

they are being exposed to tremendous material losses and to the impairment of our fundamental democratic institutions, through the misguided idea that the method of achieving business and industrial prosperity is to stimulate immigration and destroy or weaken existing labor organizations.

An intelligent and patriotic industrial statesmanship as regards immigration at the present time would base its method of procedure upon the recognition and strengthening of legitimate labor organizations in the same enlightened way as was done by the federal government during the war period. This would stimulate labor to be a coöperative and not an antagonistic factor in industry. With this as a starting point, through conference and discussion under governmental auspices, labor and capital could agree as to a policy towards immigration which would conserve the public interest, maintain trade-union wages and standards, and make possible a wholesome development and expansion in industry. This is what should be done, and our experience during the war in the control and distribution of the labor supply shows that it is entirely practi-

cable and desirable. It assumes that labor is not a commodity or an article of commerce and that it has the right to collective bargaining and collective recognition.

From present tendencies, however, there is no indication that such a policy will be even considered. There should be undoubtedly, however, a temporary control or exclusion of immigrants at once until the Congress has the time to consider the question exhaustively. When it does have the opportunity for permanent legislation, the most practicable as well as the most possible general principle or proposal which has thus far been advocated is to restrict immigration on a percentage basis, a certain proportion of each race or people to be admitted to the country each year on the basis of the numbers of such races or peoples already resident in the United States, as shown by the latest census returns. The larger proportions of our newcomers would thus be restricted to the peoples of northern and western Europe and Great Britain and would be more nearly akin to us in their political institutions and ideals and their industrial and social aspirations.

Immigration and the World War

By PRESCOTT F. HALL¹

Secretary, Executive Committee, Immigration Restriction League, Boston

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

¹ Author of: *Immigration and Its Effects on the United States* (1906, 1908).

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 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, Adams, Madison and Franklin as to the danger of ungarded 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

¹ Vol. 24, p. 163 (July, 1904).

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 out¹ 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 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 pop-

ulation 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.² 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,³ "you can not make bad stock into good by changing its meridian, any more than you can

² 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).

³ *Journal of Heredity*, X, No. 3, March, 1919.

¹ Sadler, W. S. *Long Heads and Round Heads*.

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 today 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 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.

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.