HANDOUT A

Immigration Experiment Discussion

**Directions:**
Fill in the graphic organizer in your assigned groups with the answers to your questions into the two categories of economic and social.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DISCUSSION QUESTIONS**

1. Why did you choose to move or to stay put?
2. Were your motivations to sit closer to your friends?
3. Were you worried about your performance in class?
4. Was it frustrating to be separated from your friends without a good reason?
5. What happened when I took a few seats away?
6. Why did some of you want to move upfront when I offered an incentive?
7. How did you feel having students from another class come into our classroom? If you found it awkward or strange, why was this?
8. How you think the choices you made compare to the decisions made by immigrants around the world? How are these decisions similar and/or different?
9. How is it that we adapt to change within a community?
It is impossible to understand the American experience without understanding the impact of immigration. The millions of immigrants who came to the United States settled across the nation, named its cities, helped build its canals, roads, and railroads, mined its ore, and shaped its culture. To understand immigration in the United States is to understand the history of the country itself.

Between 1880 and 1920, over twenty million people immigrated to the United States. Men, women, and children from across the world, seeking the opportunity and freedom available in a society rooted in the principles of the Declaration of Independence. They traveled thousands of miles in the hope of providing a better life for themselves and their families in the economic opportunities available in a free-enterprise, industrial economy. They brought with them diverse languages and cultural traditions that enriched American society and culture. Their experience of immigration varied, but those who stayed became Americans and helped build modern America.

However, whenever different cultures meet, the differences can cause tensions. The absorption of these immigrants into the fabric of American society was not always a smooth process. Pressures stemming from the blending of cultures had profound effects on the politics and opinions of the era. The clash and unity of these worlds, the conflicts, successes, and failures, are the real story of immigration in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era.

Coming to America

Migration is the movement of a person from one geographic location to another. The immigrants of the late nineteenth century came primarily from southeastern and northwestern Europe, Asia, and from Mexico and Canada in North America. The migrants only became immigrants when they crossed the international border for the United States. It is this factor that makes immigration a matter of law between countries.

For immigrants of this era, and any era, the long journey to a new home began with a decision. Uprooting themselves from their homes, farms, and jobs was an arduous process. The immigrants came to the United States for different reasons. For many immigrants in the late nineteenth century, there was something that pushed them out, such as slow economic growth in Southern Italy, or religious persecution in Eastern Europe. Others were pulled from their homes by the job opportunities the rapidly expanding industrial economy and cheap, farmable land in the countryside.

These push and pull factors acted together to animate the millions of immigrants who found their way to the United States during this period. Finding their way was no easy task. Immigrants had to contend with treacherous roads and oceans, often in cramped and uncomfortable quarters. They also had to overcome language barriers and foreign social customs and traditions. Moreover, they had to navigate the legal process of coming to a new country.
Their experiences upon arriving in the United States changed throughout the period. Immigration to the United States in the early part of the eighteenth century was fairly informal, but this would change throughout the century. By the 1860s the Fourteenth Amendment, and the 1866 Civil Rights Act, helped to make clear a definition of who was and was not a citizen. This led to an increase in regulation of immigration at the federal level. By 1890, the federal government had assumed the responsibility of processing immigrants arriving in the United States. To cope with this responsibility, the government developed a formalized method for vetting immigrants as they arrived. By 1892, the famous port of entry at Ellis Island was opened and began welcoming immigrants ashore in New York City. In 1910, on the West Coast, Angel Island, in San Francisco Bay, also began examining newcomers as they came ashore.

Immigrants arrived at these ports of entry into the United States with high hopes for the future. From their steamships they were ferried ashore to the processing facility on the island. They would be subjected to a medical examination, have their documents inspected, and most were then released to gather their luggage and purchase or pickup train tickets. Most walked out the doors carrying all they owned in their arms.

Not all of the immigrants were granted permission to enter the country. The majority of those on Ellis Island who were denied entry were denied due to medical reasons. Those deemed medically unfit could be treated on the island, but if their condition was too dangerous, they would be sent back to their country of origin. Others were rejected for being (or suspected of being) radicals, anarchists, or criminals. On Angel Island the circumstances were different. Beginning in 1882, laws restricting the immigration of Chinese and other Asian peoples were put in place by the federal government. Countless numbers of Asians immigrants were denied entry to the United States at Angel Island as a result of these laws.

**The Challenge of Assimilation**

From these processing centers, the immigrants spread out and settled across the nation. Throughout the 1870s and 80s many of these immigrants settled in the West, seeking the opportunities for land afforded by the frontier. They worked as farmers and laborers, tilling the land and building the infrastructure that facilitated the nation’s growth. As the century progressed, the rise of the industrial economy opened up thousands of new low-skilled, labor-intensive jobs in cities across the country. These jobs opened opportunities for the newly-arrived immigrants. The impact of immigration was felt throughout the nation, from the Pittsburg steel mills, to New York’s garment district, to California’s farms.

To find and take advantage of these opportunities, immigrants relied upon familial and cultural networks in the United States. They relied upon information and introductions received from family members to seek out and exploit economic opportunities. Being strangers in a foreign land, familial groups also provided support to the newcomers. Groups of immigrants from particular countries settled in cities and neighborhoods together and created distinctive cultural enclaves. In addition to providing support getting jobs and places to live, these neighborhoods allowed immigrants to keep their own customs and traditions alive. Common languages, familiar foods, cultural festivals,
native language newspapers, and religious observances all assisted immigrant groups as they adapted to life in the United States and assimilated into society.

**The Rise of Nativism**

The hatred and fear of immigrants and immigration during this period was known as nativism or xenophobia. Nativism arose out of the tensions between native-born Americans and newly-arrived immigrants. Competition over jobs and a general fear of the unknown, perpetuated by myths and propaganda, helped shape nativism into a strong political movement.

The ideas of Social Darwinism also helped to perpetuate nativist sentiment. Applying the concept of evolution as theorized in Charles Darwin’s *The Origin of Species* (1859), many native-born Americans reasoned that different races or groups of people had reached higher levels of civilization depending on their race or ethnicity. People who applied Darwin’s theory to society and the ranking of the races around the world, predominately believed that white, western European men had reached the pinnacle of civilization. They believed, therefore, that it was their duty to assist those they saw as “lesser races,” mainly Eastern and Southern Europeans, Africans, and Asian peoples, to become more civilized. They feared that too great an influx of these groups into the country would pose a threat to the white, Anglo-Saxon race in America and the ordered and complex civil society into which they were entering. The progressives were firmly behind the movement to Americanize the immigrant population in America for a more united culture and social order.

The tide of nativism rose throughout the late 1890s and into the twentieth century. Increasing nativist sentiment created political movements to restrict immigration. Nativist organizations like the Immigration Restriction League and the American Protective Association advocated strongly for limiting immigration into the United States. Many of the members were progressives who believed that restricting immigration of the “inferior races” would help bring about greater social order and harmony. Many unions whose members’ jobs were threatened by competition with cheap immigrant labor supported immigration restriction. Many politicians who represented rural areas supported the measures.

Opponents of immigration restriction were the owners of factories, mines, and other industries that relied heavily on large pools of low-wage immigrant labor. Other opponents of immigration restriction included politicians who represented northern states and cities where millions of immigrants settled. Finally, the immigrants who already had settled in America were strong opponents of restricting immigration.

The two sides of the immigration debate demonstrate the tensions which arise from a society coping with change. Immigrants played a vital role in the country’s economy, but they introduced foreign beliefs, customs, and opinions about American society and government. Therein lies a tension.

This tension has at its heart a difficult question for a democratic society. Fundamental principles like the rule of law, private property, and individual liberty may be undermined if they are not properly understood and jealously guarded by the people. In the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, however, this question became erroneously entangled with the racial prejudices of the time. The main tension still exists today, and the questions that still beg asking today. The
progressives grappled with the same questions related to the immigration debate today. The questions of adopting certain fundamental principles clashed with those of preserving one's culture and ideas in a pluralist society.

This struggle played out throughout the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. As the number of immigrants coming ashore increased, nativist concern and political pressure to address the issue mounted. This pressure led to the passing of several major pieces of legislation. The first, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, virtually eliminated all immigration from China while banning Chinese from American citizenship. In 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt traded protection of Japanese immigrants in America for a promise that the Japanese government would not allow additional immigrants to go to the United States. Though popular in the legislature, the nativist push for immigration restrictions was met with opposition in executive branch. During World War I, Congress overcome a series of presidential vetoes to pass a literacy test on immigration to keep poorly-educated immigrants out of the country. Increasing nativism culminated in the Immigration Act of 1924, which set limits based on a national origins formula for how many immigrants from different countries would be allowed in the country. The date for that formula was set before 1890 when large numbers of southeastern European immigrants began to arrive.

Though the number of immigrants coming into the country was being curtailed, their influence was not. Immigrants had a dramatic impact in shaping the future of the nation. As they became assimilated into American society, the United States also assimilated to them, shifting and changing to integrate the countless millions from around the world who came to the new world seeking a new life.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What sorts of challenges did immigrants face when deciding to leave their homes and travel to a new country?
2. How do push and pull factors affect immigration?
3. What was the purpose of Ellis and Angel Island? Why do you think the government established these facilities?
4. Why did immigrants tend to group together in cultural and family groups?
5. What were the sources of tensions between immigrants and native-born Americans?
6. What benefits do you believe immigration brings to the United States?
7. What challenges might immigration pose to the United States? How has the United States responded to these challenges in the past and present?
The Challenges of Assimilation

Directions: Begin by reading the short introduction below. Then read Handout D: Selections from Henry Cabot Lodge’s Speech in the Senate, March 16, 1896 and Handout E: Selections from the President Grover Cleveland’s Veto Message of the 1896 Literacy Test March 2, 1897. Answer the critical thinking questions that follow each.

Introduction: As the flood of immigrants coming into the United States grew, tensions between native-born Americans and immigrants increased. The demographic shift of the immigrant newcomers shifted from Western Europe to primarily an Eastern and Southern European influx, also contributing to the increase in tensions. Those immigrants originating from these countries shared less of the same cultural background and legal traditions than their western counterparts, as well as speaking less English. Fears that these newcomers might undermine the culture of the United States abounded. However, not everyone believed these fears were founded. Citing the generations of immigrants who had populated the United States in the preceding decades, many believed these immigrants posed no threat. The central question the country faced was this, could American society subsume a large foreign population without costing the jobs of thousands of Americans or losing support and understanding of the fundamental principles of the United States.

The following documents provide insight into the various sides of this debate. Henry Cabot Lodge, a powerful senator advocating for the restriction of immigration, fought hard to pass a literacy test for immigrants to gain permission to enter the country. The bill stated that any person who could not show a basic reading and writing proficiency would not be allowed to enter the country. On the other side, President Grover Cleveland advocated strongly against the bill. The selections of his veto message outline his reasoning. The two documents together illuminate the tensions at play in the immigration debate at the turn of the twentieth century.
I have said enough to show what effects of this bill would be, and that if enacted into law it would be fair in its operation and highly beneficial in its results. It now remains for me to discuss the second and larger question, as to the advisability of restricting immigration at all. This is a subject of the greatest magnitude and the most far-reaching importance. It has two sides, the economic and the social. As to the former, but few words are necessary. There is no one thing which does so much to bring about a reduction of wages and to injure the American wage earner as the unlimited introduction of cheap foreign labor through unrestricted immigration.

It is not necessary to enter further into a discussion of the economic side of the general policy of restricting immigration. In this direction the argument is unanswerable. If we have any regard for the welfare, the wages, or the standard of life of American workingmen, we should take immediate steps to restrict foreign immigration. There is no danger at present at all events to our workingmen from the coming of skilled mechanics or trained and educated men with a settled occupation or pursuit for immigrants of this class will never seek to lower the American standard of life and wages. On the contrary, they desire the same standard for themselves. But there is an appalling danger to the American wage earner from the flood of low, unskilled, ignorant, foreign labor which has poured into the country for some years past, and which not only takes lower wages, but accepts a standard of life and living so low that American workingmen cannot compete with it....

I now come to the aspect of this question which is graver and more serious than any other. The injury of unrestricted immigration to American Wages and American standards of living I sufficiently plan and is enough, but the danger which this immigration threatens to the quality of citizenship is far worse. That which it concerns us to know, and that which is more vital to us as a people than all possible questions of tariff or currency, is whether the quality of our citizenship is endangered by the present course and character of immigration to the United States....

Mr. President, more precious even than forms of government are the mental and moral qualities which make what we call our race. While those stand unimpaired all is safe. When those decline all is imperiled. They are exposed to but a single danger, and that is by changing the quality of our race and citizenship through the wholesale infusion of races whose traditions and inheritances, whose thoughts and whose beliefs are wholly alien to ours, and with whom we have never assimilated or even been associated in the past. The danger has begun. It is small as yet, comparatively speaking, but it is large enough to warn us to act while there is yet time and while it can be done easily and efficiently. There lies the peril at the portals of our land; there is pressing the tide of unrestricted immigration. The time has certainly come, if not to stop, at least to check, to sift, and to restrict those immigrants. In careless strength, with generous hand, we have kept our gates wide open to all the world. If we do not close them, we should at least place sentinels beside them to challenge those who would pass through. The gates which admit men to the United States and to citizenship in the great republic should no longer be left unguarded.
HANDOUT E

Selections from the President Grover Cleveland’s Veto Message of the 1896 Literacy Test March 2, 1897

To the House of Representatives:
A radical departure from our national policy relating to immigration is here presented. Heretofore we have welcomed all who came to us from other lands except those whose moral or physical condition or history threatened danger to our national welfare and safety. Relying upon the zealous watchfulness of our people to prevent injury to our political and social fabric, we have encouraged those coming from foreign countries to cast their lot with us and join in the development of our vast domain, securing in return a share in the blessings of American citizenship.

A century’s stupendous growth, largely due to the assimilation and thrift of millions of sturdy and patriotic adopted citizens, attests the success of this generous and free-handed policy which, while guarding the people’s interests, exacts from our immigrants only physical and moral soundness and a willingness and ability to work.

A contemplation of the grand results of this policy can not fail to arouse a sentiment in its defense, for however it might have been regarded as an original proposition and viewed as an experiment its accomplishments are such that if it is to be uprooted at this late day its disadvantages should be plainly apparent and the substitute adopted should be just and adequate, free from uncertainties, and guarded against difficult or oppressive administration.

It is not claimed, I believe, that the time has come for the further restriction of immigration on the ground that an excess of population over crowds our land.

It is said, however, that the quality of recent immigration is undesirable. The time is quite within recent memory when the same thing was said of immigrants who, with their descendants, are now numbered among our best citizens.

It is said that too many immigrants settle in our cities, thus dangerously increasing their idle and vicious population. This is certainly a disadvantage. It can not be shown, however, that it affects all our cities, nor that it is permanent; nor does it appear that this condition where it exists demands as its remedy the reversal of our present immigration policy.

The claim is also made that the influx of foreign laborers deprives of the opportunity to work those who are better entitled than they to the privilege of earning their livelihood by daily toil. An unfortunate condition is certainly presented when any who are willing to labor are unemployed, but so far as this condition now exists among our people it must be conceded to be a result of phenomenal business depression and the stagnation of all enterprises in which labor is a factor. With the advent of settled and wholesome financial and economic governmental policies and consequent encouragement to the activity of capital the misfortunes of unemployed labor should, to a great extent at least, be remedied. If it continues, its natural consequences must be to check the further immigration to our cities of foreign laborers and to deplete the ranks of those already there. In the meantime those most willing and best entitled ought to be able to secure the advantages of such work as there is to do....
...The best reason that could be given for this radical restriction of immigration is the necessity of protecting our population against degeneration and saving our national peace and quiet from imported turbulence and disorder.

I can not believe that we would be protected against these evils by limiting immigration to those who can read and write in any language twenty-five words of our Constitution. In my opinion, it is infinitely more safe to admit a hundred thousand immigrants who, though unable to read and write, seek among us only a home and opportunity to work than to admit one of those unruly agitators and enemies of governmental control who can not only read and write, but delights in arousing by inflammatory speech the illiterate and peacefully inclined to discontent and tumult. Violence and disorder do not originate with illiterate laborers. They are, rather, the victims of the educated agitator. The ability to read and write, as required in this bill, in and of itself affords, in my opinion, a misleading test of contented industry and supplies unsatisfactory evidence of desirable citizenship or a proper apprehension of the benefits of our institutions. If any particular element of our illiterate immigration is to be feared for other causes than illiteracy, these causes should be dealt with directly, instead of making illiteracy the pretext for exclusion, to the detriment of other illiterate immigrants against whom the real cause of complaint can not be alleged....

...A careful examination of this bill has convinced me that for the reasons given and others not specifically stated its provisions are unnecessarily harsh and oppressive, and that its defects in construction would cause vexation and its operation would result in harm to our citizens.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What are the main points of Henry Cabot Lodge’s argument?
2. What is the basis for his fears?
3. Does he take issue with any one type of immigrant? If so, which one and why?
4. What do you think of his argument? Does it seem to have a rational basis?
5. What seems to be the issue central to Lodge’s argument?
6. What are the main points of Grover Cleveland’s veto message?
7. Why does he ultimately state that he is vetoing the Bill?
8. On what points and constitutional principles do the two men disagree?
9. What do you believe is the central argument of Cleveland’s veto message?
10. Does Cleveland disagree with the premise of Lodge’s argument, that the greatest threat facing the nation was a protection of American society?
11. Do the men agree on any points and constitutional principles?
Directions: Review the Excerpt from Coolidge First Address to Congress, and President Coolidge's Proclamation of Quota's for the Immigration Act of 1924 below and write down 5 initial reactions.

Background

The increasing number of immigrants arriving in the United States during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era created pressures within society that found their largest political expression in the nativist movement. Beginning with the Chinese Exclusionary Act of 1882, the United States Congress passed increasingly more restrictive and wider reaching immigration regulations. The Immigration Act of 1917 created an Asiatic Barred Zone and expanded the listed reasons, either political ideologies or illness, which immigrants could not have or be associated with if they wished to gain entrance into the country. In 1921, the Emergency Quota Act, created a national origins formula, which set quota restrictions based on the proportional population of certain immigrant groups. The United States would only permit a number totaling 3% of the total population of certain groups as noted by the census of 1910, to enter the United States. The Immigration Act of 1924 made this formula more restrictive by basing these limits on the census of 1890 instead of the 1910 census and setting the amount at 2% instead of 3%. Calvin Coolidge signed the bill into law in 1924. In both his first address to congress and his proclamation upon signing the bill into law, Coolidge reveals his reasoning behind backing the law. In reviewing his statements, we gain an insight into the thinking, right or wrong, of our nation.

Excerpt from Coolidge first address to congress – December 6, 1923:

American institutions rest solely on good citizenship. They were created by people who had a background of self-government. New arrivals should be limited to our capacity to absorb them into the ranks of good citizenship. America must be kept American. For this I purpose, it is necessary to continue a policy of restricted immigration. It would be well to make such immigration of a selective nature with some inspection at the source, and based either on a prior census or upon the record of naturalization. Either method would insure the admission of those with the largest capacity and best intention of becoming citizens. I am convinced that our present economic and social conditions warrant a limitation of those to be admitted. We should find additional safety in a law requiring the immediate registration of all aliens. Those’ who do not want to be partakers of the American spirit ought not to settle in America.

President Coolidge’s Proclamation of Quota’s for the Immigration Act of 1924

A Proclamation

Whereas it is provided in the act of Congress approved May 26, 1924, entitled “An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes” that “The annual quota
of any nationality shall be two per centum of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in continental United States as determined by the United States Census of 1890, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100 (Sec. 11a). . . .

“The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, jointly, shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this act, prepare a statement showing the number of individuals of the various nationalities resident in continental United States as determined by the United States Census of 1890, which statement shall be the population basis for the purposes of subdivision (a) of section 11 (Sec. 12 b).

“Such officials shall, jointly, report annually to the President the quota of each nationality under subdivision (a) of section 11, together with the statements, estimates, and revisions provided for in this section. The President shall proclaim and make known the quotas so reported” (Sec. 12 e).

Now, therefore I, Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States of America acting under and by virtue of the power in me vested by the aforesaid act of Congress, do hereby proclaim and make known that on and after July 1, 1924, and throughout the fiscal year 1924-1925, the quota of each nationality provided in said act shall be as follows:

Country or Area of Birth Quota 1924-25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country or Area of Birth</th>
<th>Quota 1924-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan - 100</td>
<td>Albania - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andorra - 100</td>
<td>Arabian Peninsula - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia - 124</td>
<td>Australia (incl. Papua, Tasmania &amp; all islands) - 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria - 785</td>
<td>Belgium - 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan - 100</td>
<td>Bulgaria - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon (proposed British mandate) - 100</td>
<td>Cameroon (French mandate) - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China - 100</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia - 3,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danzig, Free City of - 228</td>
<td>Denmark - 789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt - 100</td>
<td>Estonia - 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia (Abyssinia) - 100</td>
<td>Finland - 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France - 3,954</td>
<td>Germany - 51,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain &amp; Northern Ireland - 34,007</td>
<td>Greece - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary - 473</td>
<td>Iceland - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India - 100</td>
<td>Iraq (Mesopotamia) - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Free State - 28,567</td>
<td>Italy (incl. Rhodes, Dodecanesia &amp; Castellorizzo) - 3,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan - 100</td>
<td>Latvia - 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia - 100</td>
<td>Liechtenstein - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania - 344</td>
<td>Luxemburg - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco - 100</td>
<td>Morocco (French &amp; Spanish Zones &amp; Tangier) - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscat (Oman) - 100</td>
<td>Nauru (proposed British mandate) - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal - 100</td>
<td>Netherlands - 1,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand (incl. appertaining islands) - 100</td>
<td>Norway - 6,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Guinea (&amp; other Pacific islands under Australian mandate) - 100</td>
<td>Palestine (with Trans-Jordan, proposed British mandate) - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia - 100</td>
<td>Poland - 5,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal - 503</td>
<td>Ruanda &amp; Urundi (Belgium mandate) - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania - 603</td>
<td>Russia (European &amp; Asiatic) - 2,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa, Western (proposed mandate of New Zealand) - 100</td>
<td>San Marino - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siam - 100</td>
<td>South Africa, Union of - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Africa (proposed mandate of Union of South Africa) - 100</td>
<td>Spain - 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden - 9,561</td>
<td>Switzerland - 2,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria &amp; The Lebanon (French mandate) - 100</td>
<td>Tanganyika (proposed British mandate) - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togoland (proposed British mandate) - 100</td>
<td>Togoland (French mandate) - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey - 100</td>
<td>Yap &amp; other Pacific islands (under Japanese Mandate) - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia - 671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL NOTE.-The immigration quotas assigned to the various countries and quota-areas should not be regarded as having any political significance whatever, or as involving recognition of new governments, or of new boundaries, or of transfers of territory except as the United States government has already made such recognition in a formal and official manner.
HANDOUT G

Critical Thinking Questions

1. What themes do you see from our class discussion playing out in these selections?
2. Why do you think changing the census date from 1910 to 1890 significant?
3. Do you believe a country should be able to limit who crosses its borders? Why or why not?
4. What themes from Cleveland and Lodge’s arguments are reflected in the Immigration Act of 1924?
5. What are Coolidge’s major themes and constitutional principles in support of immigration reform?
6. How do you think this legislation impacted the relationship between immigrants and native-born Americans?
7. Do you think the limiting of immigration had the impact the authors of the bill desired? Why or why not?
8. The 1920’s in the United States are known as the “Roaring 20’s” due to the explosive growth of the economy. How might this economic boom effect feelings toward immigration?
HANDOUT H

Immigration Today

Directions:

Research and find three recent articles on immigration. One article should be focused on immigration and the economy. Another should be focused on immigration and social issues. The final article should be focused on immigration and politics. For each article, answer the questions listed below.

1. How are the issues and constitutional principles similar to immigration during the Gilded and Progressive eras?

2. In what ways are the issues and constitutional principles different?

3. What themes, constitutional principles, and civic virtues from your class discussion can you find in the article?

4. What challenges does this issue present?