

The good Cardinal would have made a good lawyer. He had as little to say about God and the general righteousness of things as the Bishop of London. But he got in some smug reminders of the severance of diplomatic relations with the Vatican. Perhaps now France will be wiser. He pointed out that the Holy See in its Consistorial Allocution of January 22nd, 1915, invited the belligerents to observe the laws of war. Could anything more be done than that? Oh!—in the general issue of the war, if you want a judgment on the war as a whole, how is it possible for the Vatican to decide? Surely the French know that excellent principle of justice, *Audiat et altera pars*, and how under existing circumstances can the Vatican do that? The Vatican is cut off from communication with Austria and Germany. The Vatican has been deprived of temporal power (another neat point).

So France is bowed out. When peace is restored the Vatican will perhaps be able to inquire if there was a big German army in 1914, if German diplomacy was aggressive from 1875 onward, if Belgium was invaded unrighteously, if (Cath-

lic) Austria forced the pace upon (non-Catholic) Russia. But now—now the Holy See must remain as impartial as a mascot in a shop window.

The next column of *Le Journal* contained an account of the Armenian massacres; the blood of the Armenian cries out past the Holy Father to heaven; but then Armenians are after all heretics, and here again the principle of *Audiat et altera pars* comes in. Communications are not open with the Turks.

*Audiat et altera pars*, and the Vatican has not forgotten the infidelity and disrespect of both France and Italy in the past. These are the things, it seems, that really matter to the Vatican.

It is the most astounding renunciation in history.

Indubitably the Christian church took a wide stride from the kingship of God when it placed a golden throne for the unbaptised Constantine in the midst of its most sacred deliberations at Nicaea. But it seems to me that this abandonment of moral judgments in the present case by the Holy See is almost a wider step from the church's allegiance to God.

H. G. WELLS.

## Assimilation

### Immigration in the Light of History: IV

**A** BY-PRODUCT of the present European struggle, but one of immense consequence for this country, has been the revelation or the realization "that America has not safely assimilated the vast mixture of nationalities it has attracted during the last fifty years." It was Chester Bailey Fernald who used those words in a communication to the London *Spectator* last December, and his next sentence might well have served as a text for this sermon: "In 1814 we had been a solution; in 1914 we had become to a great extent merely a mechanical mixture."

It is the shock of the European war that has seemed to separate some of the ingredients of our population mixture, and in general the most conspicuous of these are the more recent immigrants. There is nothing at all surprising in this, nor is there anything new. Our war for independence in the eighteenth century was not carried on by a whole-souled, united people. The shock of the Revolution produced far more serious divisions in public opinion than we have yet experienced. Some of the newcomers of that time found their sympathies violently enlisted on one side and some on the other. But most people who had left their own countries because of war's devastations or of

compulsory military service, could not be expected to fight with any enthusiasm in a quarrel about which they didn't know enough to be interested.

Those people were as much a mechanical mixture at the time of the Revolution as our people are now, and yet Fernald rightly said that "in 1814 we had been a solution." The forces in operation which produced that change between the beginning of the Revolution and the end of the War of 1812, are the important subjects for us to study. Opinions will necessarily differ as to the significance of various factors, and the writer will only say in self-defense that the analysis here presented was originally made for historical purposes only, when the striking similarity to present-day conditions led him to institute a comparison between the two.

Before proceeding with that analysis it might be well to notice that there was one thing that the Revolutionary generation had which we have not—at least not yet, for the time has been short—and that was leaders in thought and action. It was those leaders who carried the struggle for independence through to a successful conclusion in spite of the opposition or apathy of a large part of their fellow-countrymen. The success of the war did much to unite public sentiment, partly through the silencing or forcible suppression of the opposition, but the diverse elements were not assimilated.

lated. The lack of a national spirit, or of a unity of public opinion, is sufficiently attested by the troubles of the Confederation and by the difficulty which was encountered in framing and adopting the Constitution.

The only solvent of the population mixture was time, and time is a notoriously slow worker. A generation and more had to pass before we became a united people. That is the fact which needs to be more widely appreciated. In a generation and a half after the outbreak of the Revolution, time was given not merely for the mixing but for the dissolving of the various ingredients. The War of 1812 revealed a people sadly divided as to the wisdom or justice of the war, but it was a difference of sections and of sectional interests rather than of racial or national strains. The divergence of sections continued after the war, and even grew greater, but we were more nearly a homogeneous people than we ever had been, and the different sections recognized and appreciated that most of their interests were in common. There was a unity of feeling, which resembled if it did not actually represent a genuine national spirit.

Various forces were at work in the process of assimilating the diverse elements, among which are usually mentioned: the improved means of transportation which made communication and travel between all sections of the country easier and consequently much more frequent; the practically unlimited amount of unoccupied land to be had for the asking or the taking; the westward movement of population, and in particular the mingling and mixing of all classes and sections and nationalities on the frontier. Undoubtedly these were all of them important, but they were probably only the forms in which a more fundamental cause was manifesting itself at that time. Study and reflection has led to the belief that the all-important factors are a steady natural increase in numbers and a people who are busy and absorbed in their work. Prosperity may be essential as a preventative of discontent, but it is hard to conceive of a people under such circumstances being anything but prosperous.

The growth of our population in the period under consideration is a matter of record—our prosperity is almost equally well recognized—and that we were a very busy people ought also to be appreciated. When Lafayette made his visit to this country in 1824 and met his fellow-soldiers of the Revolution, "What do you think," he said, "is the question which these Revolutionary soldiers, to whom I am introduced, almost invariably ask me? It is this: 'What do you do for a living?' And sometimes the inquiry comes: 'What was your father's business?'" Upon this Josiah

Quincy commented: "Everybody is working for a living in America—that is, pursuing some money-getting trade or profession—and the people do not understand how it can be otherwise in the older countries."

But whatever factors may have been in operation in the work of assimilating the immigrants or alien elements, in the opinion of the writer the all-important condition which gave these forces an opportunity to accomplish results was the cessation of immigration for a time. Unfortunately we have as yet no accurate data for immigration after 1776. We know that the immigration was practically stopped by the Revolution. We have figures to show that there may have been a sharp revival with the establishment of peace. For example, the Austrian commercial agent in the United States reported about 1784 that there were ten thousand immigrants who had been obliged to indenture themselves. But this could not have lasted for long. Immigration must certainly have been checked by the French Revolution or by the Napoleonic wars that followed. The only estimates available are those which have been made in the later census reports beginning with that of 1850. These estimates are for the total immigration for the thirty years from 1790 to 1820 and amount to only 250,000. With a population of 4,000,000 in 1790 and of 9,000,000 in 1820, this would mean an annual average immigration of from 1/10 to 1/20 of 1 per cent.

With this checking of immigration, the necessary opportunity was given for the forces of assimilation to succeed in their work. In the course of a generation and a half, our people, busy and prosperous, actually absorbed all the foreign elements, so that for the first time there arose after 1815 an American people with something like a national spirit, developing many of the traits that have come to be known as American characteristics. It was this newly aroused American people that first established anything like a real democracy in this country.

In making a comparison between conditions now and those of a hundred and more years ago, it must be recognized that some of the most powerful forces operating in the earlier days have now practically ceased to exist. This is notably true of the land. The large area of unoccupied land has been used up, and though many immigrants of the newer types are succeeding as farmers, the numbers are small in comparison with what they used to be. But new factors are at work that were not in existence in the earlier period. Such, for instance, are the labor unions and the public schools. When reference has been made to this country as a melting-pot, it has more than once

been remarked that to keep the heat up to the fusing point, a forced draught was necessary. This, with our drive and hustle, we have been able to do, so that competent foreign observers, who are in sympathy with our life and institutions, are inclined to believe that our powers of assimilation are on the whole increasing rather than diminishing.

If these things are true, the future of our immigration question ought not to be so dark provided only time and opportunity be given for the accomplishment of results. This means that immigration into this country should be sufficiently reduced to permit our assimilative powers to absorb what we already have. It would be much better for the slackening of the tide to come from natural or unconscious causes than to be forced to check it by any artificial restrictions. There is a possibility, to some it is a probability, that one result of the present European war will be to reduce the number of immigrants to America. The immediate effect has certainly been to cut off immigration almost entirely, and there can be no doubt that the demand for labor will be so great in some of the belligerent countries that if necessary governmental prohibition of emigration will be resorted to after the war.

On the other hand there are prophecies, positive and unconditional, that immigration to this country will increase exactly as it has done after almost every other European disturbance in the past. But this war outclasses all others in size and extent; it probably marks a new era; and just as it has gone beyond all forecasts and expectations, so predictions as to its aftermath must be futile. There is a possibility that the war will lessen the immigration to the United States. If not, restrictive measures are always possible. And from that point of view, the literacy test is possibly a useful measure.

As was stated at the outset, it is with no idea of solving our immigration problem that these things have been presented, or that the comparison with earlier times has been made. It is simply in the belief that some new light might be thrown upon a much vexed question and that the prospect might thereby be rendered somewhat less gloomy. With the similarity of conditions, the successful outcome a hundred years ago makes it possible to be hopeful of the ultimate result now, and to agree with Kipling, in his poem "An American," when he interprets the American Spirit as saying:

Lo, imperturbable he rules,  
Unkempt, disreputable, vast—  
And, in the teeth of all the schools,  
I—I shall save him at the last!

MAX FARRAND.

## Zuloaga

THE pictures by Ignacio Zuloaga, exhibited at present at the Brooklyn Museum and later to be exhibited in various cities of the United States, form a brilliant ensemble. One great canvas shows us four or five vigorous young toreros, splendid in cloaks of blue and green and gold, standing on a rocky platform against a distant fenced-in bull-ring and an old surmounting castle. The picture is drenched in gorgeous hues and tense with vivid young life thrown up against a background of romantic power. Another canvas gives us a gaunt old picador mounted on the battered wreck of a gray horse splashed with blood, most probably his own, the horse and rider, painful symbols of life outlined, silhouetted against a great sun-swept plain and stormy sky. In a third picture the dark figure of Maurice Barrés leans against a rock, hawk nose in air, and looks out on a brilliant panorama of rock-borne, river-girt Toledo, of which he has so eloquently written. And then there is no end of charming Spanish women in glowing shawls and glittering laces, some portraits where the characters are sharply graven, gray landscapes of stony Spanish towns, Segovia, Sepulveda, Alquezar, and studies of the no less rugged Spanish peasants. Spain is preëminently the country of western Europe in which we feel the individual expression least adulterated by the leveling tendencies of our time, and Zuloaga is peculiarly gifted for its portrayal.

Zuloaga is a Spaniard of old Spain who spends half his time in Paris. He feels strongly his identity with his ancestral home, both with its present and its past, and at the same time he is sufficiently detached, is sufficiently a man of the modern cosmopolitan city, to realize the foreignness of his own country. He does not, like an outsider, see it only as a romantic spectacle for he knows it too well both spiritually and materially, nor on the other hand does he take it quite so naturally as Goya did. Goya drew bull-fights, Spanish people, Spanish scenes, as one might for persons to whom they were native and familiar and not exotically picturesque. When he sought picturesqueness he turned to witches' Sabbaths and strange festivals. Zuloaga has both kinds of interest for he is conscious of the bull-fighter as a man whose portrait can be painted, of the Spanish woman or peasant as the simple individual, interesting as another, and at the same time he recognizes them as peculiar, as a spectacle in which the world may well be interested as in a romantic revelation. He is therefore the ideal guide and illustrator of his marvellous native scene.

Zuloaga possesses in a high degree the talent