

periodicals are "magazines," whose advertising pages are to be taxed, and what are the educational and religious periodicals which are to continue to enjoy what the President calls a "subsidy." Such a censorship would be a new feature in postal administration, and it would seem to be a thing very difficult to work out on any fair basis. Second, the proposal to hamper advertising in periodicals by taxing it is to hamper an important agency in the creation of letter postage, which is very profitable to the Government.

Of course the ultimate consumer—that is, the person who wishes to read the magazines—will in the end pay the postage, as he has done from the beginning. Forty years ago he paid the postage on all his periodicals directly, at the post-office when he received them. A later law provided that the postage should be paid in advance by the publisher, but the amount of postage was still an element of cost to be included in the revenue necessary for the safe conduct of any publishing business. It will always be so, and if the people wish to add to the cost of their magazines by imposing a tax through the Post-Office Department on the advertising pages or columns, they will in the end pay the bill. The proposed legislation is therefore of interest to all readers of magazines as well as to publishers, who would of course first feel the burden and the confusion incident to a radical increase in the cost of their several publications.

We should be glad to believe that all public officials and all members of Congress are free from any but patriotic motives in their recommendations and actions. But it cannot be denied that among the legislators at Washington and in official circles there is at present current a clearly expressed feeling that the magazines of the country have been for the past few years the most independent and relentless critics of public affairs and of public servants, and that any inconvenience or loss which they might suffer as the result of an increase of postage along the lines suggested would be a not inappropriate punishment for what, by some politicians, is regarded as pernicious activity. It may be only a coincidence that the "magazines" which the President and the Postmaster-General propose as the only

periodicals to be affected by the change in postage include the rather limited group which has been most outspoken in criticism.

The Outlook repeats what it said a year ago, that the Department's first duty is to continue the work of placing the Post-Office on a thoroughgoing business basis along the lines so well marked out by the Carter Reorganization Bill of the last session of Congress, and then—when the cost of handling second-class matter is really known, as it certainly is not now—to take up the whole question of postal rates and settle it on a basis that is fair to readers, publishers, and taxpayers alike.



SHALL WE RESTRICT IMMIGRATION?

In 1863 Abraham Lincoln urged upon Congress the adoption of measures to promote immigration into the United States. In 1907 Congress created a Commission to inquire into the subject of immigration for the purpose of considering what restrictions are advisable. The contrast is significant. The significance is indicated in the following quotations from the Report of the Commission:

"From 1819 to 1883 more than ninety-five per cent of the total immigration from Europe originated in the United Kingdom, Germany, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Switzerland. . . . In recent years more than seventy per cent of the movement has originated in southern and eastern Europe. . . . The old immigration movement was essentially one of permanent settlers. The new immigration is very largely one of individuals, a considerable proportion of whom have apparently no intention of permanently changing their residence, their only purpose in coming to America being to temporarily take advantage of the greater wages paid for industrial labor in this country. . . . The old immigration came to the United States during a period of general development, and was an important factor in that development, while the new immigration has come during a period of great industrial expansion and has furnished a practically unlimited supply of labor to that expansion." This means, as interpreted by Mr. James Bryce in the new edition of his "American Commonwealth,"

three things: First, "Whereas the former [the old immigrants] started at once for the land and set themselves to fell the woods or till the prairies of the West, the bulk of the later comers have either, like the Jews and Greeks, flocked into the cities and taken to the life of retail trading or of handicrafts and petty industries there, or have, like the Slovaks and Poles and Italians, found occupation in the mining districts or in railway construction and other forms of unskilled work." Second: "Whereas the early immigrants, Irish, Germans, Scandinavians, usually applied for and obtained citizenship very soon after their arrival," "a certain part of this recent immigration is transitory; Italians and Slovaks, for instance, after they have by thrift accumulated a sum which is large for them, return to their native villages;" and "between those of the new immigrants who work in mines or in the construction of public works and the native American there is very little contact and practically no admixture. Even in the cities the Italians and the Jews keep to themselves, often occupying poor quarters exclusively their own." Third: "The American people of the future will be an amalgam from a much greater number of component elements than have entered into it theretofore. Moreover, these new accessions, except the Jews, Greeks, some of the Roumans, the Finns, and the Armenians, belong almost wholly to the Roman Church, so that if the children of the immigrants remain connected with that Church, its share of the population will be relatively greater." What is vastly more important, the ethical standard of the recent immigrants is not the highest, and the conditions under which they live make the maintenance of any high standard very difficult. "It is difficult for parents who must themselves toil all day long to retain any control over children who enjoy the license and are exposed to the temptations of a vast city. Accordingly, the percentage of juvenile crime among the children of the foreign born is more than twice as great as it is among the children of native white parents."

We believe that the above summary of facts will suffice our present purpose, which is to put before our readers certain

fundamental principles which we believe should govern the country in its future regulation and restriction of immigration. The recommendations of the Commission we report elsewhere; here we state our own.

I. This land belongs to its citizens. But the present generation have in it only a life estate. They are solemnly bound to leave it unimpaired to their children and their children's children. This involves guarding, not only against needless waste of its material resources, but even more against adulteration and corruption of its citizenship. We have come to a policy of restriction and regulation of immigration none too soon. This country is not a Hospital for the diseased, nor an Asylum for the feeble-minded, nor a County Farm for the world's paupers, nor a Reform School for the morally deficient.

Nor is there any adequate reason why it should any longer be a Refuge for the oppressed of other lands. In western Europe there is not now any such political oppression as drove out refugees from Ireland and Germany and Italy in the first half of the nineteenth century. In every country of western Europe the theory is entertained, as in America, that governments exist for the benefit of the governed, and life and property are as well safeguarded as in America, in many countries better safeguarded. There is no such wholesale violation of liberty as obliges us to open our doors to all exiles. Metternich and King Bomba have left no successors. The Armenian is relatively safe even in Turkey. It is only in Russia that military despotism still rules; it is only the Russian Jew that needs a Refuge. And it is not our duty, nor even our right, to allow our whole international policy to be determined by sympathy for him.

II. The need of this country is not for cheap labor. The wealth of a country consists not in its money-bags but in its men. Too much cheap labor means too many multi-millionaires; we have an excess of both already. National progress and material wealth are not synonymous. America has been quite too fond of the voice of the Northern farmer:

"Doesn't thou 'ear my 'erse's legs, as they canters awaay?
Propputty, propputty, propputty — that's what I 'ears 'em saay."

Aristotle, in the fourth century before Christ, defined the object of national life. The nation does not exist merely to preserve property—if so, the voter's political power should be proportioned to his stock in the enterprise; nor to protect and promote industry—if so, an ant-hill and a beehive would be nations. "A state, on the contrary, is the association of families and villages in a complete and independent existence, or, in other words, according to our definition, in a life of felicity and nobleness." America could learn a lesson from Aristotle. What we want in America is men who will contribute to its life of felicity and nobleness. Unskilled labor has built, and is building, our railways and aqueducts, and public and private buildings, and opening our mines. We would put up no bar against unskilled labor. But it is possible for a nation, as for an individual, to grow too fast. It is better to be slow—and sure. The need of America is not cheap labor, but men who will become permanent and patriotic American citizens, and will add to the Nation's wealth because they add to its intelligence and its integrity, and who will neither go back to the old country which in sentiment they have never left, nor remain as an alien element in the American amalgam of the future.

III. We ought to take some far more radical and effectual means than we now take to select the immigrants we want. We should do this negatively by exclusion; we should do it affirmatively by invitation. At present the steamship companies get all the steerage passengers they can, and we put up a filter on this side to exclude the objectionable. The steamship companies are not interested in quality, they are interested only in quantity. If the intending immigrant has money enough to pay for his passage and not be deported on arrival as a pauper, and is physically, mentally, and morally sound enough to pass the brief and cursory examination which is all that is possible at the American port, the steamship company is content.

The peasants of southern and eastern Europe have for a number of years supplied a rich harvest to the promoter of immigration. The promoter is usually a steamship ticket agent, employed on a commission basis, or a professional money-lender, or a

combination of the two. His only interest is the wholly selfish one of gaining his commission and collecting his usury. He is employed by the steamship lines, large and small, without scruple, and to the enormous profit of such lines. The more aliens they bring over, the more are there to be carried back if failure meets the tentative immigrant, and the more are likely to follow if success is his lot. Whatever the outcome, it is a good proposition for the steamship line.¹

We do not criticise the steamship lines. We criticise a government which takes great care and is at great expense to exclude the products of cheap labor, and throws the doors wide open to an indiscriminate importation of the cheap labor itself; which carefully excludes from our markets, by a prohibitory tariff, certain products of foreign industry supposed to be injurious to the interests of the manufacturers, but is only just beginning, in a tentative and half-hearted way, to exclude from our citizenship human products of a foreign civilization injurious to the higher life of the Nation.

IV. The main inspection of the incoming immigration should be transferred from the American port of disembarkation to the European port of embarkation. The Immigration Commission thinks that the medical inspection of the steamship companies at the European ports, tested as it is by a renewed medical inspection by Governmental authorities upon the landing here, is sufficient. And it cites in support of its contention the fact that American medical inspection has been attempted at Italian ports for the last ten years, and its recommendation invariably respected by the steamship companies, with the result that the proportion of diseased immigrants arriving from those ports has exceeded that from several other European ports where the examination has been conducted solely by the steamship companies. This, of course, is not conclusive; we must also know whether Italian immigrants are less healthy than those from the "several other European ports." But medical inspection is the least important form of inspection, because the peril from contagious disease is less than the peril from contagious character. And the ex-

¹ Report for 1909 of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, p. 112, quoted by Mr. James Bryce in "The American Commonwealth," ed. of 1910, Vol. II, p. 472.

clusion of the latter is a much more difficult matter. The Outlook heartily indorses on this subject the following recommendation of the Immigrant Commission :

Under the provision of Section 39 of the Immigration Act of February 20, 1907, the President should appoint commissioners to make arrangements with such countries as have adequate police records to supply emigrants with copies of such records, and that thereafter immigrants from such countries should be admitted to the United States only upon the production of proper certificates showing an absence of conviction for excludable crime.

But we also think that our Government might go further. It might adopt a passport system. It might require every immigrant to procure before embarking for our shores a passport from his government certifying to his character; and it might require this passport and the police record to be submitted either to the American consul nearest the home of the departing emigrant, or to a special American emigration officer at the port of his embarkation, and an opportunity furnished for inquiry as to the integrity of the papers and the character of the person presenting them. This plan at least deserves careful consideration on the part of Congress. If any country refused to participate in such a passport arrangement, the remedy would be simple, as the United States Government would refuse to receive any immigrants not provided with such passports; it would refuse to receive any immigrants from the country which refused to supply them such passports. Mr. Bryce gives as the chief causes of emigrations in the past, four: (1) Wars; (2) political or religious oppression; (3) the desire of a growing population to find fresh land to cultivate; (4) the movement of labor from regions where it is abundant and cheap to regions where it is scarce and dear." To these we add a fifth: love of liberty. And this love of liberty invites to our shores the best and the worst of men: the best—those who wish an opportunity for the freest self-development for themselves and for their children; the worst—those who wish to be free from that police espionage and that prompt and vigorous execution of the law which are almost unknown in America. The introduction of police espionage in America would be of

doubtful expediency even if it were practicable; but it might well be applied effectively in determining who may be admitted to America.

V. Scientific tests of comparative accuracy can be applied in determining the existence of physical and mental disease. But there are no scientific tests by which to determine the existence of practical intelligence and practical morality. The majority of the Commission recommend "the exclusion of those unable to read or write in some language." From this recommendation Representative William S. Bennet, of New York, dissents. The arguments *pro* and *con* are not given; we hope that they may be supplied in a supplementary report. There are some facts which the public ought to know before it can wisely pass judgment on this question. Is it a fact that immigrants who can read or write are more intelligent and more virtuous than their illiterate fellow-countrymen? Or are those who can read or write often only superficially educated and not equipped with capacity to think? From what source, the literate or the illiterate, come the faddists of various classes, from the criminal Anarchist to the enthusiastic Tolstoyan? What sort of men are the leaders of the "Black Hand"—illiterate men who know no better, or half-educated men who use as their tools their wholly uneducated companions? In America the man who can read or write is usually a man who has gone to the public school, and in the public school has had some teaching in the art of thinking. Reading and writing are therefore a sign of moral intelligence in America. Is this equally so in the Italian, Polish, or Hungarian immigrants? Mere literacy is no guarantee of character. How much of an indication of character it is in incoming immigrants is a question on which the American people need more light before adopting it as a test at Ellis Island.

We shall hereafter consider the question whether affirmative methods may not be taken by the United States to secure the right type of immigrants from European countries, and also the application of the principles above laid down to the question of Oriental immigration on the Pacific slope.

THE POSSIBILITY OF GREAT GIVING

The best gifts are never things; the best gift is always from within and is charged with personality. In the case of those who are able to make great gifts for the highest purposes—for the teaching of religion, the discovery of truth, the opening of the doors to education—it is often true that the spirit behind the gift is more valuable to the community than the gift itself, and the example far more influential in the long run than the great sum of money bestowed. The highest service a man can render to his fellows is some bestowal of himself in sacrifice, work, influence, inspiration. Phillips Brooks founded no college and endowed no hospital, but he is to be counted among the greatest givers of his time. Other men poured out wealth lavishly for good and great ends and are worthy of all honor for their large-minded and large-hearted recognition of the mutuality of all possessions, the common fortune of the race, held in trust by the few for the liberation and education of the many. It was the high privilege of the great preacher to give himself with the prodigality of a man possessed of a vast treasure; to pour himself out year after year on the spirits of confused, wayward, starving people, to whom he gave a vision beyond the perplexities of the hour, a clear view of the right path and strength to walk in it, the bread which feeds the soul.

The Great Giver brought no money, clothes, or food with him. No man ever had less at his command of those things of which men usually make gifts; he was, during the wonderful years of his active life, penniless and homeless; but he was incomparably the greatest giver who has appeared among men. No one of all the great benefactors of mankind has approached him in the reach, power, and eternal value of his gifts. The secret of his divine generosity is told in a sentence: he was himself a gift! It was not the separate and detached gifts he made by the way—the healing, the hearing, the speech, the loaves and fishes—that clothed him with compassion and beneficence like a garment from the very hem of which life and peace flowed; it was the complete

and perfect bestowal of himself that has begun to fill the world with light and health and love.

Here is the supreme reward of growth in purity, unselfishness, the wisdom of love: it so greatly enriches the spirit that he who comes to possess these beautiful and divine qualities gains the privileges of a great giver. Many men and women are perfectly sincere in desiring great wealth that they might use it generously for others. But great wealth comes to few, while the inward enrichment comes to all who invite and hold themselves open to it. Every man may become a great giver if he chooses; for every man may make himself rich in the vision, the moral strength, the peace of spirit, which are the supreme achievements of life, and the most inspiring, comforting, enduring things which a man can bestow on his fellows.



THE SPECTATOR

The Spectator's birthday happened somewhat out of the ordinary. It came upon him in Morocco, in the blue-and-white city of Tangier, on the extreme northwest point of Africa, and was eventful chiefly by reason of the camel-accompanied picnic that, in celebration, set out that morning into Barbary.



It was a perfect October day. A little Portuguese lady was the chaperon, a joyous little lady, struck suddenly silent with the news of the revolution in Lisbon and fear for a husband and father, as yet unheard from, in the struggling city. And there was a Minister besides, and three Secretaries, with their Legation soldiers in colored turbans and flowing bath-robcs, and a half-dozen Americans; and what with every one mounted, and the soldiers, and the four Moorish guards, and a camel for the tea-things, and a burro, and counting in all the vigorous dogs of Tangier and forty-one small boys attendant, the modestly planned procession resembled nothing so much as a complete caravan to Fez.



The size of the expedition, moreover, made early progress difficult. Guards preceded the party, shouting "*Balak!* *Balak!*" to clear the way; but the streets