

In the discussion of dumping, for example, and of costs and fair price in relation to dumping, the author does not consider, as he should, the fact of overcapitalization of domestic concerns which argue for the legitimacy of dumping on the ground that it enables them to earn fair return on capital. Moreover, he is perhaps too conservative and cautious in his estimate of governmental ability to ascertain fair costs and fix fair price. Again, in his discussion of the development of machinery in cotton manufacture one would welcome, as elsewhere, a much more extensive consideration of the tariff in relation to labor and labor competition. He does refer to the incoming of dense masses of unskilled immigrants, but all we get in the way of critical treatment is a sort of easy optimism that the condition of labor improves as time goes on—possibly under the principle of comparative advantage. Incidentally, he remarks that “one should hesitate to use the condemnatory term exploitation.” Just why is not stated. Again, on p. 288, in referring to the question of speed, he says: “The ideal would be alert and strenuous labor for so long a working day as can steadily be maintained without irrecoverable fatigue or premature old age.” Such statements, even when given more or less incidentally in the course of treatment of matters in which the ethics of labor and capital is not the primary question in the author’s mind, afford a certain basis for the oft-repeated accusation made against the orthodox economists that they habitually think of the laborer merely as a means to an end—somebody else’s end. Yet those familiar with Professor Taussig’s economics know that he is as little open to this charge as any economist this side of Fabian socialism.

These studies of the tariff are really masterful excursions into economic history. Teachers of that subject will find the book most useful. Students of the labor problem and of immigration will also find much of interest, as will those who desire more light on the relation of invention and the introduction of machinery to industrial evolution and social change. Finally, these pages can hardly fail deeply to interest the reader, whatever his special field, in the tariff as an American institution—and perhaps a world-illusion.

A. B. WOLFE

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

---

*Confessions of a Hyphenated American.* By EDWARD A. STEINER.  
New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1916. Pp. 63.

Professor Steiner always sees the good side of the immigrant, which is so generally invisible to the native American, and he tells about it in

a marvelously fluent style. This lecture is no exception. He feels that the real danger is much more to be looked for in the American who has adopted Europe and a sneer toward the crudity of America than from the maligned hyphenate. A second danger will come from letting our fears and prejudices lead us into a policy of suppression. It is but natural that people want to keep their mother-tongue, but, judging from the history of Europe, he says: "We have succeeded in keeping America a country of English speech just because we have not insisted upon it." The most conspicuous factor in preserving European national allegiances he thinks to be the religious organizations, which enter less readily into the democratic ideals of America because of their devotion to the purpose of maintaining traditional forms. In contrasting the much-discussed fear of violence from the Germans in our midst, he questions what would happen if we were sending munitions to England to help a war against Ireland, and finds cause to be grateful that the Germans are "usually not red-headed and never Irish."

There is no possibility of making a sweeping generalization which can define the relations of the various immigrant groups to America, and no greater mistake can be made than to universalize the present common attitude toward the Germans. It is difficult to keep in mind the divergent backgrounds from which the various immigrants come, but every "hyphen" gets its value directly from its own background. In spite of the unquestioned cosmopolitanism of Professor Steiner, his early background made America for him exactly as for Mary Antin, "the Promised Land." His enthusiasm for America, like hers, cannot fail to be different from that of people whose patriotism looks back to a definite land for whose political existence their profoundest traditions have been crystallized. Besides the Jews, who are without doubt the most loyal Americans in America, there are two other distinct groups: those who come from sovereign governments like Scandinavia, Germany, and Italy, and those who have been subjects in Poland, Bohemia, and—all except the Germans there—in Austria. The Hungarians, because of their semi-independence, fall between these two groups.

The Scandinavians are conscious of the worth and independence of their countries, and, with the exception of the efforts of the religious organizations, make no conscious effort to keep from becoming assimilated Americans as soon as possible. With the Germans there are a good many artificial conditions. To be sure, in recent years there have been some well-defined plans for organizing the continuance of German tradition, but it should be constantly remembered that most Germans came

to America to escape exactly what the rest of us condemn in Germany. As citizens they have previously become group-conscious, probably more on the temperance question than anything else. As Steiner says, "it is not loyalty to the Kaiser but to the Kaiserhof in which they gloried." Now, however, when every German is under suspicion, it is the most natural thing in the world that those who had forgotten it should glory in being Germans. One of the facts that nationalism is showing us is that it is natural for people to ally themselves with the persecuted with whom they have some traditional connection, rather than go with the persecutors with whom they have had cultural sympathy.

With regard to the dozen or more other "hyphens" that are somewhat persistent, the author thinks that, if the ideal of Mr. Roosevelt is what is desired, the hyphen is America's greatest asset. In case of war with the only country which the most warlike seem to fear, millions of men trained in the armies of Russia and Austria would immediately offer their services. In fact, the offer has already been made through several of their national organizations. Dumba's plan could never work, because the vast majority of the munition workers whom he sought to induce to go out on strike would rather make munitions to be used against Germany than do anything else in the world. I have myself attended several meetings in which this was discussed. At one, on the eve of a big strike which had been called in such a factory, the men were trying to decide whether to scab on their union or to seem to try to tie up a munition factory. It was decided that every effort should be made to prevent the strike, but that they should be loyal to the union unless some political significance could be seen in the strike, in which case they should stick to their jobs. At a Bohemian meeting in behalf of the Serbian Red Cross the Serbian speaker was given over six hundred dollars by these Bohemians, every one of whom had relatives in the Austrian army.

We have come to think that our recent immigrants come here solely to make money, but this is utterly wrong, even if the immigrant himself admits it. The proof may be seen in the fact that more than 99 per cent of the Serbians and Roumanians, and most Bulgarians, do not come from Serbia, Roumania, and Bulgaria, and of the vast immigration from Russia the number of real Russians is negligible. Let anyone ask one after another immigrant from the various countries to compare his own country with America, and the frequency of the reply, "America is free," will be both surprising and encouraging to those who have entered the hysterical state over the "hyphen."

HERBERT ADOLPHUS MILLER

OBERLIN COLLEGE