

9—Inclusion and Exclusion

Issues:

1. The US has a persistent tradition of excluding some portion of its population from full social and legal fellowship, most commonly along the axis of race, class, and gender.
2. Exclusion is not inherently wrong, but it is when done because of hidden bigotry.
3. Founding ideals of fairness, equality, freedom, and rights have encouraged us to address these inequities, and in general we have moved toward inclusion.

Student Outcomes:

1. Students will develop a better sense of the complexity of exclusion, including an understanding of the role of ethnocentrism, economic competition, and hegemony in exclusion.
2. Students will understand when discrimination is appropriate (because of the administrative power of the state, etc.) and when it is not (because of bigotry). They will learn to examine their own beliefs in order to realize what motivates their own views.
3. Students will explore the nature of discrimination and exclusion in our past through specific, selected images and examples.
4. Through a short history of the Civil Rights movement, students will understand the role of protest, the Executive, and the Supreme Court in bringing about legal equality for African Americans.

Note: First day's readings: pages 1–7; second day's readings: pages 8–12.

Students should come to class prepared to teach the other students in the class what they have learned through preparing for the class and be able to provide evidence to support their ideas.

9 - Inclusion and Exclusion

The point of this topic is to help students consider the complex issue of the “exclusion” of certain groups from fully participating in the American experience. Students will be asked to explore the nature of racism, discrimination, bigotry, and nativism in America’s past through specific, selected images and examples. Through a short history of the Civil Rights movement, students will understand the role of protest, the executive branch, and the Supreme Court in bringing about legal equality for African Americans. Through a brief overview of the history of immigration in America students will consider how the issues of race, culture, and economic competition have influenced the debate over who should be considered an “American.” Students will also be asked to consider when discrimination is appropriate (because of the administrative power of the state, etc.) and when it is not (because of bigotry). This discussion about exclusion will be considered in conjunction with the statement in the Book of Mormon that “none shall come to this land, save they shall be brought by the hand of the Lord.”

Definitions:

Race—an inherited set of characteristics that make it possible to distinguish one person or group of persons from another. Today these are considered to be primarily physical characteristics, but in times past could have included everything from physical to emotional to language patterns to political beliefs. Often formed the basis of negative, often violent, discrimination.

Culture—a learned set of expressions and values. Includes everything from language to religion, to ideas about marriage and employment, to whether one spits or blows his nose into a handkerchief. Has much more to do with how a person was raised than how they were born (nature vs. nurture).

Ethnicity—an expression of chosen characteristics. These could be cultural characteristics that a person chooses to retain when entering a new culture or it could be a set of cultural characteristics that a person decides to reclaim from a distant cultural past.

Melting pot/ pluralism/ tossed salad—metaphors used to describe how immigrants to America have integrated or assimilated into American culture. Melting pot indicated almost complete assimilation, tossed salad represents a celebration of continuing cultural, ethnic, and racial differences.

1. What are examples of each of the above terms, not including those already listed, from the American experience?

Racism—a negative expression of discrimination, prejudice, and bigotry based on race. Examples include racism toward Native Americans, African Americans (segregation), Japanese Americans (during World War II), German Americans (during World War I), and even Irish immigrants in the mid-1800s (yes, the Irish were considered to be a non-white race at the time).

Bigotry—holding blindly and intolerantly to the opinion that your culture (or race) is superior to any other. Although there are many examples of this in American history some of the more prominent examples are the way that many Euro-Americans treated Native Americans and African slaves, how the 1st KKK used violence and intimidation to enforce cultural superiority over freed slaves after the Civil War.

Nativism—a fear of foreign influence on the dominant culture and a strong desire to preserve that dominant culture against other cultures. Some examples of the nativist fear include the treatment of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe and Asia during the period 1890-1914, the trial of Sacco and Vanzetti, and the 2nd KKK, which was aimed primarily against immigrants, Jews, and Catholics, as well as African Americans between 1900 and 1939.

Segregation—the established practice of separating “colored” races from the white race primarily (but not limited to) in the South from the 1880s to the 1960s. This created a social system in which blacks (and other minority races) and whites were not to mingle with each other in society. There were separate entrances to businesses; separate seats on busses, in libraries, and in churches; separate drinking fountains, restrooms, swimming pools, and schools; and even separate blood banks collected by the Red Cross.

2. What are the negative expressions of each of these terms?

Case Study:

Access the website below. Click on the picture labeled “Image of a Legend.” Watch the slide show and read the narrative explanation. Consider what the pictures and narrative demonstrate about race, ethnicity, and culture in early and present American culture.

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/pocahontas/>

The Civil Rights Movement

Understanding social, political, and economic exclusion is an important part of understanding the American experience. The practice of slavery, beginning as early as 1619, was founded on the idea that some races were biologically inferior and therefore could rationally be excluded from mainstream American society. Slavery was for the most part limited to African Americans but others groups—Native Americans, the Irish, the Chinese, the Japanese, The Italians, the Jews, the Hispanics and other non-Anglo-Saxon groups—have also been excluded from mainstream American society at different times as well. These exclusions were based upon attitudes of racism, bigotry, and nativism and those attitudes came to justify slavery, Indian removal, discrimination, and segregation. The following statements help demonstrate the basis for this kind of exclusionist thinking.

George Fitzhugh, *The Failure of Free Society*—1854

Source: *Sociology for the South, or the Failure of Free Society*, (Richmond, Va., 1854) iii, 7-12, 34-48, 83-95, 161-163, 177-186.

NEGRO SLAVERY

It is clear [that] Athenian Democracy would not suit a Negro nation, nor will the government of mere law suffice for the individual Negro. He is but a grown-up child, and must be governed as a child, not as a lunatic or criminal. The master occupies towards him the place of parent or guardian. . . .

Second, the Negro is improvident; will not lay up in summer for the wants of winter; will not accumulate in youth for the exigencies of age. He would become an insufferable burden to society. Society has the right to prevent this, and can only do so by subjecting him to domestic slavery.

In the last place, the Negro race is inferior to the white race, and living in their midst, they would be far outstripped or outwitted in the chase of free competition. Gradual but certain extermination would be their fate. . . . This defect of character would alone justify enslaving him, if he is to remain here. In Africa or the West Indies, he would become idolatrous, savage and cannibal, or be devoured by savages and cannibals. At the North he would freeze or starve.

We would remind those who deprecate and sympathize with Negro slavery, that his slavery here relieves him from a far more cruel slavery in Africa, or from idolatry and cannibalism, and every brutal vice and crime that can disgrace humanity; and that it Christianizes, protects, supports, and civilizes him; that it governs him far better than free laborers at the North are governed. . . . Our Negroes are not only better off as to physical comfort than free laborers, but their moral condition is better. . . .

Negro slavery would be changed immediately to some form of peonage, serfdom, or villeinage, if the Negroes were sufficiently intelligent and provident to manage a farm. No one would have the labor and trouble of management, if his Negroes would pay in hires and rents one-half what free tenants pay in rent in Europe. Every Negro in the South would be soon liberated, if he would take liberty on the terms that white tenants hold it. The fact that he cannot enjoy liberty on such terms seems conclusive that he is only fit to be a slave.

But for the assaults of the Abolitionists, much would have been done ere this to regulate and improve Southern slavery. . . .

Would the Abolitionists approve of a system of society that set white children free, and remitted them at the age of fourteen, males and females, to all the rights, both as to person and property, which belong to adults? Would it be criminal or praiseworthy to do so? Criminal, of course. Now, are the average of Negroes equal in information, in native intelligence, in prudence or providence, to well-informed white children of fourteen? We who have lived with them for forty years think not. The competition of the world would be too much for the children. They would be cheated out of their property and debased in their morals. . . . The Negro would be exposed to the same competition and greater temptations, with no greater ability to contend with them, with these additional difficulties. He would be welcome nowhere; meet with thousands of enemies and no friends. If he went North, the white laborers would kick him and cuff him, and drive him out of employment; if he went to Africa, the savages would

cook him and eat him. If he went to the West Indies, they would not let him in, or if they did, they would soon make of him a savage and idolator.

3. What is the basis upon which “Negroes” can be excluded from American society according to the author above?

In the following Supreme Court case, the court attempts to define the basis for exclusion from citizenship. Notice that by 1923, seventy years after the Civil War, that race is not mentioned as the defining characteristic but “class.”

Thind v. United States: The United States Supreme Court Clarifies the Meaning of “White,” 1923

MR. JUSTICE SUTHERLAND delivered the opinion of the Court.

This cause is here upon a certificate from the Circuit Court of Appeals, requesting the instruction of this Court in respect of the following questions:

“1. Is a high caste Hindu of full Indian blood [generally considered to be a Caucasian], born at Amrit Sar, Punjab, India, a white person within the meaning of section 2169, Revised Statutes?

“2. Does the act of February 5, 1917, (39 Stat. L. 875, section 3) disqualify from naturalization as citizens those Hindus, now barred by that act, who had lawfully entered the United States prior to the passage of said act?”

If the applicant is a white person within the meaning of this section he is entitled to naturalization; otherwise not. In *Ozawa v. United States*, 200 U. S. 178, we had occasion to consider the application of these words to the case of a cultivated Japanese and were constrained to hold that he was not within their meaning. ***As there pointed out, the provision is not that any particular class of persons shall be excluded, but it is, in effect, that only white persons shall be included within the privilege of the statute.*** The intention was to confer the privilege of citizenship upon that class of persons whom the fathers knew as white, and to deny it to all who could not be so classified. It is not enough to say that the framers did not have in mind the brown or yellow races of Asia. It is necessary to go farther and be able to say that had these particular races been suggested the language of the act would have been so varied as to include them within its privileges. . . . Following a long line of decisions of the lower federal courts, we held that the words imported a racial and not an individual test and were meant to indicate only persons of what is *popularly* known as the Caucasian race. But, as there pointed out, the conclusion that the phrase “white persons” and the word “Caucasian” are synonymous does not end the matter

In the endeavor to ascertain the meaning of the statute we must not fail to keep in mind that it does not employ the word “Caucasian” but the words “white persons,” and these are words of common speech and not of scientific origin. The word “Caucasian” not only was not employed in the law but was probably wholly unfamiliar to the original framers of the statute in 1790. When we employ it we do so as an aid to the ascertainment of the legislative intent and not as an invariable substitute for the statutory words.

They imply, as we have said, a racial test; but the term “race” is one which, for the practical purposes of the statute, must be applied to a group of living persons now possessing in common the requisite characteristics, not to groups of persons who are supposed to be or really are descended from some remote, common ancestor but who, whether they both resemble him to a greater or less extent, have, at any rate, ceased altogether to resemble one another. It may be true that the blond Scandinavian and the brown Hindu have a common ancestor in the dim reaches of antiquity, but the average man knows perfectly well that there are unmistakable and profound differences between them today; and it is not impossible, if that common ancestor could be materialized in the flesh, we should discover that he was himself sufficiently differentiated from both of his descendants to preclude his racial classification with either.

The eligibility of this applicant for citizenship is based on the sole fact that he is of high caste Hindu stock, born in Punjab, one of the extreme northwestern districts of India, and classified by certain scientific authorities as of the Caucasian or cultivated Aryan race The term “Aryan” has to do with linguistic and not at all with physical characteristics, and it would seem reasonably clear that mere resemblance in language, within the indicating a common linguistic root buried in remotely ancient soil, is altogether inadequate to prove common racial origin. There is, and can be, no assurance that the so-called Aryan language was not spoken by a variety of races living in proximity to one another. Our own history has witnessed the adoption of the English tongue by millions of Negroes,

whose descendants can never be classified racially with the descendants of white persons notwithstanding both may speak a common root language.

The word “Caucasian” is in scarcely better repute. It is at best a conventional term. ... it includes not only the Hindu but some of the Polynesians, (that is the Maori, Tahitians, Samoans, Hawaiians and others), the Hamites of Africa, upon the ground of the Caucasian cast of their features, though in color they range from brown to black. We venture to think that the average well informed white American would learn with some degree of astonishment that the race to which he belongs is made up of such heterogeneous elements.

It does not seem necessary to pursue the matter of scientific classification further. We are unable to agree with the District Court, or with other lower federal courts, in the conclusion that a native Hindu is eligible for naturalization under §2169. The words of familiar speech, which were used by the original framers of the law, were intended to include only the type of man whom they knew as white. The immigration of that day was almost exclusively from the British Isles and Northwestern Europe, whence they and their forbears had come. When they extended the privilege of American citizenship to “any alien, being a free white person,” it was these immigrants—bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh—and their kind whom they must have had affirmatively in mind. The succeeding years brought immigrants from Eastern, Southern and Middle Europe, among them the Slavs and the dark-eyed, swarthy people of Alpine and Mediterranean stock, and these were received as unquestionably akin to those already here and readily amalgamated with them. It was the descendants of these, and other immigrants of like origin, who constituted the white population of the country when §2169, reenacting the naturalization test of 1790, was adopted; and there is no reason to doubt, with like intent and meaning.

What we now hold is that the words “free white persons” are words of common speech, to be interpreted in accordance with the understanding of the common man, synonymous with the word “Caucasian” only as that word is popularly understood. As so understood and used, whatever may be the speculations of the ethnologist, it does not include the body of people to whom the appellee belongs. It is a matter of familiar observation and knowledge that the physical group characteristics of the Hindus render them readily distinguishable from the various groups of persons in this country commonly recognized as white. The children of English, French, German, Italian, Scandinavian, and other European parentage, quickly merge into the mass of our population and lose the distinctive hallmarks of their European origin. On the other hand, it cannot be doubted that the children born in this country of Hindu parents would retain indefinitely the clear evidence of their ancestry. It is very far from our thought to suggest the slightest question of racial superiority or inferiority. What we suggest is merely racial difference, and it is of such character and extent that the great body of our people instinctively recognize it and reject the thought of assimilation.

4. Note the date on which this case was decided and the particular phrase “any particular class” that is bolded above. What do you think is the point of focusing on class rather than race (Caucasian)? Would you accept the Supreme Court’s argument for exclusion in this case? Why or why not?

Franklin D. Roosevelt, “Executive Order 9066,” 1942.

Although the following document never mentions Japanese Americans by name, it was aimed directly at them. Its intent was to remove all those of Japanese ancestry, citizens or not, from the states of Oregon, Washington, California, one-half of Arizona and other selected areas, and place them in “concentration camps” in the interior of the United States. In all, approximately 110,000 men women and children were removed without trial and without any determination as to innocence or guilt.

Whereas the successful prosecution of the war requires every possible protection against espionage and against sabotage to national-defense material, national-defense premises, and national-defense utilities

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, I hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of War, and the Military Commanders whom he may from time to time designate, whenever he or any designated Commander deems such action necessary or desirable, to prescribe military areas in such places and of such extent as he or the appropriate Military Commander may determine, from which any or all persons may be excluded, and with respect to which, the right of any person to enter, remain in, or leave shall be subject to whatever restrictions the Secretary of War or the appropriate Military Commander may impose in his discretion. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to provide for residents of any such area who are excluded therefrom, such transportation, food, shelter, and other accommodations as may be

necessary, in the judgment of the Secretary of War or the said Military Commander, and until other arrangements are made, to accomplish the purpose of this order. The designation of military areas in any region or locality shall supersede designations of prohibited and restricted areas by the Attorney General under the Proclamations of December 7 and 8, 1941, and shall supersede the responsibility and authority of the Attorney General under the said Proclamations in respect of such prohibited and restricted areas.

I hereby further authorize and direct the Secretary of War and the said Military Commanders to take such other steps as he or the appropriate Military Commander may deem advisable to enforce compliance with the restrictions applicable to each Military area hereinabove authorized to be designated, including the use of Federal troops and other Federal Agencies, with authority to accept assistance of state and local agencies.

I hereby further authorize and direct all Executive Departments, independent establishments and other Federal Agencies, to assist the Secretary of War or the said Military Commanders in carrying out this Executive Order, including the furnishing of medical aid, hospitalization, food, clothing, transportation, use of land, shelter, and other supplies, equipment, utilities, facilities, and services.

This order shall not be construed as modifying or limiting in any way the authority heretofore granted under Executive Order No. 8972, dated December 12, 1941, nor shall it be construed as limiting or modifying the duty and responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with respect to the investigation of alleged acts of sabotage or the duty and responsibility of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice under the Proclamations of December 7 and 8, 1941, prescribing regulations for the conduct and control of alien enemies, except as such duty and responsibility is superseded by the designation of military areas hereunder.

5. Who is being excluded in this order? What is the rationale for the exclusion?

The Civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s was an extremely important era as Americans made a renewed effort to deal with the exclusionary injustices of the past. Some have called it an effort to “finish what the Civil War began” as African Americans pressed for social, political, and economic rights. Court decisions and the courage of individual members of the black community, especially young people, sparked the movement. Non-violent protest became an early trademark but by the mid-1960s protestors turned to acts of violence in their frustration with what they saw as a lack of meaningful change. Prominent events catapulted individuals and groups into the spotlight and into the collective American memory as they encouraged and achieved a long-denied revolution in race relations. Although the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 60s initially focused on the position of Blacks within society it soon rippled out to include such formerly excluded groups as Native Americans, women, and the physically and mentally disabled.

There are several important events that set the stage and paved the way for the civil rights movement that began in earnest in the 1950s and 60s. The hope that the Civil War would bring an end to economic and social oppression based on race, certainly provided a foundational moment. This hope was thwarted in the 1860s and 70s with Black Codes designed to keep freed slaves in a lower social, political, and economic status than whites and Jim Crow Laws in the 1880s and 1890s designed to separate the races through segregation of schools and public accommodations of all kinds. The First KKK and its use of violence and intimidation certainly promoted and established these attitudes. Lynching was probably the most effective and violent expression of KKK activities. Between 1901 and 1910 there were 846 reported cases of lynching, 754 were of blacks, and 91% were in the South.

Beginning around 1900, however, events occurred that began to turn the tide against racial discrimination. In 1909, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) was created. Made up of both Blacks and Whites this organization sought to protect and promote equality through the legal system. Two of the more important and influential cases argued by the NAACP were the Emmett Till case in 1953, and the Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954.

In 1917 and 1918, there was a significant migration of Blacks from the deep South to the factories in the North and Upper Mid-west. This was primarily the result of the labor shortage caused by WWI but it established Black communities in most Northern cities that would provide real strength and influence to the Civil Rights movement in the 1960s.

In 1947, Jackie Robinson became the first Black man to play in the all-white professional baseball leagues. Not only was he a talented player but his personality allowed him to suffer numerous instances of prejudice and discrimination with patience and dignity. This prominent cultural event challenged old notions of racial inferiority and segregation and soon many teams were looking for outstanding Black players to add to their rosters.

In 1948, President Truman desegregated the military. The political backlash from this policy almost cost him the election in 1948, but it signaled a change in federal racial policy. All of the above events played a role in and set the stage for what would become Civil Rights in the 1950s and 1960s.

6. What were the major events that paved the way for the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s?

The 1950s and 60s in America began a tidal wave of actions and reactions with regard to discrimination and equality that dramatically changed ideas about race in America. The scope of American Foundations does not allow a full account of these actions but a brief listing will give those who did not experience the period a sense of what happened.

School desegregation became one of the early hallmarks of the movement. This included the Supreme Court decision in *Brown vs. Board of Education* (1954) that declared separate but equal unconstitutional. That was followed in 1957 with the attempt to enroll nine Black students in a Little Rock, Arkansas, high school where eventually President Eisenhower was forced to call federal troops to maintain the peace and to uphold the *Brown* decision. In 1963, James Meredith attempted to become the first Black man admitted to the University of Mississippi. Several court opinions, 2 federal marshals killed, 166 marshals wounded, and President Kennedy's intervention eventually got Meredith registered and in class.

Non-violent protest became another hallmark of the Civil Rights movement. Non-violence was a Ghandi inspired strategy employed by Martin Luther King Jr. and several other organizations to promote social change. The Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) used non-violent sit-ins at lunch counters, movie theaters, churches, and swimming pools to bring attention to the evils of segregation. The Congress On Racial Equality (CORE) instigated the Freedom Rides of 1960 to protest discrimination on interstate busses. And the Southern Christian Leadership Congress (SCLC) led by Martin Luther King Jr. grew out of the Montgomery Bus Boycott instigated by Rosa Parks in 1963. Out of this beginning developed mass protest marches aimed at drawing more national attention to the evils of discrimination. One of the more famous of these was Martin Luther King's "I have a Dream" march to Washington, D.C. in 1963. the goal of the non-violence movement was to directly challenge laws and social practices that were considered to be unjust, but to do it in such a way that public opinion would be turned to support the protestors, not the unjust laws and practices.

After 1963, the civil rights movement moved north and turned increasingly violent. By the latter half of the decade it was common to see American cities in flames as a result of the frustration many felt over the slow-moving process of ending racial discrimination. These more violent frustrations spawned such groups and movements as the Black Panthers and the Black Power movement and such individuals as Malcolm X and Stokely Carmichael.

7. What were the major activities and trends of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s?

The civil rights movement changed America with regard to discriminatory exclusion but it is certainly not a finished effort. Initially, it raised racial tension and violence both through the reaction to non-violent protest and through the later violent protest. The civil rights movement certainly brought racial injustices to light in a way that makes it virtually impossible to ignore such things today. It ended legalized segregation, and it went a long way toward bringing racial discrimination to an end. Racial injustice does still exist in America but it has certainly declined since the 1960s.

8. What are the legacies of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s? What are the connections between the civil rights movement and the principles of exclusion and inclusion?

9. Is it possible, and if so at what point, for the quest for civil rights become radicalized [be taken too far]? At what point does the quest for an end to discrimination become the cause of "reverse" discrimination? Are there some "rights" that are beyond the pale of what should be considered commonly accepted rights? Who should be the judge?

[End of first day's readings.]

Immigration

A case study in exclusion.

America is often referred to as a nation of immigrants. This idea is substantiated by the commonly accepted views of how the North and South American continents were originally peopled (and it really doesn't matter if one prefers the Book of Mormon model or the more secular model—both declare that even the first Americans were immigrants). The idea is supported even more clearly when studying the immigration patterns of the modern period (1492-present). It also can be demonstrated in the lives of Americans; their own ancestral heritage and their daily experience interacting with people from many cultural backgrounds at school and at work. There is no question that the immigration of peoples and cultures from around the world has profoundly affected the development of American culture and heritage. The following presents a brief chronological review of immigration and Americans' response to it.

1607	Jamestown established as the first European settlement in British North America
1619	First Africans delivered to Jamestown
1680	Native Americans successfully drive Spanish settlers from the American southwest in the Pueblo Revolt
1798	Alien and Sedition Acts restrict the freedoms of speech and press among non-naturalized immigrants
1830	Cherokee Indians removed from Georgia to the Indian Territory in the "Trail of Tears"
1882	Chinese Exclusion Act prohibits further immigration of Chinese laborers to the United States.
1890-1914	Large numbers of immigrants arrive from southern and eastern Europe. Often referred to as "new immigrants" because their social, political, and economic backgrounds are markedly different from those immigrants who arrived earlier from Northern and Western Europe
1908	Gentlemen's Agreement halts the immigration of Japanese laborers to the United States
1924	National Origins Act effectively stops the arrival of "new immigrants"
1940	Bracero Program brings large numbers of Mexican immigrants to work in War-time industry
1965	U.S. Immigration and Nationality Amendments seek to end immigration restrictions based on race and/or ethnic origins
1960s and 1970s	Increased immigration from Asia and Southeast Asia in the wake of Korean and Vietnam Wars
1980s and 1990s	Increased support for stronger immigration restrictions especially aimed at Mexico and Latin America
1986	Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 required employers to attest to their employees' immigration status, and granted amnesty to certain illegal immigrants.
1990s	Hate crime legislation enacted to provide protection for racial and ethnic minorities
2006	America begins building a fence between the United States and Mexico.
2008	Continued political debate over immigration reform.

Most European immigrants in the 1600s and 1700s came to America for economic, religious, social, and political opportunities that they did not have in Europe. This motivation continues to bring immigrants today. Almost all immigrants come for either religious, social, political, or economic opportunity or some combination of all of them. At times, usually before 1880, immigrants were seen as a great boon to America, at others, usually after 1880, they were seen as the greatest immigration "threat" to American life. In addition, as the timeline above indicates, most immigrants came in identifiable waves. Immigrants from a certain place usually came when conditions were difficult in their home country and conditions looked better in America. The following list emphasizes and illustrates these identifiable patterns.

- Native Americans (25,000-15,000 B.C.)
- European Colonization (1607)
- African Slaves (1619)
- Irish Refugees (1820-1840)
- "New" Immigration (1890-1914)
- Hispanic Immigration (1917-present)
- The New Asian Immigration (1965-present)

10. What are the two general characteristics of America immigration?

Americans have always been ambivalent about immigrants and immigration. They have proudly proclaimed the words chiseled on the base of the Statue of Liberty, “Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,” and yet at the same time they have feared that large numbers of immigrants could overwhelm American culture and dangerously affect American politics and government.

During the early years of colonial America most saw the arrival of immigrants from Northern and Western Europe as a positive boost to the future development of America. America was habitually short of laborers and immigrants provided a welcome solution to the labor shortage. Slavery itself was really a forced immigration solution to the labor shortage problem. A few colonial Americans, like Benjamin Franklin, expressed concerns over those immigrants who were not Protestant or did not speak English (particularly German) but those like Franklin were clearly in the minority.

One of the reasons for this overwhelming acceptance of immigrants in the early period (in addition to the need for labor) was the fact that so many American residents were so recently immigrants themselves, or their immediate ancestors had been immigrants. They recognized the benefits of immigration and they also recognized that being American was as much a state of mind (culture) as it was point of origin. Immigrants upon arrival may have had different cultural backgrounds but given a few years, a generation at most, and it was simply impossible to tell who was an immigrant and who was not. The immigrant had become assimilated into American life and culture. The metaphor “melting pot” was developed to explain this transformation.

This melting pot idea came into question with the arrival of the “new immigrants” who arrived after 1890. These immigrants were seen as too different—in language, religion, politics, and looks—to truly assimilate or melt. They came from southern and eastern Europe—Czechs, Poles, Russian, Greeks, Turks, Italians, Jews and Catholics—and from Asia—Chinese, Japanese, Buddhists, Shintoists, and Confucianists. Many saw these immigrants’ religious and political backgrounds, even their race, as dangerous to American life and overwhelming to American culture. This fear resulted in the passage of legislation that restricted the number and types of immigrants allowed into the country. This legislation included the Chinese Exclusion Act (1882), the Gentlemen’s Agreement (1908 Japan), and the National Origins (1924 southern and eastern Europe), and grew out of deep seated attitudes held by Americans and how they viewed those of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

America has always seen itself as a refuge for the oppressed but this attitude has always had limits. We would accept the oppressed as long as they were truly oppressed, not just distressed, and if they did not pose an economic or social threat to America. In the 1930s, shiploads of oppressed Jews from Germany and Europe made it to within sight of the Statue of Liberty before they were forcibly turned around and sent back to Europe, to Hitler, and to the concentration camps. Being oppressed was one thing, accepting Jews into America was another. One of the greatest challenges to many Americans is accepting the fact that being American has nothing to do with racial, or ethnic, or cultural identities.

The following documents may help you better understand the historical debate surrounding the issue of immigration and immigrant groups. Notice that some of the groups mentioned here would no longer be considered a threat to American society.

Josiah Strong, “Our Country,” 1885

As the numbers of non-western European immigrants increased at the end of the nineteenth century, some began to question the reality of the “melting pot.” Josiah Strong was one of those who did not believe that the “melting pot” could change immigrants who came to America with non-Anglo Saxon backgrounds. Writing in the early 1880s, Strong witnessed the beginning of a massive wave of immigration from southern and eastern Europe, and to a lesser extent from Asia, that would continue until the beginning of World War I in 1914. In this excerpt he discusses influence of the immigrant and lists some of the negative ideals and character traits native to the immigrant that threatened America’s social, economic, political, and religious way of life.

Source: Josiah Strong, *Our Country*, (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963) 41.

Political optimism is one of the vices of the American people. There is a popular faith that “God takes care of children, fools, and the United States.” We deem ourselves a chosen People, and inclined to the belief that the Almighty stands pledged to our prosperity. Until within a few years probably not one in a hundred of our population has ever questioned the security of our future. Such optimism is as senseless as pessimism is faithless. The one is as foolish as the other is wicked.

Thoughtful men see perils on our national horizon. Our argument is concerned not with all of them, but only with those which peculiarly threaten the West.

America, as the land of promise to all the world, is the destination of the most remarkable migration of which we have any record. During the last ten years we have suffered a peaceful invasion by an army more than four times as vast as the estimated number of Goths and Vandals that swept over Southern Europe and overwhelmed Rome. During the hundred years fifteen million foreigners have made their homes in the United States, and have come since 1850, while 5,248,000 have arrived since 1880. A study of the causes of this great world movement indicates that causes perhaps as yet we have seen only beginnings. These controlling causes are threefold. 1. The attracting influences of the United States. 2. The expellent influences of the Old World. 3. Facilities for travel.

So immense a foreign element must have a profound influence on our national life and character.

Consider briefly the moral and political influence of immigration,

The typical immigrant is a European peasant, whose horizon has been narrow, whose moral and religious training has been meager or false, and whose ideas of life are low. Not a few belong to the pauper and criminal classes. . .

Immigration not only furnishes the greater portion of our criminals, it is also seriously affecting the morals of the native population. It is disease and not health which is contagious. Most foreigners bring with them continental ideas of the Sabbath, and the result is sadly manifest in all our cities, where it is being transformed from a holy day into a holiday. But by far the most effective instrumentality for debauching popular morals is the liquor traffic, and this is chiefly carried on by foreigners. . . Of saloon-keepers about sixty per cent were foreign-born, while many of the remaining forty per cent of these corrupters of youth, these western Arabs, whose hand is against every man, were of foreign extraction.

We can only glance at the political aspects of immigration. . . Immigration furnishes most of the Victims of Mormonism and there is a Mormon vote. Immigration is the strength of the Catholic church; and there is a Catholic vote. Immigration is the mother and nurse of American socialism; and there is to be a socialist vote. Immigration tends strongly to the cities, and gives to them their political complexion. And there is no more serious menace to our civilization than our rabble-ruled cities.

It is as unfortunate as it is natural, that foreigners in this country should cherish their own language and peculiar customs, and carry their nationality, as a distinct factor, into our politics. Immigration has created the "German vote" and the "Irish vote" for which politicians bid, and which have already been decisive of state elections, and might easily determine national. A mass of men but little acquainted with our institutions, who will act in concert and who are controlled largely by their appetites and prejudices, constitute a very paradise for demagogues.

Immigration is detrimental . . . upon popular intelligence, for the percentage of illiteracy among the foreign-born population is thirty-eight per cent greater than among the native-born whites. Thus immigration complicates our moral and political problems by swelling our dangerous classes.

When we consider the influence of immigration, it is by no means reassuring to reflect that so large a share of it is pouring into the formative West. Already is the proportion of foreigners in the territories from two to three times greater than in the states east of the Mississippi. In the East, institutions have been long established and are, therefore, less easily modified by foreign influence, but in the West, where institutions are formative, that influence is far more powerful. We may well ask--and with special reference to the West--whether this in-sweeping immigration is to foreignize us, or we are to Americanize it. . . . Foreigners are not coming to the United States in answer to any appetite of ours, controlled by an unfailing moral political instinct. They naturally consult their own interest in coming.

The Secret oath of the American Protective Association—1893

For many Americans in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, one of the evils of immigration was that it introduced non-traditional religious attitudes into American society. For them Protestantism formed the basis of American Christianity, and the liberality promoted by Protestantism formed the basis of American democracy. Catholicism, on the other hand, was the religion of the Irish hordes escaping to America in the wake of the potato famine of the 1830's and 40's. Subjection to Catholicism prevented the immigrants from engaging in the free exercise of religion or free political participation because of their allegiance and subservience to the Pope. For these reasons, a number of anti-Catholic groups organized to protect America and American institutions. The following document demonstrate both the emotions involved and the activities used by the anti-Catholic movement.

Source: Michael Williams, *The Shadow of the Pope* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1932) 103-104.

I do most solemnly promise and swear that I will always, to the utmost of my ability, labor, plead and wage a continuous warfare, against ignorance and fanaticism; that I will use my utmost power to strike the shackles and chains of blind obedience to the Roman Catholic church from the hampered and bound consciences of a priest-ridden and church-oppressed people; that I will never allow any one, a member of the Roman Catholic church, to become a member of this order, I knowing him to be such; that I will use my influence to promote the interest of all Protestants everywhere in the world that I may be; that I will not employ a Roman Catholic in any capacity if I can procure the services of a Protestant.

I furthermore promise and swear that I will not aid in building or maintaining, by my resources, any Roman Catholic church or institution of their sect or creed whatsoever, but will do all in my power to retard and break down the power of the Pope, in this country or any other; that I will not enter into any controversy with a Roman Catholic upon the subject of this order, nor will I enter into any agreement with a Roman Catholic to strike or create a disturbance whereby the Catholic employees may undermine and substitute their Protestant co-workers; that in all grievances I will seek only Protestants and counsel with them to the exclusion of all Roman Catholics, and will not make known to them anything of any nature matured at such conferences.

I furthermore promise and swear that I will not countenance the nomination, in any caucus or convention, of a Roman Catholic for any office in the gift of the American people, and that I will not vote for, or counsel others to vote for, any Roman Catholic, but will vote only for a Protestant, so far as may lie in my power. Should there be two Roman Catholics on opposite tickets, I will erase the name on the ticket I vote; that I will at all times endeavor to place the political positions of this government in the hands of Protestants, to the entire exclusion of the roman catholic church, of the members thereof, and the mandate of the Pope.

To all of which I do most solemnly promise and swear, so help me God. Amen.

Chinese Exclusion Act—1882

The Chinese Exclusion Act, issued on 6 May 1882, formed one of the first attempts to restrict immigration into the United States. It came in response to fears expressed by economic and political leaders on the West Coast that a Chinese invasion was in process and that these invaders would adversely affect the economic and social balance of the region. This act set the stage for later immigration acts aimed at immigrants from other parts of the world. In effect, the Chinese Exclusion Act was based on the ideals of those who doubted the efficacy of the melting pot and those who felt that non-white races posed a danger to American institutions and society.

Source: U. S. Statutes at Large, Vol. XXII

WHEREAS, in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to this country endangers the good order of certain localities within the territory thereof: Therefore,

Be it enacted, That from and after the expiration of ninety days next after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of ten years next after the passage of this act, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States be... suspended; and during such suspension it shall not be lawful for any Chinese laborer to come, or, having so come after the expiration of said ninety days, to remain within the United States.

SEC. 2. That the master of any vessel who shall knowingly bring within the United States on such vessel, and land or permit to be landed, any Chinese laborer, from any foreign port or place, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars for each and every such Chinese laborer so brought, and may be also imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year.

SEC. 3. That the two foregoing sections shall not apply to Chinese laborers who were in the United States on the seventeenth day of November, eighteen hundred and eighty, or who shall have come in to the same before the expiration of ninety days next after the passage of this act,...

SEC. 6. That in order to the faithful execution of articles one and two of the treaty in this act before mentioned, every Chinese person other than a laborer who may be entitled by said treaty and this act to come within the United States, and who shall be about to come to the United States, shall be identified as so entitled by the Chinese government in each case, such identity to be evidenced by a certificate issued under the authority of said government, which certificate shall be in the English language or (if not in the English language) accompanied by a translation into English, stating such right to come, and which certificate shall state the name, title, or official rank, if any, the age, height, and all physical peculiarities, former and present occupation or profession, and place of residence in China of the person to whom the certificate is issued and that such person is entitled conformably to the treaty in this act mentioned to come within the United States....

SEC. 12. That no Chinese person shall be permitted to enter the United States by land without producing to the proper officer of customs the certificate in this act required of Chinese persons seeking to land from a vessel. And

any Chinese person found unlawfully within the United States shall be caused to be removed therefrom to the country from whence he came, by direction of the President of the United States, and at the cost of the United States, after being brought before some justice, judge, or commissioner of a court of the United States and found to be one not lawfully entitled to be or remain in the United States.

SEC. 13. That this act shall not apply to diplomatic and other officers of the Chinese Government traveling upon the business of that government, whose credentials shall be taken as equivalent to the certificate in this act mentioned, and shall exempt them and their body and household servants from the provisions of this act as to other Chinese persons.

SEC. 14. That hereafter no State court or court of the United States shall admit Chinese to citizenship; and all laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 15. That the words "Chinese laborers," whenever used in this act, shall be construed to mean both skilled and unskilled laborers and Chinese employed in mining.

11. According to these documents what groups should be excluded from American society? Why should they be excluded? How should they be excluded? How would our attitudes toward these groups be different today? Why?

12. How have Americans responded to immigration over the years? What role has immigration played in American economic, social, religious, and political life? How do these historical patterns play into the current immigration debate?

13. How does the topic of immigration relate to Lehi's prophecy in 2 Nephi 1:6? ("Wherefore, I, Lehi, prophesy according to the workings of the spirit which is in me, that there shall none come into this land save they shall be brought by the hand of the Lord")

14. Are there any valid reasons for exclusion in American society? Explain and describe.

15. What are the roles of Agency and Accountability, Rights of Man, and Rule of Law when considering the issues of inclusion and exclusion in American life?

[NB: Some of the material herein may be the work of Gary Marshall and Eric Walz. Marshall's content may appear in a forthcoming publication.]