Thus, in 1901, the proportions

¹ *North American Review*, vol. 183, p. 1262 (Dec. 21, 1906).

of defectives to the totals landed, according to Dr. McLaughlin,¹ were as follows for certain races:—

Syrian	I in 29.
Hebrew	I in 42.
Magyar	I in 148.
Finn	I in 163.
Italian	I in 172.
Slav	I in 664.
Lithuanian	I in 1906.

Hebrew immigration has for several years been the second largest element in the total immigration.

The census of 1900 shows that, roughly speaking, the foreign-born furnish one and one-fifth times their proportion of criminals, one and one-half times their proportion of juvenile offenders, nearly twice their proportion of insane, and nearly three times their proportion of paupers.

If we had proper immigration laws properly enforced, most of those who are or become defectives and dependents would never be admitted, and we should be protected, not merely from the burden of them, but from what George William Curtis called that "watering of the nation's life-blood" which is the result of their breeding after admission.

After great efforts, a new class of excluded persons was added to the immigration law in 1907, consisting of persons "who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally or physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living." It was further provided that there should be no appeal from the decision of boards of special inquiry

¹ *Popular Science Monthly*, vol. 62, p. 407.

excluding such aliens. This was intended to be a purely physical test; in practice, however, it has been made an economic test. It is held by some of the officials that the defect must interfere with any particular occupation which the alien states he intends to pursue; that the function of the surgeon is merely advisory; and that the question whether the decision of a board of special inquiry was, in any case, based on the medical certificate, can be reviewed by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. As a result of these refinements, the "poor physique" clause has become a dead letter, and the protection, which it was intended to furnish to the public health, has been done away with.

Admitting that immigration is to be regulated at all, there seems to be no reason why the same care should not be exercised in admitting human beings that is now exercised in relation to animals, insect pests and disease germs. The admission of undesirable individuals does not necessarily improve the world as a whole. There are as many English sparrows in England as there were before they were imported to become a nuisance in this country.

The opponents of regulation of immigration have largely relied upon the doctrine that free competition of individuals will result in the "survival of the fittest" by natural selection. This belief is based upon a misunderstanding of the expression "survival of the fittest." This really means the survival of those most fitted for survival, and not necessarily those most fitted for any other purpose. As Dr. Pearson has pointed out,¹ this practically means the survival of the most fertile. The poor drunkard in the slums who has, perhaps, ten children survives five times as much as the college president with two, but no one would think of claiming that the

¹ "National Life from the Standpoint of Science."

ten are as valuable as the two. Formerly, the ten, or most of them, would have been eliminated by disease, and only the strongest would have survived. To-day, owing to modern sanitation, they all live, though often handicapped in the struggle for existence.

A variation of this argument usually takes the form of pointing out some dramatic single instance, where a child of the slums or one immigrating from some European ghetto, has risen to distinguished rank and done valuable service to the community. In view of the recent work of Hugo de Vries, Burbank and others, it cannot be denied that spontaneous variation does produce occasional "sports" very different from the parent stock. But, although we cannot predict that X, a child of A, will be of type A, any more than we can predict the date of his death, we can be absolutely certain what a class X of children of persons of type A will be, just as we can certainly predict the average life of that class; and we can also predict that the more valuable class A, the more valuable will be class X.

On account of the tendency, discussed above, for those classes of the community which have a lower physical and mental development to breed more rapidly, we must consider classes and not individuals. Wars and pestilences no longer eliminate the unfit as formerly, and what harm can be done by the breeding of a single pair of undesirables has been shown by the history of the Jukes family in New York State. That heredity counts for more than environment is shown by the importance attached to the former, as compared with the latter, by the insurance companies. According to Galton, the individual inherits in some degree from everyone of his ancestors, but in inverse geometrical proportion to their remoteness. If, therefore, we have a class of immigrants mentally and physically defective,

we can be mathematically certain that the children of that class will contain a preponderating amount of degeneracy, no matter what the environment. As Professor Pearson says: "You cannot change the leopard's spots, and you cannot change bad stock to good; you may dilute it, possibly spread it over a wide area, spoiling good stock, but until it ceases to multiply it will not cease to be."

The United States, from its geographical position, has an opportunity to perpetuate its unique advantage in having been founded and developed by a picked class of immigrants. Only recently has the greed of transportation companies brought to our shores a selection, not of the best, but often of the worst elements of European and Asiatic populations. Pending the development of further eugenic ideals, the least we can do is to see that the best specimens of each race are chosen for the parents of our future citizens.

THE ETHICS OF IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION

In an address before the Economic Club of Boston, President Eliot, of Harvard University, once took for his text the proposition that restriction of immigration was not a "generous thought." As this phrase sums up the objection felt by a number of public-spirited persons to any rigorous regulation of immigration, it deserves careful consideration. At the first, the term "free immigration" has an attractive sound. Freedom has been the watchword of democracy, of anti-slavery, of religious liberty. It was the war cry of that school of economics which was dominant until recent years, and found expression in the doctrine of *laissez faire*. In political life, liberty meant until recently the minimum of control necessary to secure equal opportunity.

The chief difference between the viewpoint of the nineteenth century and that of the twentieth will be found, I think, in the more positive and constructive attitude of the latter. We have begun to realize the control of man over nature, and to see that the highest results come from collective effort consciously directed to an end. We have seen, for example, both in biology and in history that individuals with traits of the highest value may disappear before the onslaughts of lower types which in one way or another are better fitted to perpetuate themselves.

Do we, therefore, say that such is the Divine purpose, and acquiesce in the result? Not at all. We say there is no ground for supposing that the Divine purpose does not intend to work as much through man's reason as through the forces of nature; and we set about interfering with natural selection in almost every department of life. We not only weed out the tares and thistles to plant wheat and figs, but Mr. Burbank and others create better kinds of wheat and figs and they supplant what we had before. The race horse and the seedless orange are triumphs of man's brain applied to artificial selection. In human affairs we find that we must go far beyond the doctrine of equal opportunity, and by compulsory education, pure food laws and countless other regulations, protect the people from harm and raise them to a higher type. We even lie awake nights devising how to get better men into our municipal offices, utterly regardless of the question whether the average citizen wishes better government or not; and, when the bad citizen gets too bad, we sometimes interfere with his natural activity by putting him in jail.

Now, all these considerations have a direct bearing upon the question of immigration regulation, for the migration of peoples is one of the matters in which con-

scious human agency may produce the greatest results, by the selection of the future races.

Restriction of immigration can be justified from two points of view. The first point of view is, that any political unit has the right to exclude whatever will not help it to a higher development than it now has. Probably the world is not yet ready for eugenic ideals such as Messrs. Pearson and Galton are preaching in England, whether they be by regulation of marriage or by preserving the purity of certain races. So let us pass to the second point of view.

This is, that any political unit has the right to protect itself from the invasion of anything tending to retard its normal life and development, whether it be noxious weeds or animals, germs of infectious disease, immoral books, immoral people, criminals, or persons whose presence tends to lower the average of intelligence, political capacity, or mental and physical health.

This right has never been questioned legally; it is an inherent attribute of sovereignty. It rests on the proposition that a political and social community is the creation and property of those who have established and developed it, and that they have the right to say who shall be admitted into its life. The nation is larger, but not unlike the state, the city, the church, the club, the family. In these smaller units the right to regulate admission is unquestioned. The college, of which the president above referred to is the distinguished head, is by no means indifferent to educational tests for admission to its privileges.

But the right of the nation to exclude individuals may be questioned upon moral grounds just because it is larger than the other units we have mentioned. The surface of the earth is limited in extent; and while in most parts of Europe the birth rate is falling, in Asia

and Africa it is probably rising, and in all parts the death rate is diminishing. What, it will be asked, are these teeming multitudes to do if they overcrowd their native territory?

This problem suggests two preliminary practical considerations. One is that most nations do not restrict immigration to any extent, so that if the United States were to impose additional restrictions, most of the remaining countries would still be open. Another is, that free immigration, in many if not in all cases, results in an absolute increase in population in the country from which it takes place, so that the problem is not solved but renewed. There are ten times as many Englishmen in England as at the time of the first English emigration. Unless we admit the right of any human type, no matter how low, not only to move about the earth's surface but to propagate indefinitely at will, we must consider what types it is desirable to have populate the now unsettled portions of the world. There might be no fewer Hindus in Asia after a few years if one hundred millions out of the eight hundred millions now there were to come to America; but the effect on America would be profound and permanent, while the effect on India would be slight and temporary.

Now, if the facts show, as I believe they do, that a considerable proportion of the immigrants coming today are below the average of our citizenship, mentally, morally and physically, and if they have tended to lower that average, why is it ungenerous to say, "You shall not come faster than we can lift you to our level or higher, and those of you who are very far below our level shall not come until they fit themselves for our conditions." Observe the question which the college president raises is not one of fact but of the moral law. He proclaims that restriction of immigration is

ungenerous no matter what the quality of that immigration is.

Now if a thing is ungenerous, it must be because it is ungenerous toward somebody. Restriction of immigration, under the assumed state of facts, is certainly not ungenerous to the native-born in the United States, nor to the foreign-born already here. Is it ungenerous to the intending immigrants, who may soon number two millions a year? That must be considered in connection with the effect of exclusion upon all the population of the other countries. If the standard of civilization and progress which the United States stands for were lowered, either by thinning the life blood of the people or by supplanting the existing races by others whose ideals are different, the damage to the rest of the world might be enough to much more than offset the benefit to the individuals admitted. For nations, like individuals, progress by emulation and imitation, and if there is nothing of value to imitate, such progress becomes delayed.

Just at this point I seem to hear something said of the colossal Teutonic conceit which thinks its race better than others. I frankly accept the challenge. I do believe that in recent centuries, the Teutonic stock has been the finest in the world. The Iberic had its day; but compare the history of the Spanish-American republics for three hundred years with that of England, Germany, Scandinavia and the United States. If our country had been settled by Galicians, Croatians, Sicilians or Greeks, can anyone suppose that our institutions and achievements would have been what they have or that the movement toward political and religious liberty throughout all the world would have been the same?

Besides the advantage of continuing the higher progress of an advancing nation for its service to the world,

there are certain benefits of restriction of emigration which are often overlooked. Emigration has been used as a safety valve by the governments of Europe to enable them to continue despotic rule, burdensome taxation, indifference to educational and industrial advance. It is probable that certain European countries would be further ahead today if the pressure of population and poverty had been present to force their rulers to more enlightened policies. A few years ago the mere rumor that the United States would adopt an educational test for immigrants sufficed to cause the Italian Minister of Education to take steps to enforce the primary education law, previously a dead letter in many parts of Italy.

And it must be remembered that there are many kinds of intending immigrants. By excluding the less fit, we make room for the more fit, who would otherwise be unable to come. The great recent influx of South Italians and Slavs has had a perceptible effect in checking immigration from Northern and Western Europe. Restriction is, indeed, not a condition of our making. It is a result of the fact that even the largest country has only a certain amount of employment to offer at any given time. The admission of the less desirable means the exclusion of the better class. To which of the two does the future more justly belong? Then, again, in so far as immigration lowers the standards of things in this country, it injures the prospects of all future immigrants. We who are living today are trustees of what has been accomplished, not merely for our own people, but for all who may inhabit this country in the future. The trouble with the college president's view is that it contemplates using the principal of trust funds for temporary almsgiving, and presently there will be no funds to take care of future deserving cases. For it

must never be forgotten that assimilation works both ways; that immigrants are assimilating us, and if too numerous and too alien they destroy our power of lifting them, just as a strong man may be made feeble by the smallest germs.

To sum up, the open hand may not be the most generous attitude, either toward our foreign-born citizens, toward present immigrants, toward future immigrants, or toward the world at large. In the words of Phillips Brooks: "If the world, in the great march of centuries, is going to be richer for the development of a certain national character, built up by a larger type of manhood here, then for the world's sake, for the sake of every nation that would pour in upon it that which would disturb that development, we have a right to stand guard over it."

For publications and membership in the Immigration Restriction League, address the Secretary, 101 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass. The dues for membership are as follows: For *annual* membership, one dollar, payable in advance upon admission and upon January 1st of each year; for *life* membership, ten dollars, payable upon admission, life members being exempt from annual dues.

The League is a strictly non-partisan and non-sectarian organization, with members from all parts of the United States. It advocates a more careful selection of immigration, but not the exclusion of any immigrants whose character and standards fit them to become citizens.

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION AND WORLD EUGENICS¹

THERE is one aspect of immigration restriction in the various countries which does not often receive much attention, namely, the possibility of its use as a method of world eugenics. Most persons think of migration in terms of space,—as the moving of a certain number of people from one part of the earth's surface to another. Whereas the much more important aspect of it is that of a functioning in time.

This comes from two facts. The first is that the vacuum left in any country by emigration is rapidly filled up through a rise in the birth rate. There are more people in England today than in the time of Elizabeth, in spite of the enormous emigration from that country to all parts of the world; and there are just as many sparrows in England today, in spite of the unfortunate spread of those birds in the United States. The vacuum is chiefly filled by the breeding of the lower classes. Thus, according to Professor Pearson, more than one half the births in England are now from the lowest one sixth of the population. In Italy, a similar condition fills the vacuum left by the very large emigration from there to North and South America.

The second fact is that immigration to any country of

¹ Publications of the Immigration Restriction League, No. 71.

(Reprinted from the *Journal of Heredity* (Organ of the American Genetic Association), Vol. X, No. 3, Washington, D. C., March, 1919.)

a given stratum of population tends to sterilize all strata of higher social and economic levels already in that country. So true is this that nearly all students of the matter are agreed that the United States would have a larger population today if there had been no immigration since 1820, and, it is needless to add, a much more homogeneous population. As long as the people of any community are relatively homogeneous, what differences of wealth and social position there may be do not affect the birth rate, or do so only after a considerable time. But put into that community a number of immigrants, inferior mentally, socially, and economically, and the natives are unwilling to have their children associate with them in work or social life. They then limit the number of their children in order to give them the capital or education to enter occupations in which they will not be brought into contact with the new arrivals. This result is quite apparent in New England, where successive waves of immigration from lower and lower levels have been coming in for eighty years. In the West, the same New England stock has a much higher birth rate, showing that its fertility has in no way diminished. In the South, where until very recently there was no immigration at all, and the only socially inferior race was clearly separated by the accident of color, the birth rate has remained very high, and the very large families of the colonial period are even now not uncommon.

This is not to say that other causes do not contribute to lower the birth rate of a country, for that is an almost world-wide phenomenon. But the desire to be separated from inferiors is as strong a motive to birth control as the desire for luxury or to ape one's economic superiors. Races follow Gresham's law as to money; the poorer of two kinds in the same place tends to supplant

the better. Mark you, *supplant*, not drive out. One of the most common fallacies is the idea that the natives whose places are taken by lower immigration are "driven up" to more responsible positions. A few may be pushed up; more are driven to a new locality, as happened in the mining regions; but most are prevented from coming into existence at all.

What is the result, then, of the migration of a million persons of lower level into a country where the average is of a higher level? Considering the world as a whole, there are, after a few years, two million persons of the lower type in the world, and probably from half a million to a million less of the higher type. The proportion of lower to higher in the country from which the migration goes may remain the same; but in the country receiving it, it has *risen*. Is the world as a whole the gainer?

Of course, the euthenist says at once that these immigrants are improved. We may grant that, although the improvement is probably much exaggerated. You cannot make bad stock into good by changing its meridian, any more than you can turn a cart horse into a hunter by putting it into a fine stable, or make a mongrel into a fine dog by teaching it tricks. But such improvement as there is involves time, expense, and trouble; and, when it is done, has anything been gained? Will any one say that the races that have supplanted the old Nordic stock in New England are any better, or as good, as the descendants of that stock would have been if their birth rate had not been lowered?

Further, in addition to the purely biological aspects of the matter, there are certain psychological ones. Although a cosmopolitan atmosphere furnishes a certain freedom in which strong congenital talents can develop, it is a question whether as many are not injured as

helped by this. Indeed, there is considerable evidence to show that for the production of great men, a certain homogeneity of environment is necessary. The reason of this is very simple. In a homogeneous community, opinions on a large number of matters are fixed. The individual does not have to attend to such things, but is free to go ahead on some special line of his own, to concentrate to his limit on his work, even though that work be fighting the common opinions. But in a community of many races, there is either cross-breeding or there is not. If there is, the children of such cross-breeding are liable to inherit two souls, two temperaments, two sets of opinions, with the result in many cases that they are unable to think or act strongly and consistently in any direction. The classic examples are Cuba, Mexico and Brazil. On the other hand, if there is no cross-breeding, the diversity exists in the original races, and in a community full of diverse ideals of all kinds much of the energy of the higher type of man is dissipated, and in two ways. First, in the intellectual field there is much more doubt about everything, and he tends to weigh, discuss, and agitate many more subjects, in order to arrive at a conclusion amid the opposing views. Second, in practical affairs, much time and strength have to be devoted to keeping things going along the old lines, which could have been spent in new research and development. In how many of our large cities today are men of the highest type spending their whole time fighting, often in vain, to maintain standards of honesty, decency, and order, and in trying to compose the various ethnic elements, who should be free to build new structures upon the old!

The moral seems to be this: Eugenics among individuals is encouraging the propagation of the fit, and limiting or preventing the multiplication of the unfit. World

eugenics is doing precisely the same thing as to races considered as wholes. Immigration restriction is a species of segregation on a large scale, by which inferior stocks can be prevented from both diluting and supplanting good stocks. Just as we isolate bacterial invasions, and starve out the bacteria by limiting the area and amount of their food supply, so we can compel an inferior race to remain in its native habitat, where its own multiplication in a limited area will, as with all organisms, eventually limit its numbers and therefore its influence. On the other hand, the superior races, more self-limiting than the others, with the benefits of more space and nourishment will tend to still higher levels.

This result is not merely a selfish benefit to the higher races, but a good to the world as a whole. The object is to produce the greatest number of those fittest not "for survival" merely, but fittest for all purposes. The lower types among men progress, so far as their racial inheritance allows them to, chiefly by imitation and emulation. The presence of the highest development and the highest institutions among any race is a distinct benefit to all the others. It is a gift of psychological environment to any one capable of appreciation.

It is important, therefore, that nothing in the constitution of the League of Nations should limit the right of any nation to decide who shall be admitted into its life; for, as Le Bon says, a preponderance of foreign elements destroys the most precious thing it possesses—its own soul.

ARISTOCRACY AND POLITICS¹

MR. ALLEYNE IRELAND's article "A Biological View of Politics," in the December number of the *Journal*, states a view with which many serious students are in sympathy, but which few have the courage to state. I say "courage" because the opposite view is so universal in popular discussion that it seems to be crying in the wilderness to preach against it.

The widespread and fatuous belief in universal suffrage and in what Goncourt called the "barbarism of number" is largely due, I think, to the increasing prevalence of a new psychological type. For lack of a better term I have coined the word "expansile" to designate it. Just as we have "motiles," "audiles" and "visuels," depending upon which sense is most active, so we have "expansiles," whose characteristic is that they are the victims of any idea which is broader or more inclusive quantitatively than some other. What bodily variation is correlated with this is not clear; but it may be a symbol, in the psycho-analytic sense, of claustrophobia, and may signify a reaction from the increasing urban life. The expansile tendency is especially marked in the desire for "equality" of any kind, this being a species of inclusiveness. In fact, in some persons, the lust for equality becomes a form of paranoia. Thus, if the discussion is of suffrage, everyone should have a

¹ Reprinted from the *Journal of Heredity* (Organ of the American Genetic Association), vol. x., No. 4, Washington, D. C., April, 1919.

vote; if of wages, everyone should have an equal wage; if of education, everyone should have an equal opportunity. The idea of proportional opportunity, by which those most gifted should have the best chance, is obnoxious to the expansile. The kind of thing often expressed in the phrase "brotherhood of man" implies the maximum of expansion and equality; although logically altruism is perfectly consistent with inequality.

The most disastrous example of false reasoning under the influence of the expansile tendency was provided by the French Revolution. It is well known that certain Masonic societies had a good deal to do with this event, notably the *Grand Orient* of France, and the *Philathètes* of Paris organized by Cagliostro. The false reasoning consisted in assuming that certain principles of equality, which had worked very well among the picked and chosen members of the lodges, could be extended at a stroke to the whole population of France. The writers of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution, being Masons, adopted the language of these principles when this country started on its separate existence. Fortunately, the population of the United States at that time consisted of picked specimens of the Nordic race, selected by the perils of voyaging hither and of exploiting a new country. These people had sense enough to entrust the management of their affairs to the most capable among them; so that, for some sixty or seventy years the government, although democratic in form, was aristocratic in fact. At the present time this is no longer true. Respect for intelligence and ability have so far disappeared that it is almost impossible for a strong and able man of independent views to be elected to high office. To get into office, a man must now play the demagogue.

The result is a lowering both of ideals and of execu-

ARISTOCRACY AND POLITICS¹

MR. ALLEYNE IRELAND's article "A Biological View of Politics," in the December number of the *Journal*, states a view with which many serious students are in sympathy, but which few have the courage to state. I say "courage" because the opposite view is so universal in popular discussion that it seems to be crying in the wilderness to preach against it.

The widespread and fatuous belief in universal suffrage and in what Goncourt called the "barbarism of number" is largely due, I think, to the increasing prevalence of a new psychological type. For lack of a better term I have coined the word "expansile" to designate it. Just as we have "motiles," "audiles" and "visuels," depending upon which sense is most active, so we have "expansiles," whose characteristic is that they are the victims of any idea which is broader or more inclusive quantitatively than some other. What bodily variation is correlated with this is not clear; but it may be a symbol, in the psycho-analytic sense, of claustrophobia, and may signify a reaction from the increasing urban life. The expansile tendency is especially marked in the desire for "equality" of any kind, this being a species of inclusiveness. In fact, in some persons, the lust for equality becomes a form of paranoia. Thus, if the discussion is of suffrage, everyone should have a

¹ Reprinted from the *Journal of Heredity* (Organ of the American Genetic Association), vol. x., No. 4, Washington, D. C., April, 1919.

vote; if of wages, everyone should have an equal wage; if of education, everyone should have an equal opportunity. The idea of proportional opportunity, by which those most gifted should have the best chance, is obnoxious to the expansile. The kind of thing often expressed in the phrase "brotherhood of man" implies the maximum of expansion and equality; although logically altruism is perfectly consistent with inequality.

The most disastrous example of false reasoning under the influence of the expansile tendency was provided by the French Revolution. It is well known that certain Masonic societies had a good deal to do with this event, notably the *Grand Orient* of France, and the *Philathètes* of Paris organized by Cagliostro. The false reasoning consisted in assuming that certain principles of equality, which had worked very well among the picked and chosen members of the lodges, could be extended at a stroke to the whole population of France. The writers of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution, being Masons, adopted the language of these principles when this country started on its separate existence. Fortunately, the population of the United States at that time consisted of picked specimens of the Nordic race, selected by the perils of voyaging hither and of exploiting a new country. These people had sense enough to entrust the management of their affairs to the most capable among them; so that, for some sixty or seventy years the government, although democratic in form, was aristocratic in fact. At the present time this is no longer true. Respect for intelligence and ability have so far disappeared that it is almost impossible for a strong and able man of independent views to be elected to high office. To get into office, a man must now play the demagogue.

The result is a lowering both of ideals and of execu-

in many cases; so that I am not now contending for special power based solely on ancestry.

But even where the better sort of men have the leadership, they are often subject to the temptation to weaken it for the benefit of a temporary advantage. Nearly every extension of the suffrage has been the result of a bargain in which some party in power has traded the public good for the adherence of some faction hitherto denied the ballot, and usually in the name of progress and reform. Ludovici has pointed out the deterioration in the British House of Lords through the successive creations of life peers, mostly made to tide over some political crisis; and that the addition of men unused to legislation, even though able in other lines, weakened the average capacity of the House. The same thing can be said of the broadening of the electorate itself. And yet the recent abolition of plural voting in Belgium has been hailed as a step on the road to the New Jerusalem! In this country, so far as I am aware, there have been only three cases where the suffrage has been changed from a broader to a narrower basis. In early Massachusetts, it was limited by a vote of all the colonists to church members and property owners; in New Jersey, woman suffrage was abolished early in the nineteenth century; and in Rhode Island, the property-owning qualification of \$75 was recently raised to \$300.

In my opinion, we never shall have good government until the suffrage is limited to those having a certain education, or paying a certain tax; perhaps also allowing those to vote who are willing to pay a fee for the privilege. We never shall have good financial management in cities where, as in Boston, 118,000 non-tax-payers spend the money of 18,000 tax-payers. For, taking things on the average, as we always have to do in sociological questions, the liability to a tax implies a

certain measure of success and ability. That is why the Bolshevik, who is a mentally and nervously irritable person, filled with hate in the form of envy, is so against property as an institution.

Limitation of the suffrage may seem impossible of accomplishment in these times, when we are seeking the smallest possible political unit, even as we try to split up the atoms of physical matter; and yet, if everyone would speak out who desires it, the achievement might not be so remote. Perhaps the most pregnant saying of Goethe, which embodied a generalization from his wide study of biology and other sciences, was that anything to succeed must have "Beschraenkung"—limitation. Goethe was not what I have called an expansile. He would doubtless have recognized that the chief danger of the American people today is the tendency to follow out logically abstract ideals without reference to the concrete situation. This, as Le Bon has shown, is a tendency indigenous to the Latin but not to the Nordic spirit. We are developing it partly through the dilution of our national character by immigration, and partly by hearkening to the catchwords of expansile leaders and those who wallow in humanitarian platitudes.

Therefore we should all be grateful to Mr. Ireland for stating the case so clearly, and for his testimony to the value of aristocracy, based on his long and thorough study of various experiments in government.

IMMIGRATION AND THE WORLD WAR¹

THE World War verified at least two things about immigration which had been previously asserted by experts, but doubted or ignored by the public. The latter knows very little about anthropology or the history of various past migrations; and its opinions are largely influenced by its local experience and by the articles and news items in the newspapers, most of which are inspired by various interests, and which give usually a narrow and immediate rather than a long range point of view.

The first point proved by the war was that the immigration of a million aliens a year is not necessary to sustain the industries of this country. During the war, there was practically no immigration, and at the same time millions of men were taken out of industry for the army and navy. It is true that production in many lines was curtailed; but in many others it was vastly extended. It is also true that to attract workers to the expanding trades money wages, and in some cases real wages, were sharply advanced. But, in the long run, high wages are a good thing for a country if a fair day's work is given for them. If there had been a great general shortage of labor as a result of the war there would not even now be requests to the Division of Distribution of the Bureau of Immigration to stop sending

¹ Publications of the Immigration Restriction League, No. 76.
(Reprinted from *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Philadelphia, January, 1921. Publication No. 1473.)

aliens into various localities. Undoubtedly there was, for a time, a shortage of workers in certain places and certain industries. The newspaper reports of this were, however, undoubtedly exaggerated. We must remember that the ideal condition, from the point of view of some employers of cheap labor, is to have two men waiting for every job, in order to keep down wages. Such a condition results in an immense amount of unemployment and misery, and shows that labor which is economically cheap for the employer is seldom socially cheap for the community.

The second point demonstrated by the war, and the most important one, was in regard to assimilation. A great deal of nonsense had been preached and swallowed whole by the people, to the effect that environment is all important and heredity of little account, in considering the effects of immigration. That falsest of all shibboleths "the melting-pot" had hypnotized statesmen and legislators. That inversion of Darwin's real teaching, which pronounced that survival indicated fitness for things other than mere survival, had permeated the public mind and made it careless of current changes and of the future.

Down to 1860, as Eliot Norton pointed out in *The Annals*,¹ the United States had begun to develop a definite national character based on well-known Nordic traits. The colonial population had consisted of picked specimens of Nordic races. The Irish immigration of 1846 contributed further Nordic strains; and, what is important to observe, the German emigration of 1848 was also Nordic, whereas the more recent German immigrants are largely Alpine. Things having gone so well down to 1860, the policy of the "open door" became fixed, in spite of the warnings of Washington, Jefferson,

¹ Vol. 24, p. 163 (July, 1904).

Adams, Madison and Franklin as to the danger of unguarded gates.

From 1860 and especially after 1880, the whole situation changed. In 1914, nearly three-quarters of all alien immigrants were Alpine, Mediterranean or Asiatic and only one-quarter Nordic. In other words, 863 thousand of those coming in that year were from races with a different historic background, different customs and different ideals. This change had been proceeding with increasing intensity for forty years.

Now the temperamental optimist, the social worker and the average citizen had insisted that in the new environment of America the alien rapidly changed into a "good American." When the evidence did not entirely bear this out, some said that although the alien might be assimilating us instead of our assimilating him, nevertheless this was a good thing, and that the mixture of conflicting types was a benefit.

The World War completely knocked out these cheerful conclusions by revealing that the superficial changes constituting "Americanization" were entirely inadequate to affect the hereditary tendencies of generations; and that a mixture of conflicting types and opinions seriously affected the capacity of the nation to think and to act as a unit.

Take first the hostile attitude of many of the immigrants from the Central Powers. Probably a large majority of those of German descent, especially of those descended from Germans coming before 1870, were loyal. But the term "German" as used in statistical publications is quite ambiguous. Dr. W. S. Sadler has pointed out² that in 1600 Germany was almost entirely Nordic. Then, owing to the Thirty Years' War and other wars, the Nordic element was largely killed off

² Sadler, W. S. *Long Heads and Round Heads.*

and its place taken by Slavic Alpines, so that in 1914, Germany was 90 per cent Alpine and only 10 per cent Nordic. This, in his opinion, accounts largely for the fact that the World War was fought on the German side so much more lawlessly and cruelly than was the War of 1870. The characteristics of the Nordic race are individual initiative, love of personal liberty, and a certain chivalry and sportsmanship. The Alpine and Mediterranean races on the other hand tend to centralization of authority, reliance upon the state, and in war to subservience and absence of moral quality. Another element, the Semitic, is largely international or racial in its interests.

The resistance to the draft law, whether from cowardice, indifference or conscientious objection revealed the difference in attitude between the earlier and the later immigration, and this again showed that apparent "Americanization" was built in many cases upon quicksand. The unanimous opinion of American and French observers was to the effect that those American regiments composed chiefly of Nordic stock or led by Nordic officers were by far the most valuable.

It is estimated that at the present time from 40 to 55 per cent of our population are still Nordic. It is also stated that at least ten million aliens of non-Nordic races are anxious to come here at once. If this should be kept up for the next twenty years, it is easy to see that anywhere from twenty to forty millions or more of non-Nordic races might come, utterly changing the balance of race-stocks in this country. And, as everything depends upon the people who are here to do things, especially under universal suffrage, this would mean at the worst a profound change in our institutions and ideals, and at the best an ineffectiveness born of the mixture of diverse elements.

And still we do not learn the lesson. We forget that Egypt, Greece and Rome, as well as Chaldea, Phoenicia and Carthage, perished from the peaceful invasion of alien races.¹ Still we are led away from facing matters squarely by the red herrings of distribution of aliens and "Americanization." Neither distribution nor Americanization is possible while one or two millions of alien types are being poured into the country. I do not say that the aims and efforts of those engaged in the Americanization movement are wrong, but I maintain that the energy of many good men and a vast amount of money are being diverted from the only path by which success can be attained. I have no doubt also that they are encouraged by those who wish immigration left practically unrestricted. It has always been so in the past. Any important change in habits of thought and racial tendencies requires at least several generations. As I have said elsewhere,² "you can not make bad stock into good by changing its meridian, any more than you can turn a cart horse into a hunter by putting it into a fine stable, or make a mongrel into a fine dog by teaching it tricks." We must get away from the one-dimension, sentimental point of view that all men and all races are potentially equal, and from the two-dimensional economic view which considers man as merely a producing and a consuming animal, and face the truths of history and anthropology.

How much has "Americanization" changed the revolutionary communists in our large cities? How many more agitators are being allowed to come in to-

¹ See an excellent historical survey by Charles W. Gould, *America, a Family Matter* (Scribners, 1920); see also, Alfred P. Schultz, *Race or Mongrel* (Boston, 1908).

² *Journal of Heredity*, vol. x., No. 3, March, 1919.

day to make trouble in the future? They can not be detected by ordinary methods of inspection.

While immigration was at a low ebb and patriotic fervor was at its height during the war, there was a splendid chance to pass a stringent immigration law, even over a probable veto. We did nothing, as usual. It took twenty-six years to get the reading test into the law, although it is the most valuable restrictive clause we have. We are dallying with our future safety just at the time when, as Lothrop Stoddard so clearly shows,¹ there is a probability that the brown and yellow races of Asia will soon resume that western movement which was checked for a time by Charlemagne. Bolshevism is essentially such a movement of oriental Tartar tribes led by Asiatic Semites against Nordic *bourgeoisie*. Japan is arming. Before the war she was poor; now she is rich.² The next big war may be in the Pacific. To prepare for that, indeed merely to maintain our present development, we need to become and to remain a strong, self-reliant, united country, with the only unity that counts, viz., that of race.

What, then, shall we do? Exclude the black, the brown and the yellow altogether; as to the white, favor the immigration of Nordic and Nordicized stocks. This will best be attained by limiting immigration from any country annually to a certain per cent of those from that country already naturalized here.³ Naturalization, when not artificially fostered, is one of the best tests of assimilability, and experience shows that it is the Nordic races that become naturalized. The effect

¹ *The Rising Tide of Color*. (New York, Scribners, 1920.)

² See Thomas F. Millard, *The New Far East*, pp. 33-35; *Our Eastern Question*, p. 217.

³ This proposition is embodied in H. R. 10837 of the 66th Congress and in §9 of H. R. 12320 introduced by the Chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, Feb. 4, 1920.

84 IMMIGRATION AND OTHER INTERESTS

in a year like 1914 under a 50 per cent limitation, would have been as follows:

	<i>Actually admitted</i>	<i>Admissible under bill</i>
Northern and Western Europe.....	189,177	1,090,500
Southern and Eastern Europe.....	945,288	279,288

In other words, the total European immigration would have been reduced 47 per cent by reducing that from southern and eastern Europe 71 per cent.

Some such measures as these are essential to the perpetuation of what the United States stands for, not only within its boundaries, but to the world at large.

THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF IMMIGRATION¹

THE prediction of the best experts that, after the ending of the World War, immigration to this country would again reach the high-water mark of a million a year, which it made during the decade before the war, seems almost certain to be fulfilled. Although the net addition to population during the fiscal year 1920 was only about 193,000, the best testimony is to the effect that the numbers likely to come in the next few years will be limited only by the capacity of the steamships to bring them; in other words that a million to a million and a half will come annually.

The only influences likely to keep aliens at home are: First, a revival of racial and national aspirations in the newly created states of Europe; second, the amount of reconstruction work in countries within the war zone; third, the efforts of the various countries to keep their citizens at home for military reasons, until the political outlook is clearer; fourth, the adoption of prohibition by this country. The increased cost of passports and steerage rate has been shown already not to be an influence deterring from emigration.

The influences in favor of migration are much more potent than those above-mentioned. There has been a tremendous uprooting of families and individuals all through Europe. Persons who have once left their

¹ *North American Review (The)* May, 1921.

homes, who perhaps have no homes to return to, are very likely to seek to start life again in a new country, although they might never have thought of it under normal conditions. It remains to be seen whether the League of Nations can be counted as a factor for war or for peace; and, until the outlook is clearer, the demands of the various countries for military service are not likely to diminish. Added to this is the frightful burden of war taxation, sure to be continued for a long period. If, by any chance, some disarmament agreement should lessen the demand for military service, this would be offset by the relaxation of regulations against migration; for European countries will know the great value of colonies of their citizens in America who send home large sums to their relatives in Europe.

We may be sure that the steamship companies will seek to turn to their profit any unsettlement of mind among the various peoples. For emigrants, who load and unload themselves and their effects, and cost but little to feed during the voyage, are the most profitable cargoes that can be carried. And the normal activities in this direction are likely to be further stimulated by a large increase in merchant shipping, and of commerce especially with the United States, resulting in keen competition with temporarily lower rates. Great Britain and this country will have an enormous tonnage for commercial purposes, and Germany has already taken steps to restore her merchant marine and to compete for her former place in transportation. Never have the steamship companies been more active at Washington than at present; and the fact that more ships are flying the American flag than before the war helps the arguments of the transportation interests. America is also sure to be better known and more talked about in Europe than ever before; and the comparative

scale of wages and comfort which we provided for our soldiers will be an object lesson to reinforce the letters of earlier immigrants here, and their remittances to Europe on which whole districts have prospered.

For the past thirty years a large part of our annual immigration has not been what might be called a normal flow of population; but has been artificially stimulated in every way by the transportation companies. Although there has been legislation both here and abroad to check misrepresentation and fraud, there has been an emigration propaganda carried on by thousands of steamship agents reaching into the most remote hamlets of Europe and Western Asia. The schoolmaster and the parish priest have been agents to sell tickets on commission; and much use has been made of former emigrants returning home for a visit. Although, just at the moment, no persuasion is needed to secure enough immigrants to fill the ships, this sort of thing will be resumed whenever necessary, and on a larger scale than ever before.

In addition to the foregoing general considerations, there are special conditions in several countries which call for notice. What may happen in Russia no man knows; but it is pretty safe to say that at the present moment a considerable part of the people of Russia would like to be somewhere else. What was said above as to the uprooting of home ties and the fear of future disturbances will *a fortiori* apply to Russia for some time to come. Mr. Schiff, who was as well informed as anyone, expected three million Jews to come to this country after the war. Russia contains more Jews than any other European country, and most of those millions will come from there. Others will come from Turkey and the Balkan States. For the Zionist movement is more sentimental and formal than practical; and Pales-

tine under any system of government, and with the help of extensive irrigation works and industrial plants, is yet incapable of supporting any large population.

The British Government took steps, even before the war, to make India more self-governing. Lord Morley started this movement; and, since his time in the India office, much more has been done in the same direction. If India becomes in fact a self-governing commonwealth, this will tend to assimilate it in the public mind to the other commonwealths in the British Empire, and to validate the idea of a similar treatment of its citizens. At the present time, Hindus are, with few exceptions, excluded from the United States under the geographical limitations in the act of 1917. They are likewise excluded from Australia under the law which requires an immigrant to be able to read in any language prescribed by the inspecting officials. From Canada they are excluded by the indirect actions of two Orders in Council. But now India has contributed most important aid in protecting the Empire as a whole; and may not this fact change her status not only within but without the British possessions?

Of more immediate interest is the Japanese situation. Japanese of the laboring class are now theoretically excluded from this country by an agreement with Japan, made in 1907 and commonly referred to as the "Gentlemen's Agreement." They are also excluded under the law of 1917 as being among those excluded at the time of the passage of the law by an arrangement with a foreign country, although the specific compact with Japan was not mentioned in the law. Japanese laborers exceeding five hundred in any year are also excluded from Canada, under an agreement with Japan. Here, again, the future of Russia creates uncertainty; and for the following reason. Japan is not a democratic coun-

try. She is absolutely governed by the Genro, a body of not over seven men, choosing its own successors. Neither the emperor nor the Parliament really counts. These seven men make their plans for many years ahead. Hitherto, the eyes of the governing body have been fixed on two things: the commercial supremacy of the Pacific, and the right to colonize in the Western hemisphere. But to these has been added recently another element,—a Monroe doctrine for Asia, of which Japan is to be the administrator, coupled with a free hand in leading the awakening of the East. Now if she can play the rôle which she aspires to in the peaceful penetration and development of China, Mongolia, Manchuria and perhaps Siberia, her attention may be turned in that direction for some time. Both England and the United States gave her a free hand during the war, partly in consideration of her services to the Allied cause, partly from the necessities of the situation. Before the war Japan was poor; now she is relatively rich. But she has not put her money into redeeming land for cultivation, although she is always complaining of pressure of population. She has instead doubled her army, and probably her navy. These things may assure her freedom of action in Asia, if Russia should for a long time be disorganized and helpless. On the other hand, if Russia should be rehabilitated speedily, and England be free to interfere, Japanese ambitions on the continent may be checked, and in that case she would concentrate on the other two points of her policy. It must be remembered also that at the present time there is little inducement for Japanese laborers to settle in Asia to compete with coolies who can live on two or three cents a day. They would much rather come to this country and underbid a wage of two or three dollars a day. Japan acquired Formosa twenty years ago; yet

to-day there are only 120,000 Japanese there as compared with 3,000,000 natives. A similar situation exists in Korea.

But, while developing her scheme of the hegemony of Asia, Japan does not forget the other two principles of her policy. Commercial supremacy in the Pacific is practically already hers; and she means to keep it. And this leads directly to the third principle—that of colonizing in the Western hemisphere; for trade requires agents and immigrants in the various countries; and the steamship agents of Japan are no different from those of other countries, and would like to build up a large emigrant business. The campaign for the right of free immigration, apart from asking for it at the peace conference, which will be referred to later, takes two forms. First, colonizing in Central and South America wherever opportunity offers, with the idea of later exerting pressure upon North America. The relations between Japan and Mexico are close, and not entirely a dream in the brain of a futile Zimmerman. A case might arise in one of these southern countries where we should either have to assert the Monroe doctrine or abandon it. If we abandon it, the logic of uniformity would be invoked to change our policy as to oriental immigration to the United States.

The second form of propaganda consists in a direct agitation in this country to place Japanese immigration upon the same footing as that from other countries; and particularly to secure the right of naturalization. This agitation has been skilfully and vigorously directed. Able publicists, both Japanese and American, are engaged in the work. Churches maintaining missionaries in the East have been pressed into service, and they in turn have enlisted large numbers of philanthropists and social workers in the cause. The arguments em-

ployed are well set forth in a recent article by Mr. K. K. Kawakami, in the *Yale Review*. Some of the agitators, and many publications in Japan, even hint at the use of force if necessary; and it is known that the Philippine authorities organized for possible trouble in the early spring of 1914. A bill has been prepared, representing the views of the committee on oriental relations of the Federal Council of Churches in Christ, designed to put all immigration upon a percentage basis, and to abolish the special treatment of orientals. Organized labor is, however, unalterably opposed to permitting the economic competition of oriental labor; and the statesmen of the Pacific Slope are equally opposed to admitting Japanese, Chinese and Hindus on social and other grounds. Under certain conditions in Asia, no trouble is likely to arise: with other conditions there may yet be a war between the white and the yellow races. Meanwhile Japan, according to Mr. Uyehara, a member of the Parliamentary Commission which visited the United States two years ago, intended to ask at the Peace Conference for the right of free immigration to Australia, India, Canada and this country. Furthermore, she would like to have asked for the independence of the Philippines, and the neutralization of Hawaii. These last demands probably would have been makeweights, but were in line with the principle of Japanese hegemony of the Pacific.

Over and above these special perplexing questions remains the perpetual problem of a sound immigration policy. There are those who take account of racial differences, and who believe that the legislators of the present are trustees of the inheritance of our past for the benefit of future generations of citizens; and who do not wish to see extensive race substitutions in this country. On the other side, those who value present wealth

created by cheap labor join hands with certain philanthropists who believe that all men are brothers and equally entitled to any part of the earth's surface.

It is often falsely said that this country was founded to be a refuge for men of all lands; yet even in the days of sparse settlement Washington, Adams, Jefferson and many others were strong in their demand for immigration restriction, and since 1882 it must be considered to have been the fixed policy of the nation. Under the present law, passed in 1917, thirty classes of persons are prohibited from landing, constituting from two to eight per cent of those applying for admission. It is, however, characteristic of this country that there has to be much more law on any subject than one expects to get enforced; and the lengthy enumeration of debarred classes does not prevent the entrance of most of the physically and some of the mentally defective, or of many who quickly become public charges in our hospitals, prisons and charitable institutions. Nor does the requirement that an immigrant must be able to read in some language, valuable as it is, prevent the entrance of those who remain aliens in mental outlook and traits of character.

The facts that immigration practically ceased when the war began, and that, in spite of the millions taken for warlike occupations, business went on with as little disturbance as it did, conclusively prove that the necessity of a million immigrants a year to keep our industries going is a myth. Undoubtedly, there is always a demand on the part of employers for labor willing to work at less than the current wage. But, if wages are to be kept down, how is the average citizen to progress in comfort and refinement, or indeed in consuming power? It must not be forgotten that every wave of inferior immigration to some extent sterilizes every stratum of

our population above it; so that the question is not of adding new racial elements, but of substituting the new for the old. Indeed, many eminent economists agree that our population would be larger to-day than it is, if we had received no immigration since 1820; and, what is more important, that it would be more homogeneous in ideals and national spirit. For there is no shibboleth that can in a twinkling change a man's heredity. Neither naturalization, nor the expensive but very superficial "Americanization" campaign now going on, nor the public schools, can effect any fundamental change in a short time. This is well shown by the recent testimony of Capt. Trevor, formerly of the U. S. Military Intelligence Department, before the Senate Committee on Immigration. He pointed out that in every case centers of revolutionary and communistic agitation are found in the colonies of recent immigration. Everyone knows that many of those prominent in the Russian revolution had lived for a considerable time in New York. A number of agitators personally known to me are well educated, speak English fluently, and are entirely familiar with the Constitution and history of the United States. In this connection, I may say that the argument against the reading test, because it does not exclude persons of this sort, is quite illogical. It was never intended for this purpose. The reading test does exclude much of the ignorant material upon which agitators can best work, as well as many of the mentally and physically defective who might not be excluded under the express provisions dealing with such classes. But for dealing with the revolutionist other provision must be made.

I do not object to the "Americanization" movement in itself, although it is expensive. I doubt if it will be very successful in the case of aliens whose habits, ideals

and historical background are different from ours. But I maintain that no plan of Americanization can or will succeed if a million new aliens come in every year; and I do object to its being used, as it frequently is, to draw attention away from the need of immigration restriction.

Still another favorite red herring of the anti-restrictionists is the matter of distributing immigrants. They say that the trouble is not that there are too many immigrants, but that they do not go to the right places. We have had a Division of Distribution in the Immigration Bureau for a number of years. It has spent a good deal of money and has accomplished very little. The alien wants to go where his friends are, and to the big centers where construction jobs are easier to get. It has been suggested that an alien should not be allowed to come in unless he agrees to go to a certain place. Well and good, but how are you going to keep him there? The city of Charleston some years ago imported a picked shipload of immigrants; within a few months not one could be found within the State. Of the Mexican laborers recently imported, under what is practically a peonage system, to do agricultural work for a certain time and then be returned to their homes, already over twenty per cent have disappeared, according to the *Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration*, so that they cannot be deported according to contract. It would require a Russian police system to enforce any permanent distribution of aliens. There is also some question as to the legality of favoring particular localities and trades in the matter.

Another suggestion often made is that matters would be much improved if inspection were made at the ports of emigration instead of at our ports. Assuming that inspection were equally efficient on each side of the water, the gain would be entirely that of the aliens and

steamships. But the proposition assumes that the whole theory of our immigration laws since 1882 has been wrong. This theory is that the steamships, to avoid carrying inadmissible aliens back and the fines imposed for bringing them, will cause inspection to be made at the place where the ticket is sold. Counting in local agents, priests, teachers and returned immigrants, there are probably not less than 50,000 ticket agents in Europe. These men know the native dialects and often know the intending immigrants personally; and they execute our laws without expense to us. Further, the steamships have their own doctors to make a medical examination at the ports of embarkation, again without expense to us. Now it is obvious that an American inspector at Danzig knows no more about an immigrant from the interior of Poland than if he were in New York. We must therefore have inspectors in interior places. But where are we to get 50,000 or even 20,000 men who know the native dialects and are competent to inspect, at any wages we are likely to pay? And if inspection is often defective at our ports where we can watch it, what assurance have we that it will be any better thousands of miles away with almost no oversight? Many natives will certainly be employed as assistants, and our recent experiences with medical inspection in Italy show that these cannot always be depended on. But the conclusive argument against inspection abroad is that foreign governments have always refused to allow it. It amounts to a species of extra territorial sovereignty engaged in taking their good citizens and leaving the defectives, delinquents and agitators. Why should the foreign governments favor it? If they do not, political and trade considerations will probably always prevent our attempting to force them to sanction it.

In view of the foregoing, those who feel that we need some elbow room to work out our problems with regard to the aliens already here, are convinced that we should cut down substantially the annual total of immigration; and, further, that this cutting down should be done in such a way as to favor the races kindred to those which originally built up the country. Before the Civil War the population was almost entirely Nordic, and our political and social institutions were developed along the lines of the Nordic spirit. To-day, perhaps a little over one half our population is Nordic, while our immigration is almost entirely Alpine, Mediterranean, Semitic and Asiatic. If such immigration is allowed to come in at the rate of a million a year, the balance of race-stocks will be changed in a very few years.

The best plan in sight for cutting down the total number of immigrants and at the same time favoring the kindred Nordic races is that based on the natural capacity of the alien for assimilation. Such a capacity is indicated roughly by his desire to become naturalized, when this is voluntary, and not the result of what seems to the writer shortsighted and misguided zeal on the part of others to induce him to change his allegiance. A bill now pending in Congress¹ limits immigration from any country in any year to from twenty to fifty per cent of the natives of such country who were naturalized at the date of the last census. The exact percentage is to be fixed each year by the Secretary of Labor, with reference to labor conditions. The bill in practice would let in all who want to come from Western Europe, but would cut down the numbers from Eastern Europe and Western Asia. In 1914, under the maximum limitation, the effect of such a bill would have been as follows:

¹ H. R. 10837, 66th Congress.

IMMIGRATION—PRESENT AND FUTURE 97

	<i>Actually admitted</i>	<i>Admissible under bill</i>
Northern and Western Europe.	189,177	1,090,500
Southern and Eastern Europe.	945,288	279,288

If the United States is to continue to stand for that which it has always represented, not only within its borders, but to the world at large; if it is to be protected from that preponderance of those who are foreigners, not only in name but in character, which as Le Bon says destroys a nation's soul, some such legislation should be speedily enacted.¹

¹ Since this article was written, the Dillingham bill passed the 66th Congress by very large votes, and was pocket-vetoed by President Wilson. This limited immigration annually from any country to three per cent (with some exceptions) of the natives of such countries who were *residents* here according to the census of 1910. The three per cent in the Dillingham bill is nearly equal to seventeen per cent under the bill referred to above, as regards Southern and Eastern Europeans; but, the bill based upon the *naturalized* would allow proportionally more Northern and Western Europeans to come in, and therefore, in the opinion of the writer, is a better bill. But either measure would be a long step in the right direction. The Dillingham bill will be introduced into the new Congress, and is likely to be speedily enacted.

BIRTH CONTROL AND WORLD EUGENICS¹

I HAVE elsewhere called attention to the possible use of immigration restriction as a means of race segregation and world eugenics. But immigration to any country is only one half of the problem; the other half is the migration coming from "heaven," that is through births.

The two methods of addition to the population have precisely similar advantages and dangers. With immigration, a selection can be made not only of the better individuals of any race, but of those of the better races. If immigration is not selected, not only personally unfit individuals may come, but less desirable races, which tend to supplant the better ones. In precisely the same way, with births left to chance, as is largely the case at present, many defective individuals may be born, and an unduly large number of normal individuals may be born from less desirable stock. To make the parallel complete, we have in each case the strongest forces at work to increase numbers: in the case of immigration, the desire for material advantage and the cupidity of the transportation companies; and, in the case of births, the sex instinct.

There are certain other respects in which immigration and births resemble each other. It is more difficult to induce prosperous, successful and efficient persons in any country to migrate to another, just as the same

¹ Unpublished.

class within any country is more prudent and less prolific. On the other hand, the ignorant, the poor, the incompetent, those having no great stake in their own land, are easily induced to move elsewhere; and such a class in any country is not only ignorant of the means of regulating births, but only too ready to relieve the dreary round of a narrow life by means of the most exciting passion known to man.

It is a general principle of biology that the lower and less valuable the organism, the more prolific. In all parts of the world, the lower classes of men breed more rapidly than the higher; and, but for sanitary and other causes, would presently swamp the better elements in the community. With the increase of public hygiene these checks tend to operate less radically, so that when population reaches a certain pressure there is a strong movement to migrate, such as we see to-day in Italy and Japan. Thus the birthrate may be a cause of migration, and immigration may have a profound effect upon the birth rate.

For example in 1900 the birth rate in certain places in this country was 2.7 for whites of native parentage, and 4.4 for whites of foreign parentage. It was 6.2 for Poles, 5.6 for Russians, as compared with 4.2 for Swedes, 3.5 for English Canadians, and 3.4 for English. The largest birth rates were: first generation of Poles, 6.2; first generation of French Canadians, 5.8. These rates are more than double that of the native stock; and it is obvious that, granted fairly hygienic surroundings, the continuance of such rates would result in swamping the native element in the areas tabulated. As a matter of fact, there is some diminution of the birthrate among immigrants in the second and third generations, owing to the increase in the standard of living and the learning of contraceptive methods from natives. Thus the birth

rate of the second generation of whites of foreign parentage was 3.9 as compared with 4.7 for the original immigrants; but this rate was still more than one and one half times the rate of the native whites, and has probably been offset by a still further fall in the native rate.

It is apparent that it will in any case require a considerable time for an immigrant population to reach a state where the same checks on fecundity will operate which have operated on the natives; and this will, in general, not occur unless successive migrations of inferior strata arrive to exert the same sterilizing effect upon the first comers which they in turn exerted upon the natives.

Logically "birth control" of the less desirable and "birth release" of the more desirable should go hand in hand. But, although from time to time temporary fashions in favor of large families among the upper classes may here and there prevail, and although persons like Roosevelt may preach large families, nevertheless that social and economic pressure which demands "concentration of advantages" through smaller families, is too powerful to make birth release possible to any useful extent.

If, then, there is to be any movement to put the breeding of the more desirable and of the less desirable in any country on a proximate equality, it must be one involving the teaching of birth control methods to the lower classes; for the upper classes already know them. Formerly, nature favored such equality through disease, poor food and lack of sanitation operating amongst the more prolific. To-day it is different; and indeed it was one of Darwin's last reflections that survival was being made so easy that natural selection would be seriously interfered with. I knew an Irish emigrant of 1850 who had fourteen children, of whom only three

survived him. To-day, he might have only ten, but most of them would grow to maturity.

It is an unfortunate thing that the United States is about the only country in the world where information as to how to prevent too frequent conceptions cannot be freely given. There is a federal postal law against sending it through the mails. In the statutes of many States prevention of conception is classed with abortion. Most of these statutes were passed many years ago before the hygienic advantage of the proper spacing of children had received any attention. In New England, where legislation was largely founded on the Pentateuch, and discussion of sexual matters was considered obscene; and contraceptive literature was coupled in the laws with abortion and blasphemy. Even as recently as 1917, a young man was convicted in Massachusetts for giving away a pamphlet containing contraceptive information, under a statute regarding obscene publications.

In England, France, Germany, in fact throughout Europe such information can be freely distributed. In Holland, Australia and New Zealand there are birth control clinics sanctioned by the government where poor women can be taught how to limit their families. The results in Holland, where there are fifty-two such clinics, have been very interesting. The charity cases have been cut in half; the stature of the army has risen in a very marked manner; and the net addition to population has risen also, because, although the birth rate has fallen, the death rate has fallen still more. In other words, every child has a better show.

I want to speak particularly of the effect in Holland upon the army enlistments, because it has a direct bearing upon my main thesis. According to the *Official Statistical Yearbook of the Netherlands*, the proportion of

enlistments over five feet seven inches in height has increased from 24.5 to 47.5 per cent since 1865; and the proportion of those below five feet, two and one half inches has fallen from 25.0 to 8.0 per cent. Now this increase in height is not due solely to improved living conditions, but chiefly to the fact that the birth control clinics operate among the Alpine and Mediterranean elements of the population, which are smaller in stature than the Nordic. The result of checking the birth rate of the former has been to give the latter a better opportunity; and the Nordic element, relieved from the economic pressure of the others, has increased its birth rate, and furnishes a larger proportion of the recruits than formerly.

To illustrate in our own country. If the so-called "old immigration," which came here before 1880, together with the native stock could be put on an equality as to birth rate with the "new immigration" coming since 1880, the Nordic element here would have at least an even chance; whereas, as things are, it will have a difficult time to hold its own.

There is not only the direct competition of the numbers of the lower classes and lower races; but there is the indirect burden upon the more fit of carrying the less fit. Schools, hospitals, charitable enterprises of all kinds, the attempt in countless ways to raise the average by raising the backward, prevent those advances which might otherwise take place. I remember sixteen pages, in the report of a New York charity, of entries of visits, relief and various kinds of action taken in the case of one feeble-minded woman with fourteen children.

Now one of the chief causes of defective children is their too frequent arrival, which not only brings physiological poverty to both mother and child, but in-

creases economic want. In 1911, in Johnstown, Pa., a field study showed deaths per 1000 births as follows:

Families 1-2 children.....	108.5
“ 3-4 “	126.0
“ 5-6 “	152.8
“ 7-8 “	176.4
“ 9 or more.....	191.7

The same thing was found in Chicago.

Families of 4 children and less.....	118
“ “ 6 “	267
“ “ 7 “	280
“ “ 8 “	291
“ “ 9 and over.....	303

Dr. S. Adolphus Knopf, a high authority upon tuberculosis, reports that the tuberculous cases are almost always, in cases of large families, among the children later than the fourth.

The international conventions of workingmen have frequently demanded, not only free rights of migration, but a wage based upon the cost of adequately supporting a family of five or six children. If this latter demand were to be sustained, the burden put upon the more successful portion of the community, which does not undertake to have six children, would be still larger. Already, according to Professor Karl Pearson, more than one half of the births in England come from the lowest one sixth of the population.

But, whatever may happen in the West, the real population problem of this century lies in the Orient. It is a hopeful sign that a Japanese commission in this country recently investigated methods of birth control, with a view to teaching them widely in Japan. On the other hand, the low condition of the bulk of the population in Japan, China and India, as well as the prevalence

of certain religious beliefs, makes it very unlikely that birth control will make much progress in those countries. If it could be brought about, much of the famine, abortion, infanticide and prostitution would disappear, as well as a part of the dangers of war, one of the main inducements to which is the pressure of population.

Kipling, in one of his recent stories, looks forward to the time when the total population of the world will be about one half of what it is at present, and, with the help of new inventions and machinery, will be far more healthy and prosperous.

Birth control, then, like immigration restriction, should be applied: (1) to the defective and delinquent stocks of all races; and (2) to the less desirable races. Why should human reason be applied to the breeding of animals and plants, to almost everything in fact, except the breeding of man? The first thing to do is to make sound knowledge available; the second to secure its application. Proper discussion of sexual matters should no longer be considered obscene; parenthood should be voluntary and rational, and not a matter of chance.

REPRESENTATION WITHOUT TAXATION¹

THE late Samuel Butler had a favorite diversion—that of turning a familiar proverb or maxim upside down, to see what truth could be found in its opposite. Generally, he found a good deal of truth; and the method is one that need not be limited to followers of Hegel. For we all get into the habit of taking old sayings at their face value without much examination; indeed, education, to say nothing of propaganda and advertising, depends for its success upon the repetition and reiteration, in very nearly the same form, of something which it is desired to impress upon the infant or the uncritical mind. Napoleon went so far as to say that repetition was the only serious figure in logic.

Further, we all have habitual preferences for certain ways of thought. Like a fly crawling over the tableau of history, each of us seems to prefer some especial color to walk on. This may be due to instinctive protective mimicry. The chorus in *Faust* tells us to avoid what does not agree with us, what stirs our insides unpleasantly. So one fly likes to crawl on the high lights and adopts the great man theory of history; another likes the dull, massed colors, and attributes everything to the vast, vague undercurrents of popular instinct; one chooses the rosy and saffron tints of the romantic theory; another the single muddy tone which Marx called the economic interpretation. Few of us can get

¹ Unpublished.

far enough away from the surface of the picture to see the dramatic meaning of the whole; and, when we do, our eyes are apt to focus badly.

It is, then, a good thing once in a while to take some time-honored saying, and to turn it upside down or inside out, and to note the result. We have good authority, besides that of Butler, for doing so; because, if a maxim is time-honored, it means that the majority has endorsed it, and Herbert Spencer has reminded us that majorities are always wrong, though never wholly wrong.

In the early days of this nation, it was accepted without question that taxation without representation is tyranny. Indeed that maxim may be said to have caused the separation of the colonies from Britain. I want to reverse this saying, and to consider if it be not equally true that representation without taxation is tyranny. Charles Reade once reduced all arguments to three: *tu quoque*, *tu mentiris*, and *vos damnemini*—you're another, you lie, to hell with you. A combination of these three arguments, much in fashion at the present time, is to say "you're a reactionary." This is used whether the poor mortal to be squelched wants to return to the city-state of Pericles, or merely to have things left as they were yesterday. Whoever is not moving rapidly in some direction, even though it be as Sumner once said of Garrison, toward the edge of a precipice, is a reactionary.

Let us not, however, be afraid of this word. Men, like children, tire of any game after a period. Nietzsche may not be right in thinking that anything that has been will happen again an infinite number of times; and yet nothing is more certain than that aristocratic forms will return after some hundreds of years, and that the wisdom of to-day will seem folly to those who come

after us, even though meanwhile the phrase "kingdom of heaven" shall be expunged from the prayer book as too monarchical.

Now the essence of the phrase "taxation without representation is tyranny" is democracy—the right of all to have a share in the government. It means this because its original application to a colony has been transferred to the individual man; and a little premiss has been surreptitiously smuggled in to the effect that every one is taxed. The converse proposition, that "representation without taxation is tyranny" stands essentially for aristocracy, for the idea that only those measuring up to a certain standard should have a leading part in the government. It is truly remarkable what a magic formula the word "democracy" has become in modern times. It is almost the "one God, one law, one element, and one divine far off divine event." If anything is wrong anywhere, all that is needed is democracy, and after that more democracy. Here and there a Lecky or a Henry Adams may decline to put flowers on its altar; but he has R (for reactionary) pinned upon him as surely as A was used in the times of the *Scarlet Letter*. Professor H. M. Varrall has called my attention to a curious parallel in the Middle Ages. Then the system was monasticism; and whenever anything seemed to be the matter with it, the remedy proposed was more monasticism.

It seems that Americans, more than other Nordic peoples (if indeed we are still a Nordic people) like to be fooled by the sound of words. They were long hypnotized by that falsest of shibboleths "the melting-pot"; they are now entranced by any orator who shouts "humanity" or "democracy." For, though democracy be, in the words of Plato, the best form of bad government, we have never had it in the United States, and do

not have it now. As I have shown elsewhere¹ the democratic phrases in our Constitution and Declaration of Independence came from France; and in France they were the result of trying to apply at a stroke to the whole population certain principles of equality which had worked well among the selected membership of those Masonic lodges which had a good deal to do with the French Revolution. But it was characteristic of the relatively intelligent and almost wholly Nordic population of our colonies that, although it played with these phrases, and made much of them as compared with the feudalism of Britain, yet in practice it was as aristocratic as any country could be. For the people were intelligent enough to pick out the most able among them, and to entrust to them the management of affairs; so that for the first sixty years of our existence as a separate nation, the government, although democratic in form, was aristocratic in fact. Who can imagine, for a moment, that men like Washington, Hamilton, and especially John Marshall, could have welded the colonies into one people, if at every step they had been obliged to consult the electorate through such machinery as the referendum and recall? Even the original concept of "representation" was essentially aristocratic. The people were to elect, directly or indirectly, the man they considered fittest for senator or congressman, and he was to act as he thought best for the country. The members of the electoral college were to exercise their best judgment in picking a president.

To-day, how different the theory! Presidents, senators and members of congress are tied hand and foot before election by all sorts of pledges. After election, in doubtful cases, congressmen now take postal card canvasses of their districts. Presidential electors have a

¹ *Journal of Heredity*, x, 166 (April, 1919).

very limited choice of action, where they have any at all. Even the judiciary, hitherto more or less independent, is to be made "responsible to the people," and its decisions subject to the whim of the mob. Government by counting noses would be bad enough, bearing in mind that majorities are always wrong, except perhaps where a simple moral issue is presented. But we do not have even this; for "the people" are in turn led about by the few, only by demagogues instead of aristocrats. By aristocrats I mean men of pre-eminent intelligence, ability and devotion to the public good. True democracy is possible, as Lecky and Mallock have shown, only in a relatively homogeneous and intelligent community; in other words, where every one has a brain as well as a nose. But the lower type of man is governed by emotion rather than by reason, by the feeling of the moment unmodified by the experience of the past. It is to feeling that the demagogue appeals. He knows how to work on passing waves of popular emotion to get himself into office and to stay there. One secret of the spread of socialism is this appeal to the present, and a total disregard of both the past and the future.

The less intelligent the community, the less aristocrats have a share of power greater than their numerical proportion. That is why we are rapidly getting to the point where strong and able men can no longer be elected to public office, except in an occasional emergency. Émile Faguet in his *Culte d'Incompétence* has shown this condition in France. It is the same here.

How has this come about? One of the most fundamental distinctions between men is that between those who are interested in the whole of anything, and those who are interested in a part of it; or, in other words, between those who place the emphasis upon quantity and those who are appealed to by quality. In recent

years, there has been a great increase in men of the former type, what I call for lack of a better term the "expansile" type, who are the victims of any idea more simple and quantitatively more inclusive than some other. This type is too lazy to bother with distinctions, boundaries and classifications; it finds it easier to demand simplicity and equality in everything. Equal wages, equal suffrage, equal education, equal opportunity are its mantrams. The very language is modified in accordance with this psychological point of view. We hear no longer of "men," but of "man" and "humanity." We forget that, as Allen Upward has pointed out,¹ "humanity" is a false word, because it means that there are or ought to be no distinctions between men; and that the "religion of humanity" is not the worship of the best man or of the best in man, but of the average man. In politics, we have reached the condition deplored by Montesquieu:² "where each one wishes to be equal to those whom he has chosen to command him. Under these circumstances, the people impatient of the power itself in which it has confided, wishes to do everything itself, deliberate for the Senate, execute for the magistrates, and rob all the judges of their power."

The masses, as Amiel has said, are necessarily below the average; but democracy rests upon the legal fiction that the majority has not only power but intelligence, that it possesses wisdom as well as legal rights.³ This fiction is contrary to the dictum of Nietzsche that the highest judgments can come only from those having the fullest energy of life. To-day the most potent judgments are those of the masses. Machiavelli's Prince has

¹ *The New Word*, 98, 100.

² *Esprit des Lois*, Bk. viii, c. 2.

³ *Journal*, ii, 119.

become the common people; and the opinions of the latter are formed not by trained reason, but by hearsay and contagion, by emotional factors, by image-producing ideas given them by the popular leaders.

Price Collier¹ puts the matter concretely thus: "England's greatness is due in no small degree to the fact that she has stubbornly held to the belief, despite republics and revolutions, that all men are not equal, nor all entitled to an equal degree of liberty. . . . The old wholesome theory that the inferior should be urged to play up, and be rewarded if he did, made us Americans and English what we are; the modern theory, born of the miasma of the French Revolution, urging the superior to play down, will emasculate us inevitably." To the same effect Goncourt:² "Le suffrage universel! Après de si longs siècles, une si lente éducation de l'humanité sauvage, revenir à la barbarie du nombre, à la victoire de l'imbecillité des multitudes aveugles."

Immigration has played its part in the changed point of view in this country. The Mediterranean races, unlike the Nordic, look to the State for progress instead of to individual enterprise. The Semitic consciousness, as expressed in men like St. Paul, Spinoza, Marx and Bergson, is the champion of abstract universals as contrasted with Nordic concreteness. A nation of many races has no longer one soul, one spirit. Its integrity can be destroyed not only through heredity by cross-breeding, but in a slower way by a change in the environment through the mere presence of alien elements. Gobineau long ago pointed out that the doctrine that all men are equal is announced only by mixed races; and even the sense in which words like "equality" are used changes insensibly with the people who use

¹ *The West in the East*, 139, 184.

² *Journal*, iii, 301.

them. Equality is now political atomism divorced from any idealism, from any formal or artistic structure. Democracy tends to the levelling of all differences except that of number; it ignores the advantage of divisions of function in the body politic; and it "increasingly demands that the slavish mind shall be treated politely."¹ We should laugh at a legislator who should undertake to tell a miner or a lumberman how to do his work; but no one laughs at the idea that the miner or the lumberman is competent to vote on even the most abstruse political problems. And the result of this is that fatal tendency, noted by John Morley, for the public to attempt to give simple answers to complex problems.

Instead of that unfortunate phrase of Theodore Parker's, copied by Lincoln, "government of the people, by the people and for the people," we ought to say "government for the people; but not alone by the people, but chiefly by those leaders best qualified."² Otherwise, we shall lose all the benefits of special ability and special training. This is, indeed, recognized by some even among the radicals. For example, Labriola, the Italian revolutionist and preacher of syndicalism says: "True democracy is the concentrating of power in an elite who can best judge of social cause and effect." He likes to keep the word "democracy" for oratorical effect; but what he is in truth preaching is the value of aristocracy. And what he says must be true; because the masses are ignorant of social cause and effect in the past, and care more about the present than the future. As Emerson put it:³ "In democracy the persons wielding power are always changing. Hence the permanent

¹ Morrison I. Swift, *Can Mankind Survive*, 38.

² W. H. Mallock, *The Limits of Pure Democracy*, 57.

³ *Journal*, 1850, 140.

things in front of their minds are not the state, or its good, or any policies, but first their own interest, and second their party, for these are the only permanency they know." This was so well recognized at the beginning of the French Revolution, that its leaders had no thought of granting universal suffrage. All men were to be protected in their persons, their property and their liberty; but all were not to be "active citizens."¹ They believed, with Burke, that the tyranny of a democracy is the most dangerous of all tyrannies, because it allows no appeal from itself.

And we are now tending toward a tyranny of the few, acting by oratory, by the press, by the very form in which news is given out, upon the ignorant many. No extensions of suffrage, of referenda, of appeal to mere numbers, can improve this condition.

What, then, is the remedy? I say it frankly, to react. If we have gone too far one way, let us go some distance the other way. The alternative is all kinds of wild, popular experiments—all of them by the way tried long ago—followed by the despotism of some individual strong enough to control all others. The true remedy is to give more power to the brains and less to the noses; in other words, to limit political power to those having a certain stake in the community. In the phrase of my text, "No representation without taxation."

We need not make economic success the sole criterion of suffrage, although it is probably the surest one. We could limit the suffrage to the following classes of persons: (a) those paying a certain amount of federal or local tax; (b) those having a certain education; (c) those having a business of their own of a certain size; (d) those willing to pay a considerable fee for the privilege. It is not even necessary to disfranchise anybody.

¹ Siéyès to the Committee on the Constitution, July 20, 1789.

If we wish to stick to the principle of every person having one vote, we could give an additional vote for each of the classes mentioned above in which any voter found himself. It is true that any proposition to limit the suffrage does not look very promising when we consider the expansile tendency of the age; and yet it has been done at least three times already in this country. In colonial Massachusetts, the ballot was restricted to those who were both church members and property owners; in New Jersey, woman suffrage was abolished early in the last century; and, in Rhode Island, the property qualification was recently raised from seventy-five to three hundred dollars.

It will be objected at once that most, if not all, of the bosses and demagogues could qualify as voters under the above scheme. That is perfectly true. There is no Utopian method of separating out Cicero's "good men" in the community, and turning the government over to them. But the power of the boss is gone as soon as he no longer has the ignorant voter as his support.

In an emergency, by common consent, aristocrats are put in office and given supreme power. Cæsar long ago remarked that the Gallic tribes were democracies in peace but oligarchies in war. The same is always true; and the World War was perhaps the best example of the necessity of putting able men in power when a thing has to be done well and quickly. No doubt many mistakes were made; no doubt many things might have been done better. But, in every country taking part in the great struggle, there was the phenomenon of the competent few taking the place, for the time being, of the incompetent multitude. The problem is to so arrange the political system that what is done in a great emergency shall be done more or less all the time. The first step is to realize that superficial equality is essen-

tially inequality; that the parable of the talents still holds true; and that to him that hath much in the way of intelligence, ability and public spirit should much be given in the way of power, and of him should much be demanded in the way of service.

THE PERSONAL SIDE

THE PERSONAL SIDE

“When spirit calls to spirit, there will be
Dominion, wider than eternity;
Then forget me or remember, as you will,
I'll not forget to bless you ever; still
You will forget-me-not.”

FROM the time Prescott Farnsworth Hall was born, his mother, Mrs. Samuel Hall, Jr., who was then forty-five years of age, was an invalid. As a result, he grew up under restrained and unusual circumstances. Mrs. Hall's only other child, William Farnsworth Kilbourne, had died at the age of two and one half years. This made her all the more insistent concerning the health and care of the new baby. Consequently he grew up a frail little hothouse plant, for he was never allowed to romp, to climb and to be reckless, as other boys were.

Mr. Hall's entire life was a courageous battle against ill-health. Once during the World War he was expressing regret that he could not take part in the great struggle, and I said to him: “You have been given the hardest battle in life to fight. It were easier to meet a foe openly, than one which we cannot see or understand.”

One of his nurses once said to me: “I think he has more courage than any one I have ever seen.”

All his life he had insomnia. In normal times it was his custom to go to bed about twelve or one o'clock; and if he couldn't sleep, which was often, he would return to the library, to his books or his writing. If he could

sleep solidly from four o'clock till eight in the morning it was sufficient sleep for him. But he was so highly sensitive that it was hard for him to sleep after the early morning noises began.

Mr. Hall was devoted to his home; and he was a great lover of nature. No one ever loved flowers, shrubs and trees more intimately than he. And he knew all the little flies and bugs that inhabited them. Of these he had a large collection,—one of the interests of his youth. He taught me to feel friendly towards little insects which had hitherto been repulsive to me. He knew all their names and some of their missions in the great scheme of life. It was his custom, as soon as the buds commenced to appear in the spring, until the frosts of winter obscured all foliage, to walk around the grounds after breakfast before going to his office. So many times I've watched him as he slowly walked about, sometimes stopping—with arms folded—communing, apparently, with his silent friends.

Late one afternoon when the world seemed so at peace, and a most brilliant afterglow shed radiance all about us, we were walking in the garden when we came upon a robin tugging away in an effort to get a helpless worm from the earth. Mr. Hall looked on sadly for a moment and said: "If we could only know why that should be, one of the biggest problems of the Universe would be solved." He often said with Tyndall, "if we could only be sure that the Universe is friendly." He never could bear to see anything suffer. A cat with a mouse distressed him unbearably. A suffering animal, or anything that hadn't the faculty of reasoning or understanding engaged his attention and his sympathies always. Where there was a question of human beings or animals suffering, his sympathies were always with the animals, because they were more helpless.

Notwithstanding Mr. Hall's profound mind and his habits of philosophical reasoning, he had a simple, a loving and a lovable nature. This side of his character is the one I am intentionally setting forth.

The thing that he had least patience with was the "more holy than thou" attitude. He hated moral prigs with a cordial hatred. He could forgive any other form of crime, but not that. And no one ever hated all forms of gossip and uncharitable criticism more than he did.

His sympathies were always with the down-trodden. This, I think, sometimes lead to misunderstanding him.

He felt that every intelligent man possessed a God-given right to live life according to his own interpretations. "By thine own soul's law learn to live."

He could not endure "tailor-made religions." But a spiritual life appealed greatly to him—the spiritual life that practises, but does not preach.

Mr. Hall thought the pursuit of happiness an entirely erroneous life theory. He agreed with Schopenhauer that "not pleasure but freedom from pain is what the wise man will aim at." Freedom from pain that one might do good work—best serve. And he felt it was the duty of every intelligent person to have some public spirited interest, some interest in the common good, the betterment of the future generations.

I once asked him what he considered our most important duty to the Universe, and he said: "Self-expression."

Always he believed in hammering away at one's ideals, no matter whether they were attained or not. One were better for the struggle. The following from *The Statue and the Bust* was a favorite of his, and suited him peculiarly well:

“Stake your counter as boldly every whit,
 Venture as warily, use the same skill,
 Do your best, whether winning or losing it.

If you choose to, play!—is my principle.
 Let a man contend to the uttermost
 For his life's set prize, be it what it will.”

Mr. Hall was always vigorous in his conversations and his writings, and no matter whether his views were shared or not, one always felt his honesty and sincerity underlying all words and arguments. He would not concede a thing he could not honestly believe, no matter what the consequences. Indeed, his honesty was his tragedy for he stuck to his beliefs, often defying society—and willingly paid the price.

He was a man with a prophetic vision, and a great, grand patience with which he accepted defeat. Never a politician, but always a statesman. Interested in every one's subject, taking stock of every one's views.

Mr. Hall was a critic and an inspiration. He was a man whose mind had no holiday, for he was always restlessly active. And Goethe says, “Restless activity proves the man.”

He was very fond of the German language and literature, also German music. The German thinking mind appealed greatly to him.

In the last entry in his journal, after speaking of his long, tedious illness, he says: “It comes down to the question whether all things have value, or some things or nothing. And there is no answer.”

Mr. Hall had a great deal of sentiment, was honest to a fault and was the most loyal person I have ever known. He requested that locks of his mother's and father's hair, which he had kept, be buried with him; also certain things which had belonged to a very splendid young woman he had loved and lost in his college days.

After a rather tempestuous life, it is sweet to remember the calm, glorified radiance which surrounded him at last. He seemed perfectly happy—unafraid—and so at peace with all the world.

Thus, like a tired child, he fell asleep and slipped away into the silence—the silence into which all lives must hush at last.

Lucyle Deby Hall.

Brookline, Massachusetts.

Summer of 1921.