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It is clear that eugenicists considered immigration restriction one of their most important goals. As we have seen in chapter two, the theme of immigration restriction - the control of "foreign defective germ plasm" - was seen as necessary for the salvation of civilization as a whole. Virtually all of the key speakers at the Second International Congress of Eugenics in 1921 addressed this issue and called for controls. Jon Alfred Mjoen and others expressed the view that eugenics was concerned broadly with world-wide human migration patterns and world population control.¹ This concern for the control of world-wide human population movement remained a central concern of the eugenics movement throughout the inter-war period.

¹ See for example, "Address of Welcome," by Henry Fairfield Osborn; "Aims and Methods of Eugenical Societies," by Leonard Darwin; "Research in Eugenics," by Charles Davenport and "La race chez les populations mélangées," by D.V. de LaPouge. There were numerous addresses on particular topics not related to immigration. My point is that the opening addresses and those aimed at a wider audience, i.e., those reported widely in the press, focused or stressed the importance of immigration restriction. All of the above addresses are reprinted in the two volumes of scientific papers published by the Congress: Eugenics, Genetics and the Family I and Eugenics in Race and State II (Baltimore 1923).
Furthermore, immigration restriction was not the only goal of the eugenics movement. Another important goal was to lay the foundation for the growth of interdisciplinary fields in the broad areas of social and population biology and demography. In the twenties and thirties eugenic leaders helped establish major research programs in the area of "human migration patterns." The Scripps Foundation, the Milbank Memorial Fund, and National Research Council took leading roles in directing and coordinating numerous studies in this broad area.  

The eugenicists' involvement in immigration restriction poses two issues: Understanding the extent to which the eugenicists affected social policy and the extent to which the advent of the new eugenics implied any significant changes in the ideas or campaigns of the eugenics movement. With regard to the former, it must be understood that the immigration restriction laws of the 1920s belong to a hail of anti-foreign statutes that began during the war with passage of the Espionage Act of 1917. Between 1917 and 1920 state laws barred aliens from practicing medicine, surgery, chiropractic, pharmacy, architecture, engineering, and surveying, from operating a motor bus, and from executing

---

wills. Immigration restriction marked both the climax and the conclusion of an era of nationalistic legislation.\(^3\)

While the eugenicists did not create the movement for restriction, they became centrally important to its leadership and played a major role in the passage of the 1924 law. With regard to the second issue, it is clear by following the activities undertaken by the eugenicists after 1924 and comparing them with their pre-1924 efforts, that the the policy and program of the eugenicists remained consistent throughout the period 1921-1940.

Over the past two decades there has been a great deal of debate over the role eugenicists played in the passage of the Johnson Immigration Restriction Act of 1924. Historians of eugenics have tended to emphasize the role of eugenicists while other historians have tended to play down the role of eugenics. The debate has been particularly heated on the question of the role played by the early mental testers.\(^4\)

---


4 See for example, J. David Smith, *Minds Made Feeble: The Myth and the Legacy of the Kallikaks* (Rockville 1985) p. 3, "The Immigration Restriction Act of 1924... was passed largely because of supporting testimony provided by the staff of the Eugenics Record Office..."; a more balanced view is Ludmerer, "Genetics, Eugenics and the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 46 (Jan./Feb. 1972) 59-81, see p. 60; John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American
In the final analysis, the movement which led up to the reversal of the historic policy of open immigration was a complex mix of anti-Catholicism, anti-Bolshevism, war-inflamed nationalism, and racism. The coalition which led the movement was composed of eugenicists, blue-bloods, academics, progressives, business leaders, and nativists of all shades.\(^5\) In this section I will describe the precise


role of the Eugenics Committee and later the American Eugenics Society in the passage of the Johnson Immigration Restriction Act.

The passage of the 1924 immigration restriction act has generally been acknowledged by historians as one the great successes of the early eugenics movement. Less well appreciated is the fact that eugenics leaders campaigned persistently for the extension of the quota system to the Western Hemisphere in the period 1924 to 1940. The AES was particularly concerned with the immigration of Mexicans into the Southwest. The tactics and arguments against Mexican immigration paralleled those used in the campaign against eastern and southern European immigration. This campaign


The other great success being the Supreme Court ruling of 1927 declaring eugenical sterilization constitutional.
was carried on throughout the period of the development of the so-called, "new eugenics."

The Eugenics Committee, however, clearly considered the 1924 immigration restriction law its greatest national victory, and while support for restriction was broadly based, the eugenics movement deserves substantial credit both for coordinating the Congressional campaign between 1922 and 1924 and for the form of the final law. In his presidential report of 1926, Irving Fisher wrote:

We naturally feel pleased when we realize the important part our Committee on Selective Immigration played in the passage of the recent Immigration Act by Congress. We hope this is destined to have a very far reaching effect upon the future character of America.

After the passage of the law, Albert Johnson wrote to the American Eugenics Society:

The members of the American Eugenics Society realized, I am sure, that the investigations made by Dr. Laughlin and the reports made by the Society's Committee on Selective Immigration have been of the greatest value to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in the preparation of laws affecting these two important subjects.

---


9 "Report of the President," AES Pamphlet (1926) p. 6. See also, "Biological Aspects of Immigration: Testimony
As important as the AES may have been in the final passage of the Immigration Restriction Act, the anti-immigrant movement which led up the passage of the 1924 law predated organized eugenics and drew on sources outside the eugenics movement. The anti-immigrant movement began in the 1880s and gained momentum as immigration from eastern and southern Europe increased. The first institutional expression of this movement came in 1895 when Prescott Hall and Robert DeCourcey Ward founded the Immigration Restriction League. The IRL was an expression of a general dismay at open immigration. As far as Ward was concerned the new immigrants from both eastern and western Europe were, on the whole, ignorant, depraved, and useless.¹⁰

The IRL had little impact in the 1890s. Until 1896 the old immigration from northern and western Europe surpassed the southern and eastern European current. All in all, at

---

¹⁰ Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants (Cambridge 1956) chapter 5, "Founding the Immigration Restriction League" p. 101. See also her essay "The Intellectual Background of the Immigration Restriction Movement in New England," New England Quarterly 25 (1952) pp. 47-59. An example of the attitude of the IRL can be found in the statement of Francis Kinnicutt before the House Immigration Committee in January 1924. Adolph Sabath compared the statements of the IRL with those of the Know-Nothing Party dating back to 1810. Kinnicutt’s reply was that had we "listened a little bit better to some of their warnings" we would be better off today. See, Hearings Before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 68th Cong. 1st. Sess. p. 844.
least 80% of the total European-born population in the U.S. in mid-nineties still derived from Germany, Great Britain, Scandinavia, France, Switzerland, and the Low Countries. Furthermore, concentration of settlement limited the impact of the new groups. Although some New England States and coastal cities had fairly large numbers of new immigrants, the vast majority of the country knew nothing of Italians, Jews, and Slavs.11

Unlike anti-Catholicism and racism against blacks, Americans did not have deep-rooted feelings towards southern and eastern Europeans. Thus, the anti-immigrant sentiment that grew rapidly in the 1890s and after was a new phenomenon in the American nativist tradition. Race prejudice had long been common in the United States, but it was confined to non-whites.

Americans in the 19th century harbored the belief that America could easily absorb European immigration. American industrial interests considered immigration of great value. Immigrants were both new consumers and a pool of cheap labor. It was not an easy task to reverse this long held belief. It would be difficult to develop opposition to the new immigration without some means of distinguishing between the new immigrants and the old. The key problem, therefore, was to articulate a theory which distinguished racial

differences between western, southern, and eastern Europeans. William Z. Ripley, a young economist at Columbia University provided the answer in *The Races of Europe*, a massive scholarly volume published in 1899.  

Ripley organized into an impressive synthesis the tripartite division of white populations which European ethnologists had been developing over the previous two decades. Europe was divided into three distinct races: a northern race, called Teutonic; a central race, called Alpine; and a southern race, called Mediterranean. John R. Commons, labor historian and progressive activist at the University of Wisconsin, lectured publicly in favor of immigration restriction in the 1890s. He dramatized Ripley’s division of European peoples:

A line drawn across the continent of Europe from Northeast to Southwest separating the Scandinavian Peninsula, the British Isles, Germany and France from Russia, Austria-Hungary and Turkey, separates countries of representative institutions and popular government from absolute monarchies; it separates lands where education is universal from lands where illiteracy predominates; it separates manufacturing countries, progressive agricultural and skilled labor from primitive hand industries, backward agriculture and unskilled labor; it separates an educated thrifty peasantry from a peasantry scarcely a single generation removed from serfdom; it separates Teutonic races from Latin, Slav, Semitic and Mongolian races. When the sources of American immigration are shifted from the western countries so nearly allied to our own to eastern countries so remote in the main attributes of civilization, the change is one

---

that should challenge the attention of every citizen.\textsuperscript{13}

The movement received a powerful stimulus from Francis A. Walker, president of MIT and one of America's outstanding economists. Walker was superintendent of the census for 1870 and 1880. Using the statistics from the census, Walker, in 1891, began arguing that the rate of population growth in America was declining and that this decline coincided with the influx of inferior immigrants. He speculated that native Americans, forced to compete with cheap labor, were reducing the size of their families rather than lowering their standards of living. Thus, Walker argued that natural selection was working in reverse. Steamship companies, advertising campaigns, and cheap transatlantic rates were bringing "beaten men from beaten races; representing the worst failures in the struggle for existence."\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{13} John R. Commons, "Immigration During the Nineteenth Century," The Chautauquan 12 (1903) p. 326. It should be noted that Commons, like many American academics, accepted the Lamarckian view that acquired characteristics were heritable. Lamarckian theory did not interfere with notions of racial superiority and inferiority. Negroes would improve in native ability under slavery (not, however, in a free state) but this improvement would take many generations. In the meantime the white race would also improve leaving the Negro perpetually inferior. Commons approved of a system of peonage for blacks.

\textsuperscript{14} Quoted from Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) pp. 142-3; see also, Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants (Cambridge 1956) pp. 69-70.
In 1901, Edward A. Ross coined the phrase "race suicide" in an address before the American Academy of Political and Social Science. In discussing the dangers of unchecked Asiatic immigration Ross amplified Walker's theory of the survival of the unfittest. When a higher race quietly eliminates itself rather than suffer the competition of a lower one, it is committing suicide. The argument was quickly picked up by other progressives (including Theodore Roosevelt) and applied to the competition between inferior eastern Europeans and native Americans.\footnote{Ross was a member of the AES advisory council from 1925 to 1935. He was quite active in both the eugenics movement and later in the population control movement. His most important work on eugenics and immigration restriction was The Old World in the New (New York 1914) which was a racist attack on the new immigrants. His later work, Standing Room Only (New York 1927) focused on the issue of world population control.}

Organized eugenic activity in the immigration campaign began between 1910 and 1912 when Charles Davenport organized the committee on immigration of the eugenics section of the American Breeders Association. Davenport was an energetic organizer. He brought the Immigration Restriction League \footnote{E.A. Ross, "The Causes of Race Superiority," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 18 (1901) pp. 85-88; see also Ross, "The Value Rank of the American People," Independent 57 (1904) pp. 1061-63. John R. Commons extended the argument to the Europeans. "The competition of races is the competition of standards of living." Wages originally set by the greater necessities of more advanced races decline in the face of competition from the Chinaman or the Italian - "competition has no respect for superior races. The race with the lowest necessities displaces others." John R. Commons, "Social and Industrial Problems," The Chautauquan (March 1904) p. 18.}
into the eugenic fold by enlisting Prescott Hall\textsuperscript{17} and Robert DeCourcey Ward, cofounders of the IRL, into the American Breeders Committee. He also recruited Madison Grant and Franz Boas into the ABA group although Boas quickly withdrew.\textsuperscript{18} It was also apparently on the suggestion of Davenport that Henry Goddard went to Ellis Island in 1912 to experiment with the use of the Binet test in detecting mentally defective immigrants.\textsuperscript{19}

Between 1907 and 1910 the Department of Commerce and Labor under the direction of Senator William Dillingham held extensive hearings on the immigration issue. While noting that the new immigration was inferior to the old Dillingham's committee nevertheless concluded that immigration legislation should be primarily based on economic and business considerations. Selection of

\textsuperscript{17} Davenport and Hall had been classmates at Yale.


immigrants should be limited to a literacy test.\textsuperscript{20} There was very little input by eugenic leaders in these hearings.

Proposals for immigration restriction legislation had been introduced into Congress as far back as the 1880's. What held restriction back was a formidable coalition of business interests, progressives, and first generation Americans. This coalition began to disintegrate in the teens and collapsed completely in the face of war-inflamed nationalism. Progressives were among the first to see a danger in the new immigration. They often encountered immigrants as a stumbling block to urban reform.\textsuperscript{21} Business leaders were slower in yielding to the restrictionist trend but they succumbed to the fear of anarchism and communism.\textsuperscript{22}

Thus defenders of open immigration were steadily decreasing during the first two decades of the twentieth century. A few progressives, such as Edward Everett Hale and William James, continued to defend the immigrant. Bourke Cochran, the Irish representative of the House, and


Adolph Sabath, the representative of the Jewish 'greenhorn sections,' still called for open immigration on the House floor. Immigrant writers such as Franz Boas, Ludwig Lewison, Mary Antin, and Horace Kallen still defended open immigration but they were increasingly isolated voices.23

Anti-Catholicism was also making spectacular gains. In 1911, Wilbur Franklin Phelps, a small country editor from the Ozark highlands, founded The Menace, a rabidly anti-Catholic newspaper. In one year circulation rose to over one hundred thousand and in five years circulation topped a million! Other anti-Catholic organizations, including the American Protective Association and Ku Klux Klan also gained membership in these years. At the same time Catholics themselves, caught up in fear of anarchism and communism, turned against open immigration.24

The eugenics movement was developing an identity in America at the same time that this diverse movement for immigration restriction was gaining momentum. What the

23 Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants (Cambridge 1956) ch. 9, "The minority with faith" pp. 176-194. See Boas, "What is Race" Nation 120 (1925) p. 91; New York Times, 4/26/24, p. 17. see Lewison's autobiography, Up Steam (New York 1922); Mary Antin, They Who Knock At Our Gates (Boston 1914).

24 Donald Kinzer, An Episode in Anti-Catholicism (Seattle 1964); Richard Linkh, American Catholicism and European Immigrants (Staten Island 1975) chapter XII. Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 180; The paper ceased publication during the war and started up again under the title, The New Menace to campaign for immigration restriction. See The New Menace, 1921-1929, Missouri State Historical Society.
eugenics movement did was weave these threads into a whole cloth, developing a coherent theory and popularizing it throughout the country.25 According to immigration historian Robert Divine, "the man who played the key role in synthesizing these racist concepts and applying them to immigration restriction was Madison Grant," author of The Passing of the Great Race (1916). Grant "wedded the racist ideas developing in the United States to the more virulent European race theories" of de Gobineau and Chamberlain.26 Grant was not alone, however, in calling the attention of the nation to the racialist perspective. Between 1916 and 1920 a cascade of books and articles flowed from the eugenacists' pens.27

25 John Higham estimates that between 1910 and 1914 popular magazines carried more articles on eugenics than on the three questions of slums, tenements and living standards combined. (Higham, 149). Garland Allen notes that by 1915 the Readers Guide lists over fifty articles a year under the subject eugenics. This is a substantial underestimate. Dozens of eugenics related articles are also to be found under the headings of "intelligence tests", "genetics", "immigration" and "heredity."

26 Divine, American Immigration, pp. 11-12.

27 Among the best known of the period were, Madison Grant's, The Passing of the Great Race (New York 1916); Charles Gould's, America: A Family Matter (New York 1921), and Lothrop Stoddard's, The Rising Tide of Color Against White Supremacy, (New York 1920). There were also numerous other books and articles. See, for example: Clinton S. Burr, America's Race Heritage (New York 1922); Edwin G. Conklin, "Some Biological Aspects of Immigration," Scribner's Magazine 69 (1921) pp. 352-59; George Creel, "Close the Gates!" Collier's 67 (1921), pp. 9-26.
The eugenics movement also brought restrictionists together under the banner of science. Supporting such popular works were the statements of America’s leading academics. Among them were the leading psychologists of the day, who were rising to national prominence and prestige in these years. Yerkes, Terman, and Brigham joined the restrictionist campaign after World War I, using the Army intelligence test data to argue that the new immigrants were racially inferior. Terman boasted after the passage of the Johnson Immigration Restriction Act that, because of the mental tests, psychology "has become the beacon light of the eugenics movement;... [and] is appealed to by Congressmen in the reshaping of national policy on immigration."  

The eugenicists managed to instill the belief that eastern and southern Europeans were biologically inferior to northern European whites. Furthermore, most restrictionists

---


29 Lewis Terman, "The Mental Test as a Psychological Method," Psychological Review 31 (1924) p. 206. See also Samelson, "Putting Psychology on the Map: Ideology and Intelligence Testing," in Buss (ed.) Psychology in Social Context (New York 1979). In February 1921, Yerkes wrote to Johnson calling his attention to the army tests and pointing out the "important bearing upon the immigration Bill... before Congress." Samelson, p. 124. In his introduction to Carl Brigham’s, A Study of American Intelligence (New York 1923), Yerkes pointed out that "no one of us as a citizen can afford to ignore the menace of race deterioration or the evident relations of immigration to national progress and welfare." (p. vii).
jumped on the eugenics bandwagon and either joined eugenic organizations or coordinated their work with the eugenic leadership.

Frenzied agitation for restriction began during the third session of the 65th Congress. A number of bills were introduced to deny citizenship to "alien slackers," deport "alien enemies," and aliens who attempted to escape military service. Playing on the fear of Bolshevism, both the Senate and the House introduced bills to suspend immigration entirely. These demands showed the extent the war had altered the temper of American nationalism.

The turning point in terms of the involvement of the eugenicists in the actual formulation of restrictionist legislation came in 1919 with the appointment of Albert Johnson as chair of the House Immigration Committee.

---

30 Between 2 December 1918 and 4 March 1919.

31 The fear of Bolshevism, at least for some restrictionists, was more a ploy than a sincerely felt threat. Madison Grant was more contemptuous of communism than frightened of it. He had another consideration in mind. "When the Bolshevists in Russia are overthrown, which is only a matter of time, there will be a great massacre of Jews and I suppose we will get the overflow unless we can stop it." Madison Grant to Prescott Hall, 10/21/18 IRL papers, Harvard University quoted from Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 306.


33 The IRL was instrumental in getting Johnson appointed to this committee. It maintained a full time lobbyist in Washington. See Chase, Legacy, p. 289. For a biography of Johnson see, "One who must be shown," Saturday Evening Post, 195 (19 May 1923) pp. 92, 97. The foreign danger
Quickly becoming the leader of the restrictionist movement, he brought the eugenics leadership to Washington to join him in an informal cabinet which planned the legislative battle for restriction.

It was probably Madison Grant who introduced Johnson to eugenic circles in New York. Johnson and Grant were old allies and Grant was in a unique position to introduce Johnson to New York restrictionist circles. Grant had been treasurer of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, a charter member of the Eugenics Committee, chairman of its subcommittee on Selective Immigration, founder of the Galton Society, member of the Eugenics Research Association, and a leader in the American Defense Society.34

Before long Johnson was made a member of the Eugenics Research Association, the Eugenics Committee of the United States, and the Galton Society. Lothrop Stoddard, Kenneth Roberts,35 Charles Gould, and Harry Laughlin were meeting was the governing passion of his entire Congressional career. He was first elected to Congress in 1912 on a restrictionist platform. He embraced the two bitterest aversions of his timber-rich constituency in southwestern Washington.—hatred of the wobblies and hatred of the Japanese.

34 John Higham is the source of the speculation that Grant was Johnson's initial contact with New York restrictionist circles. Johnson was impressed with Grants 1916 book (The Passing of the Great Race) and had been corresponding with him since that time. Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 313-315.

35 Roberts was particularly active and important in the immigration restriction campaign throughout the twenties and thirties. He traveled to Europe in 1919, 1920 and 1921 as a reporter for the Saturday Evening Post sending
regularly with Johnson to plan strategy. Johnson was especially pleased to enlist the cooperation of Harry Laughlin. Laughlin gave the House Committee and through it the American people an extensive education in the importance of basing immigration policy on scientifically racial rather than economic considerations. After Laughlin's first appearance before the committee in 1920, Johnson appointed him its "expert eugenics agent." \(^{36}\)

The *Eugenical News* was used to inform the troops of the progress of Immigration bills and call on its readership for support. Kenneth Roberts, whose editor at the *Saturday Evening Post* was a member of the Eugenics Society's advisory council, \(^{37}\) was ordered to Washington to do a series on back alarmist reports on the numbers and nature of the immigrants waiting to come to America. He kept in close touch with Albert Johnson during these trips and later testified before Johnson's Committee on December 14, 1921. See *Hearings*, 67th Cong. 2d. Sess. pp. 97-106.

During the 1930s he used the same arguments developed in the campaign against the Jews to campaign against the Mexican immigrants. See Robert A. Mohl, "The *Saturday Evening Post* and the 'Mexican Invasion,'" *Journal of Mexican American History* 3 (1973) pp. 131-38.


\(^{36}\) The editor, George Horace Lorimer, while not a member of the advisory council was clearly in sympathy with their aims (see his editorial "The Great American Myth" 5/7/21 in which he recommends reading Grant and Stoddard to
immigration and the House debate. He "practically camped in the committee's office," according to Peter Snyder, Johnson's personal secretary. Lothrop Stoddard and Harry Laughlin came to Washington to testify before Johnson's committee.38

Early in 1920 Johnson invited Harry Laughlin to testify before his committee. Laughlin presented a report entitled "Biological Aspects of Immigration."39 Laughlin told the committee that "the character of a nation is determined primarily by its racial qualities; that is, by the hereditary physical, mental, and moral or temperamental traits of its people." Laughlin summarized the data on the Jukes, Ishmaels, and Kallikaks,40 telling the committee that they had been deported from England because even then "it was found that they were the kind who would steal the bishop's silver if they got a chance." Even in Australia eugenics workers had found slums populated by the descendants of the original Botany Bayers deported from anyone who "wishes to understand the full gravity of our present immigration problem." quoted from Chase, p. 173); Roberts original series on the Immigrants began in October 1919. He later published a book, Europe Leaves Home based on the series in 1922.


40 The Jukes, Ishmaels, and Kallikaks are examples of studies of family groups allegedly proving genetic propensities for crimes, pauperism, and feeblemindedness.
England. To prevent any further "deterioration of the American people" immigration of "degenerate 'blood'" must be prevented.41

By the summer of 1920 the tide of anti-immigration was clearly turning. The war over, transportation lines were once again fully operative. New immigrants were arriving in the latter half of 1920 at the rate of over fifty-thousand a month. The new immigrants came in the face of the Red scare, depression, and rising unemployment. A wave of persecution in Europe brought 119,000 Jews to America between 1920 and 1921.42 Johnson made as much of this as he could. He reintroduced his suspension bill (H.R. 14461), which called for a two year suspension of immigration. Johnson's arguments for the bill played on anti-Semitism. The bill passed the House 296 to 42.

Testifying before the Senate Immigration Committee on behalf of this bill, Johnson presented a report from the State Department to the effect that the "dregs of Europe" were crowding French, German, and Austrian cities waiting to inundate America. Prefacing his remarks by saying that these reports "have been assailed as somewhat offensive," he

41 Quoted from Chase, Legacy, p. 292.

42 The actual numbers were not very large. According to Senate testimony between one hundred and sixty and three hundred thousand immigrants arrived between January and October 1920. Prior to 1914 the country was receiving an inflow of over one million annually. Hearings before the Committee on Immigration, United States Senate 66th Congress, 3d. Sess. p. 89; 144.
urged his colleagues to remember "that they are from our own State Department, from the consular agents." The State Department report referred to the immigrants as "wasted by disease," "mentally deficient," "abnormally twisted" and mostly of the "Jewish race" whose "unassimilability" cannot "bear any argument." The report referred to "great masses" of Polish Jews "of the usual ghetto type" who were waiting to come to America. "They are filthy, un-American, and often dangerous in their habits." The State Department Report went on for eleven pages and returned over and over again to the Jews. Johnson’s campaign was simple and direct. America faced an emergency which called for the immediate suspension of all immigration. The alternative would be inundation by "filthy, un-American" Jews.


44 Kenneth Roberts supplied similar testimony before the House Committee. He described a situation in which a "venerable Jew" who was serving as his guide "tore" into a crowd of immigrants, "beat them, and apparently cursed them... That was the only thing that would make them get back. Apparently they won’t allow themselves to be handled in any other way." Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 67th Cong. 2d. Sess. 13 Dec. 1921, pp. 97-106.

45 On the origin of the State Department report see Louis Marshall to Charles Evans Hughes, April 27, 1921, in Marshall Papers, Box C Archives of the American Jewish Committee; New York Times 11/13/20, p.11; Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York 1970) p. 309. Johnson also presented eyewitness testimony and news stories supplied by Frederick Bigelow and Kenneth Roberts. They had gone to Europe to generate stories and gather material in support of Johnson’s efforts. See Johnson’s testimony before the Senate Committee on Immigration 66
The Senate committee did not buy Johnson's arguments. It was obvious that no emergency existed. The reports of millions of Jews waiting to come to America were clearly false. The actual numbers of immigrants coming per month was light to moderate by pre-war standards and as Louis Marshall and others pointed out many of those coming were the close relatives of immigrants already here. Nevertheless, the sentiment for restriction was strong. The Senate Committee recommended substitution of a fifteen-month quota system for aliens based on 5% of the number of foreign born persons of such nationality based on the 1910 census. This bill would limit immigration to around 350,000 per year. The House Conference committee accepted the plan and the compromise was sent to President Wilson in February 1921. It received a pocket veto from the President. In the next session of Congress both the House and Senate tightened up the original quota bill, cut the quota from five to three percent, and sent it on to Harding who signed it into law on 19 May 1921.

---

Cong. 3d. Sess. on H.R. 14461, pp. 7-40. See also the compelling and rational reply of Morris Rothenberg, of the American Jewish Congress, on pp. 143-47 and the detailed point by point rebuttal by Judge Leon Sanders, representing the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, pp. 89-96. There was simply no foundation in the State Department reports. Most of the Jews who wished to immigrate to America had family here already. They were the wives and children of families who arrived before the war.


Although adopted as a temporary measure, the law was a turning point in American immigration policy. It imposed the first sharp limit on European immigration and it established the national origins test as a means to restrict immigrants. The eugenicists had wanted an army of testers and eugenic field workers to screen the immigrants both in Europe and at Castle Garden. This idea was politically unrealistic and the eugenicists compromised on the national origins system, although they never gave up the dream of eugenic field workers selecting seed stock from Europe.

With the quota system in place Johnson began an extended campaign to tighten up the immigration quotas. At this point the Eugenics Committee and the eugenics movement as a whole began to play a leading role. The temporary law still allowed 150,000 immigrants from eastern and southern Europe to enter America each year. Between 1922 and 1924 Johnson and his allies in the eugenics movement planned a

---

48 The national origins test was not abandoned until the Cellar Act of 1965. See, Time "Special Immigrants Issue: The Changing Face of America" 7/8/65 for a popular look at the contemporary immigration issue.

49 They never entirely gave up the hope of a system run by eugenic field workers who could cull Europe of its best seed stock. Even within the national origins system the eugenicist pushed for testing. See for example, the 1930 Report of the Committee on Selective Immigration of the AES, 11 November 1930 reproduced in Eugenics 8 #12 (December 1930) pp. 470-73. The Nazi Lebensborn program was based on a similar idea. SS troops kidnapped "Aryan" children from across occupied Eastern Europe, and brought them back to Germany to infuse the seed stock stock of the Fatherland.
well coordinated campaign to close the door even further.50

With the help of his "Kitchen Cabinet" in New York, Johnson and his Committee developed the strategy for the Congressional campaign. They would aim at reducing the quota to 2% and changing the census base from 1910 to 1890.51

Although the Committee on Selective Immigration of the Eugenics Committee of the United States was not officially constituted until 28 April 1923, the AES leadership began organizing academic support for tightening immigration control in 1922 when Robert Yerkes and Charles Davenport helped create the Committee on Scientific Problems of Human Migration52 as part of the the National Research Council's Division of Anthropology and Psychology.53 The Committee


51 Laughlin comments that Grant was "instrumental in the framing of the Johnson Restriction Bill of 1924." See Laughlin "Notes on Madison Grant" Laughlin Papers, Kirksville in Laughlin/Grant file. The New York Times obituary of Grant 5/31/37 makes the same point claiming that Grant helped "frame the Johnson Restriction Act of 1924."

52 The Committee was organized in August 1922. For a full report on its diverse activities see, "Report and Recommendations of the Committee on Scientific Problems of Human Migration." Presented to the Division of Anthropology and Psychology, National Research Council, April 5, 1926.

53 "Report of the Biological Conference Group" of the Committee on Scientific Problems of Human Migration
believed that it was "urgent" to study the biological consequences of racial intermixture. This work bears "directly upon the immigration question." Yerkes obtained five thousand dollars to begin a scientific study of the problem from the Scripps Foundation. On 25 January he, Wissler, and Lillie met with Commissioner General of Immigration, W.W. Husband to explore ways in which the committee might encouraged and guide academic work in support of immigration restriction. The committee was composed almost entirely of the inner-core of the AES leadership.

The AES Committee on Selective Immigration consisted of Grant as chairman; Laughlin, secretary; and Robert deCourcey Ward as vice-chairman. In the Fall of 1923, the following submitted by Frank R. Lillie, March 8, 1923. Population Council Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, New York. The Committee consisted of Yerkes, Chairman, Dr. Dodge, Sec. of the National Research Council, Kellogg, chairman of the NRC Division of Biology and Agriculture, Davenport, Holmes, Pearl, and Wissler.

54 Ibid. See, Appendix to the Report titled, "Recommendations as to Problems in Race Intermixture," see also p. 5 of the Report itself. The Committee believed that adequate funding had to be found for research on the effects of race-crossing. They decided that this would be a priority of their work. The Committee also specifically recommended eight thousand dollars for the National Bureau of Economic Research in New York to undertake a study of the projected need for labor in relation to Immigration. See Exhibit 12.

55 The Eugenics Committee was actively organizing on behalf of immigration restriction even before the establishment of the Committee on Selective Immigration. See, "Eugenics Committee of the United States," a type written report circa January 1924, AES Papers," in Minutes of the Eugenics Committee, AES Papers.
members were added to the Committee: Lucien Howe, Charles W. Gould, Albert Johnson, and Francis Kinnicutt.\textsuperscript{56} Thus, the Committee on Selective Immigration was represented by the Chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, the leaders of the Immigration Restriction Leagues of Boston and New York, the American Defense Society, and the Eugenics movement. This group coordinated the campaign, which included releasing special reports to the press at crucial points in the House proceedings.\textsuperscript{57}

Using Congressional franking privileges and Congressional stationery, Laughlin surveyed all major public institutions for the mentally and physically handicapped and prepared a new report documenting his earlier assertions regarding the inferiority of the new immigrants. Laughlin's massive new report containing detailed statistical analysis of the number of immigrants and children of immigrants in jails and other institutions for the socially inadequate.

Laughlin testified on the result of the survey of state and federal institutions for social inadequates. He studied ten classes: feebleminded, insane, criminal, epileptic, inebriate, tuberculous, blind, deaf, deformed, and dependent. "It shows that certain individuals are

\textsuperscript{56} Kinnicutt was a founder of the 20,000-member New York Immigration Restriction League which was separate from the Boston IRL headed by Ward.

\textsuperscript{57} See Report titled, "Eugenics Committee of the United States" circa January 1924 pp. 3-4. AES Papers.
contributing unduly to an institutional population; it reveals clear evidence that some countries are 'dumping' their defectives upon 'Our America.'" the report recommended the following: 1) examination of the individual immigrant, not only as such but as a potential parent; 2) the measurement of immigrants by modern mental tests; 3) the consideration of the personal standing of each immigrant at his home; 4) a consideration of the family history of the immigrant; 5) the establishment of immigration officials to secure adequate personal and family data. Davenport commented in reporting on Laughlin's testimony that it was "really thrilling to observe the attention Congress is paying to precise facts concerning immigration and its consequences."58

In December Laughlin prepared yet another report both for the Eugenics Committee and for Johnson. The Eugenics Committee's Committee on Selective Immigration distributed the report to the advisory council and to Congress. They also distributed 2360 copies to newspapers, magazines, and journals across the country for release on 7 January 1924.

Another five hundred copies were distributed by Committee members to individuals and organizations.59

Laughlin's report was sent to all the members of the advisory council with the request that they read the report carefully and give any comments or advice on the report. When H. S. Jennings received a copy of the report he was extremely disturbed over its conclusions. Jennings believed the report was methodologically flawed. Laughlin surveyed 445 state and federal custodial institutions. He calculated the proportion of various categories of defectives such as insane, feebleminded, criminal, etc. He then calculated a sort of quota system. A group that furnished inmates to these custodial institutions in the same proportion as it furnishes inhabitants to the population was said to fill 100 percent of its quota. Jennings pointed out that Laughlin's entire edifice was fraught with methodological problems.

Jennings was particularly disturbed by the conclusions drawn from Laughlin's data. He pointed out that by Laughlin's own standards Negroes had to be considered among the best biological stock in the nation since they furnished

---

59 The details of the Committee's activities on behalf of the 1924 Immigration Restriction Act can be found in a report on the accomplishment of the Eugenics Committee of the United States, a five-page typescript titled: "Eugenics Committee of the United States of America." It was written sometime early in 1924 and is part of the AES collection (Bk I). Harry Laughlin, "Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot," Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 67th Cong. 3d. Sess. Serial 7-C, 1923, pp. 725-831.
only 16% of their quota for the feebleminded while native whites filled 125% of their quota. Furthermore, Jennings's pointed out:

if we examine the facts for the nationalities or regions that have contributed very large blocks of immigrants, so that there were in 1910 as many as 1,000,000 foreign born Americans from each, we find that Ireland contributed a much greater proportion of defectives than any of the other large groups.... Ireland was first in the proportion of insane, of pauperism or dependency; and of total defectives. The next to the worst record is that of Russia; then follows the Balkans; ... Italy, Scandinavia; Great Britain; Germany; with Austria-Hungary last.60

"Thus," Jennings concluded, based on Laughlin's own data, "the worst record is given by a country in Northwest Europe; the best by one in Southeast Europe [i.e. Austria-Hungary].

Now, does this situation call for going back to the census of 1890 as a basis [for the immigration quotas]? If it does ... It would discriminate against what on the face of Laughlin's own data is the best stock among the large groups. I am not certain that I should be able to subscribe, in view of Laughlin's statistics, to what is said on Page 8 of the Committee report as to the aliens from Northwest Europe being the 'good types, able bodied, physically fit, independent,' etc, ...

The Eugenics Committee ignored Jennings criticism and went ahead with a massive propaganda campaign based on

60 Jennings to Fisher, 11/21/23, see, also Irving Fisher to H.S. Jennings, 11/19/23; Jennings Papers, American Philosophical Library, Philadelphia, Pa.

61 Ibid.
Laughlin's worthless data. The results of Laughlin's report were published extensively in newspapers throughout the country. During the hearings of the House Committee two professional statisticians declared Laughlin's report "unworthy of consideration."\(^62\) Jennings, too, was called to refute Laughlin's arguments. He summarized his critique of Laughlin's report with devastating simplicity. Laughlin's data, he argued, presented a powerful argument against changing the quota basis. According to Laughlin's data changing the quota basis from 1910 to 1890 would increase the number of defectives.\(^63\)

Jennings also published his objections in *The Survey, Science*, and later in a short book entitled *Prometheus or Biology and the Advancement of Man*. Jennings wrote:

---


\(^63\) Statement of Professor H.S. Jennings, Hearings Before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 66th Cong. 1st. Sess. Friday 4 January 1924, pp. 510-518. Jennings was not the only one to question Laughlin's report.
the current fallacy that what is hereditary is
certain, fixed, unchangeable ... reappears in
discussions of racial problems .... There is no
warrant in the science of genetics for such a
statement; under new conditions they may not
appear. It is particularly in connection with
racial questions in man that there has been a
great throwing about of false biology.
Heredity is stressed as all-powerful;
environment as almost powerless; a vicious
fallacy, not supported by the results of
investigation. We are warned not to admit to
America certain people now differing from
ourselves, on the basis of the resounding
assertion that biology informs us that the
environment can bring out nothing whatsoever
but the hereditary characters. Such an
assertion is perfectly empty and idle ...64

Shortly after passage of the immigration restriction
bill Jennings sent Irving Fisher his resignation from the
Eugenics Society. "My main difficulty with the methods of
the Eugenics Society" he wrote, "lies in its use of Dr.
Laughlin's 'Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot' in
support of the provisions of the immigration bill basing
admission of immigrants on the census of 1890 in place of
1910." That provision "may be a wise one, on other grounds,
but the arguments for it drawn from Laughlin's studies seem
to me clearly illegitimate. His data do not in my opinion
justify the statements made in the Report."65

64 H. S. Jennings, "'Undesirable Aliens': A biologist's
Examination of the Evidence before Congress," The Survey
51 #6 (15 December 1923) pp. 309-312; "Proportions of
Defectives from the Northwest and from the Southeast of
Europe," Science (14 March 1924); Prometheus or Biology
and the Advancement of Man (New York 1925) p. 55-8. See
also, Fisher to Jennings, 2/22/24.

65 Jennings to Fisher, 9/27/24; Jennings Papers, APS, Phil.
PA.
Jennings took pains to review the entire history of the Laughlin affair. Noting that all through the proceedings he communicated his objections to the Board and to the Congressional Committee.

When your letter of Nov. 19, 1923 enclosing that report came, I wrote you, under the date of Nov. 21, calling attention to the shakiness of the evidence on which the assertions were made. I trust that I am not 'sore' because no attention was paid to the point I made but here was a question of fact, one susceptible to test by some simple computations. The Committee did not think it worth while to make these computations ... Yet this was a matter of enormous importance on which the statements of the Committee were mistaken.66

Not only were Jennings' objections ignored, the Committee was clearly rounding up all arguments in favor of restriction without regard to merit. The overriding concern seemed to be to find the cluster of arguments that would support the bill. For example, John B. Trevor, a close friend of Madison Grant and a fellow trustee of the American Museum of Natural History, and eventually an unofficial advisor to Johnson, recommended that the new bill be argued on the grounds that the 1910 census unfairly favored the southern and eastern European immigrants! The argument was simple. A quota should maintain the racial balance in the country. Since the new immigrants only constituted some 12 per cent of the population they should not constitute more than 12 per cent of the quota. By the 1910 census they were allotted 44% of the quota. By the 1890 census they were

66 Ibid.
allotted 15%. Thus the 1890 census was fair— even liberal. 67

While such a tactic was deemed necessary for the floor of the House, no such ruse was necessary among the eugenicists themselves. In their campaign for restriction they had repeatedly referred to the racial inferiority of the new immigrants. In its call for support of the bill the Committee on Selective Immigration of the Eugenics Committee of the United States of America wrote to its members:

Our immigration policy in the past has been too much a matter of temporary economic or political expediency. One of the most encouraging recent developments is the rapidly growing conviction on the part of our people that, as Dr. H. H. Laughlin has stated it, 'immigration is a long-time investment in family stocks rather than a short-time investment in productive labor.'...

A percentage limitation based on the census of 1890 would therefore not only reduce (1) the inflow of unskilled 'cheap' labor, but would also greatly reduce (2) the number of immigrants of the lower grades of intelligence and (3) of immigrants who are making excessive contributions to our feebleminded, insane, criminal, and other socially inadequate classes." The initial argument in favor of the restriction law was economic. "The fundamental reason for its continuance is biological." 68

In its campaign for the bill, the Eugenics Committee also stressed the importance of the results of the Army


intelligence tests. The Committee believed that the country at large had been greatly impressed by the results of these tests.

Experts have told us that had mental tests been in operation, and had the 'inferior' and 'very inferior' immigrants been refused admission to the United States, over 6,000,000 aliens now living in this country, free to vote, and to become the fathers and mothers of future Americans, would never have been admitted. The facts are known. It is high time for the American people to stop such a degradation of American citizenship, and such a wrecking of the future American race."69

The Johnson Immigration Restriction Bill passed the House and Senate with only minor modifications. It was signed by President Coolidge on 26 May 1924.70 The eugenicists rejoiced at what they considered their greatest national victory. They believed this victory would be only the beginning of a eugenics campaign that would permeate every aspect of American social and legal life. In the end immigration restriction took the wind out of the eugenics sail. The eugenicists had been able to lead a large coalition of nativists in the campaign. Once won, however, the coalition disintegrated.


70 Calvin Coolidge had already lent his name to the Nordic theory when he published, "Whose Country is this? In his address to Congress he called for some action to keep America American. *Good Housekeeping* 72 (February 1921) p. 14.
While the country lost interest in immigration restriction, the American Eugenics Society did not. The Committee on Selective Immigration continued to be active well into the thirties. In 1928 the Committee issued its fourth report. It called for three additional standards to the legislation then in effect.

(a) That in the future there shall be admitted as immigrants only white persons, all of whose ancestors are of Caucasian descent.

(b) That the standard of natural intelligence be at least equal to the mean of the population and that no immigrant who rates below a "C" in the Army intelligence scale should be admitted.

(c) That it be required that the majority of the near kin of each particular immigrant indicate a high probability from the standpoint of family stock, that the particular immigrant will become an asset to American citizenry.

Society literature stressed the continued danger of non-Aryan immigration. Among those the society mentioned as of particular danger were Negroes from the West Indies, coolies from Philippines, and peons from Mexico. The Society advocated extension of the quota system to all countries of North and South America. The Society also advocated strengthened border patrols, an effective deportation system, and consular examination of potential immigrants. The AES was also interested in bringing a test case before the Supreme Court to determine whether Mexicans
could be excluded on racial grounds since they were neither white nor of African descent.\textsuperscript{71}

While the Society was interested in all aspects of immigration control, including such things as registration and deportation of aliens, its focus turned more and more to the danger of Mexican immigration. In testimony before the House Immigration Committee in March 1928, Harry Laughlin called attention to the entrance of Mexican and colored races into the southwest since 1920.\textsuperscript{72}

In a talk he presented before the Galton Society, Laughlin pointed out that the 1924 Restriction Act had resulted in larger numbers of Mexicans pouring into California, Arizona, and Texas. According to Laughlin the Mexicans were threatening to reconquer these areas. Francis Kinnicutt reported that the question of Mexican immigration was one of the major problems before Congress and that bills

\textsuperscript{71} The Immigration Act of 1924 restricted immigration to white persons or persons of African descent. The courts had already ruled that this excluded Hindus and Mongolians. "Fourth Report of the Committee on Selective Immigration," \textit{Eugenical News} 13 #10 (October, 1928) pp. 134-5; see also, "Memorial on Immigration Quotas," \textit{Eugenical News} 12 #3 (March 1927) p. 27. See also footnote 4 above.

\textsuperscript{72} "American History in Terms of Human Migration," review of statements by Harry Laughlin before the House Immigration Committee March 7, 1928. \textit{Eugenical News} 13 #8 (August, 1928) p. 112.
drawn up on the issue were being effectively opposed by the railroads, farmers, and the sugar industry.\textsuperscript{73}

The Galton Society responded by calling upon Madison Grant and Harry Laughlin to prepare a statement which the Society could endorse. The "Statement on Immigration Control in Relation to National Character" was issued in May 1929. The statement emphasized that "the essential character of every nation depends primarily upon the inborn racial and family endowments of its citizens."\textsuperscript{74}

The campaign for continued restriction in the period 1924 to 1935 followed the same methods of the earlier campaign. The AES Committee on Immigration coordinated the efforts of restrictions, worked closely with Albert Johnson and the House Immigration Committee, produced many books and articles on the danger of immigration, and influenced organizations such as the NRC, AAAS, and foundations to take an interest in the issue. Furthermore, throughout this period the Committee on Selective Immigration was led by Madison Grant and Harry Laughlin. The transformation of the


Society in these years from the so-called "old" eugenics to the "new" eugenics made very little difference in this campaign.

In 1934, for example, Frederick Osborn, acting as director of the Galton Publishing Company, supervised the production of *The Alien in Our Midst*, a collection of essays edited by Madison Grant and C.S. Davison. Among the authors included in the volume besides Grant were Albert Johnson were E.M. East, Lothrop Stoddard, and H.F. Osborn.\(^7\)

Frederick Osborn expressed his views on these questions directly in *Dynamics of Population*, a book he wrote with Frank Lorimer in 1934.\(^7\) Osborn was agnostic on the question of the hereditary nature of race and class differences. While the I.Q. tests scores clearly showed race and class differences, those groups with lower average scores also suffered from economic and cultural deprivation which might account for the differences. Osborn assumed that some of these differences were genetic but there simply wasn’t enough evidence available to justify "invidious


racial distinctions." While Osborn rejected the certainties of past eugenic pronouncements on race, he maintained all of the Society's anti-immigrant policies. On the question of immigration restriction he wrote:

There has been a great influx of persons of diverse racial origins, with low standards of living and with unknown intellectual capacities during recent years... These groups have also been characterized, at least during the first generation, by rapid natural increase. Combining immigration and natural increase, there was accession to the United States during the last decade of nearly a million persons of Mexican or West Indian origin, including a large proportion of Indian and Negro stock. There seems to be no valid reason, except the private gain of some parties interested in exploiting cheap labor, for a continuance of this policy. The time would seem to be ripe for legislative action on this matter.7

Osborn explained that immigration restriction should ideally be based on a close examination of the individual and his or her near kin, though politically "it is frequently necessary to deal with groups." Intelligence tests have shown "that there are significant differences in the distribution of intellectual development among immigrants" On the basis of this evidence

There would seem to be every reason in favor of extension of the quota principle of immigration control to North America (especially south of the Rio Grande), South America, and the Atlantic and Pacific Islands.79

77 Ibid. p. 337.
78 Ibid. p. 336.
79 Ibid.
Osborn also was troubled by the migration of Negroes to the northern industrial centers. While the science of genetics had not proven miscegenation harmful, unions of persons "of very different capacities, always involves hazards from the eugenic standpoint." Furthermore, interracial unions also carry a "social stigma." The discouragement of miscegenation "is a eugenic objective which intelligent leaders of racial minorities will readily share with other thoughtful persons."\(^80\)

Osborn and Lorimer even expressed concern over the Northern migration of Negroes for the future of the Negro race. They felt that it was unfortunate that the most "intellectual Negroes" were moving into the "relatively sterile environment of urban life" leaving behind the "most retarded Negro families" in the high birth regions. Osborn and Lorimer recommended a policy that would encourage "superior Negro families" to remain in rural communities.\(^81\)

Osborn expanded and revised these views in his book *Preface to Eugenics* published in 1940. By 1940, Osborn was confident that "stocks which do not differ in color from the majority of natives" would rapidly assimilate into the nation. They intermarry with the native stocks and "tend toward occupational and individual levels" in accordance

\(^80\) *Ibid* p. 338.

\(^81\) *Ibid* pp. 337-8.
with their individual abilities. As we noted in chapter three, this was not true of Negroes, Indians, and Mexicans.

Of all the racial groups in this country, the Negroes, the Indians, and the Mexicans present the most serious cultural problems. There is as yet no scientific evidence as to whether these races differ from the white stocks in genetic capacity to develop qualities of social value. But their present cultural qualities and standards of education and sanitation are such as to complicate and retard the development of adjoining white groups.... These problems are not eugenic, so far as we know at present, but they are a matter of grave social concern, since racial problems are accentuated by any tendency of minority groups to increase at the expense of the majority.

Osborn speculated that these races might be improved "by a process of increasing births among their best stocks and decreasing births among their poorer stocks," but the eugenic aspect of this problem was overshadowed by the inability of these groups to assimilate culturally and economically into America. The only acceptable policy, Osborn concluded, would be "to equalize any disproportion now existing between the natural increase of white, blacks, Indians, and Mexicans.

Thus, the AES maintained all of its positions relating to immigration throughout the decade of the thirties. The certainty of racial inferiority was replaced with the

82 Osborn, Preface to Eugenics (New York 1940) p. 75.
83 Ibid. p. 119.
84 Ibid p. 78.
85 Ibid. p. 119.
suspicion of such inferiority. In 1934 the Society maintained the conviction that it was best to keep the eastern and southern Europeans out. I.Q. test scores, after all, showed them to be, on the whole, of inferior intellect. By 1940 with absolutely no danger of further European immigration, Osborn grew sanguine about the prospects for the complete assimilation of white immigrants. The problem became the Indians, Mexicans, and Negroes. Osborn reiterated earlier positions on miscegenation, opposition to Negro migration from Southern rural areas, and opposition to any differential birth rate which favored these racial groups. In the end, "invidious racial distinctions" were replaced with "a reasonable" eugenic policy. 86

---

86 It should also be noted that while Osborn was more cautious in his statements regarding race, Madison Grant and Harry Laughlin were still spearheading the Society’s campaign and their position on race had not changed.