

studies in all the phases of child life touched by the war we may look not only for immediate help in solving the various urgent problems now confronting the countries of central Europe, but also for data invaluable for other purposes.

Miss Lathrop suggests three chief directions that such correlated studies of child welfare in central Europe would naturally take—studies of underfeeding, studies of behavior and delinquency, and studies of children in industry.

“The most obvious war consequence is, of course, the continent-wide phenomenon of underfeeding.” One would suppose that to a self-critical and self-protective civilization the scientific ascertainment of the extent and exact nature of this phenomenon would be equally obvious. Doctors and scientists overwhelmed with practical tasks have given hints here and there, have indicated the lack of data and urged the need of wider study. Some of the results of underfeeding are on the surface, others are far more subtle and await more concerted and penetrating scientific attack.

Similarly, the war's effects upon the conduct of children and young people have arrested the attention of criminologists and social scientists. But thus far only partial and isolated statistical studies have been made. The phenomenon is wide spread, varying in intensity, doubtless, with the impairment of family restraints and the degree of economic pressure. Moreover, subtle factors are here, too, at work—the influence on Belgian children of disobedience of the invader's laws, the effect on the child mind of the soldier-father's exploits.

How far the lack of food and physical welfare is responsible, how far the absence of fathers and the breakdown of the family is accountable, in what degree the lack of schooling, how far the excitement and abnormal social conditions of war have unsettled nervous and mental balance and hence led to delinquency, are among the questions whose answers would be useful in the readjustment to peace conditions in every country, in the establishment of the new laws and institutions which are urgently necessary.

The studies thus far made are chiefly from the approach of the physician, but other scientific observations are also necessary, including those of the educator and the student of applied social science.

Finally the physical effects of industrial life upon children offer a long-delayed field for scientific study. “The intelligent protection of the health of working children and the studies upon which that protection should be based are subjects of increased urgency wherever marked underfeeding and hardship have prevailed for a period covering the war and postwar years of the child's life.” This need has been heretofore recognized by such authorities as Dean Edsall of the Harvard Medical School and the American Academy of Medicine.

Only the United States can secure the fulfillment of this urgent scientific program. The materials for study and the scientists to pursue it are available abroad. Miss Lathrop herself, in conjunction with a scientific advisory committee, could organize such a survey as she outlines. Europe can furnish men and material, this country must furnish the necessary money. And what a mere pittance would suffice for so fruitful a work! Here, surely, is a proposal for research that should make a compelling appeal, at once scientific and humanitarian, to those men, like Dr. Vincent, Dr. Flexner, Dr. Pritchett, Dr. Scott, Professor Farrand, who guide the destiny of the great foundations.

A Truce to Immigration

TO close our doors against immigration, even temporarily, is a measure no one imbued with the American spirit can contemplate without misgivings. We are essentially a nation of immigrants. Our history of colonization is a romance of immigration which has impressed itself deeply on the minds of all Americans. Our traditions are tinged with the color of new life blooming from stocks transplanted to a fertile soil under a new sky. What is the characteristic American optimism and courage but the collective reflection of the new hopes springing from the opportunities thrown open to the newcomer? Has the time now come when we must reverse our policy, and guard our national heritage jealously for those already here? In that case we must look forward to a different kind of America, less generous, less free, less brave.

For our part we do not believe the time has come, or is even near at hand, when our national welfare may require the permanent exclusion of those who wish to make their homes in America. We believe that it is a superficial view that room can not be made for additional population without lowering the standards of living already established, or without checking present tendencies toward higher standards. The chief possibilities of American economic development still lie in the future. We believe that it is a timid and mean-spirited view that American ideals and institutions can not prevail over any new and strange ideals and institutions the prospective groups of immigrants may bring with them. America is not a China, compelled either to exclude the “foreign devils” or be warped out of her self-chosen orbit.

But though we believe that there is no valid reason why a permanent dyke should be erected against immigration, we can not accept the laissez-faire view, that it is no concern of the American people what kind of immigrants come, what im-

fluences are at work to draw them to this country, what happens to them after they get here, how their coming bears upon our own current social and economic problems. America needs a definite immigration policy, which shall make it possible to differentiate between those who have the intelligence and initiative to seek entrance to America on their own account and those who are recruited for emigration by the steamship companies, by employers seeking cheap and docile labor, by governments desiring to expel recalcitrant minorities by philanthropic organizations that would solve particular problems of European poverty through their removal to America. We ought not to tolerate any kind of mass immigration or subsidized immigration.

Selection is necessary, but it is far from the whole of a sound immigration policy. We cannot afford to have even the best selected immigrants dumped at our ports, to fall, very likely, into the hands of exploiters, and, at the best, to go through a period of bewilderment and hopelessness that will go far toward setting them against America. Immigration is economically a matter of labor supply and can not be handled intelligently except as related to the demand for labor throughout the country. But we are so far from a systematic oversight of the labor demand that intelligent men are now asserting that we are suffering from a shortage of labor and other equally intelligent men are asserting that there is not a class of labor of which we do not have a plethora. We shall never handle immigration rationally so long as this condition obtains.

We are not now organized to receive immigrants properly, or to distribute them in such a way as to insure ourselves against aggravation of the present evils of increasing unemployment and labor unrest. To work out a satisfactory national policy will require months; but in the meantime multitudes, in almost every European country, are restless and discontented, and the shipping companies are casting eager eyes upon the earnings to be had from mass emigration. What else can we do, in the national interest, but declare a truce to immigration? A year's suspension to immigration ought to suffice, if the working out of a national policy is undertaken in good faith. But such a truce will be of no value unless we actually use the time to overhaul our entire immigration policy. If we stop with the truce, the disadvantages of indefinite restriction will presently impress themselves upon us when our industry again takes an upward swing and we shall remove all barriers and let in a flood probably not so desirable in its constituent elements as that which it is now proposed to exclude.

American Business Depression and European Distress

THERE was a time when even the fairly well informed Americans might cherish the illusion that the United States was economically independent of Europe. We could produce for ourselves the food and raw materials we required; we possessed the manufacturing power to supply our needs; what, then, had we to do with Europe? But we have since learned better than to comfort ourselves with the balancing of big figures, appropriate material for spread eagle orations. Throughout the country mills are closing down and unemployment is growing apace. From the price level of last spring, on which the farmer based his calculations when he plowed and sowed, agricultural products have fallen so disastrously as to involve losses according to the estimate of the National City Bank of between six and eight billions. That loss in purchasing power necessarily reflects itself in the demand for industrial products, with corresponding losses to industry probably greatly exceeding the agricultural loss. Without a doubt, the national production, measured in money values, is at least a billion a month less than it was a year ago.

That is in part due to the inevitable deflation and readjustment after the fever of war. Some decline in price levels was inevitable. Many bankruptcies were due, in consequence of the cumulative effect of business vices condoned or overlooked in time of war. But nobody can believe for a moment that those inherent weaknesses count for much alongside of the utter disorganization of the foreign market produced by the failure of Europe to return to the normal processes of peace. There would not be in fact a world surplus of wheat and cotton, wool and leather, copper and iron and steel products, if those who stand in need of those materials were in a position to buy. Indeed, we shall not know for months whether existing wheat stocks will suffice to feed the world until the next harvest, and by all the indicia of normal world consumption there ought to be a demand sufficient to absorb eighteen million bales of cotton, instead of merely the twelve million we actually produced. Wheat and cotton are down simply because those who need them have not the purchasing power. France, Italy and Belgium, but beyond all, central Europe, need the surpluses that are dragging our markets down, but they cannot surmount the wall of the exchanges to get those surpluses. They can not produce goods in advance to barter against our products, and we are not financially organized to furnish the goods on credit. Not that we are