

**Woodrow Wilson, Congress and Anti-Immigrant Sentiment
in America**

An Introductory Essay

**By Don Wolfensberger for the Congress Project Seminar
“Congress and the Immigration Dilemma: Is a Solution in
Sight?”**

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Monday, March 12, 2007

Some Americans need hyphens in their names because only part of them has come over; but when the whole man has come over, heart and thought and all, the hyphen drops of its own weight out of his name. This man was not an Irish-American; he was an Irishman who became an American.

–Woodrow Wilson (1914)

When Woodrow Wilson was first inaugurated as President on March 4, 1913, the rising tide against immigrants was already well underway. The last two decades of the Nineteenth Century saw an increase in immigration to the U.S. that differed from the patterns of mid-century when most immigrations were from northern and western Europe. The new immigrants were from southern and eastern Europe and were distinguishable from their predecessors by different religions, cultures, languages, and physical traits. As their numbers grew, political reactions to their presence changed as well.

The purpose of this essay is to provide the social and political context that confronted Wilson when he entered the White House; to trace his evolving views on American immigrants as a scholar and politician; and to describe how the anti-immigration sentiment played out in Congress during

Wilson’s presidency over the course of his two terms from 1913 to 1920.

Turn of the Century Immigration Developments

The first Federal laws restricting immigration were enacted in 1875 and 1882. The former statute barred the entry of convicts and prostitutes, while the latter act was the first general federal immigration law, forbidding the entry of idiots, lunatics and paupers, and imposing a head tax of 50 cents per immigrant.

Another immigration act in 1882 was the first U.S. statute to bar immigrants on the basis of national origin. Known as the Chinese Exclusion Act, it banned nearly all Chinese immigration for ten years and prohibited Chinese from becoming citizens. Nevertheless, the restrictive laws did not have their desired effect. European governments continued to send their “undesirables” to the U.S. and the Chinese government ignored the exclusionary law.¹

Undaunted, Congress in 1891 enacted legislation specifically aimed at the new immigrants from southern and eastern Europe by barring unskilled workers while encouraging those who were talented and professional. One of the leading voices in the debate was Henry Cabot Lodge (R-Mass.) who urged reform “to separate the chaff from the wheat” and to “address a decline in the quality of American citizenship.” The resulting legislation added to the categories of those who could be excluded from entry into the country to include those who had “loathsome or contagious diseases,” or who had been convicted of “crimes involving moral turpitude.” Congress renewed the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1892 and revised it to require that Chinese workers obtain residency certificates

or face being deported. The Act did not deal with the problem of excludables entering from Canada.²

As immigration continued to grow in the early Twentieth Century, public opinion against free entry into the country united as well. Public sentiment was channeled to Capitol Hill in the form of hundreds of petitions from states and labor organizations. Members of Congress responded by introducing all manner of legislation both regulate and suspend immigration. Debate began to focus on whether to impose literacy as a condition for admission—a policy directed primarily at those from southeastern Europe.³

Two Presidents vetoed such literacy test laws for entering immigrants— Republican Presidents William McKinley in 1896 and William Howard Taft in 1913. Congress did not override either veto. By the time Woodrow Wilson landed in the White House in 1913, he had some idea of the ongoing immigration challenge from Congress he might face, even though his own party now controlled both houses. Nevertheless, he was forced to veto three immigration bills over the course of his two terms, and, unlike his predecessors, was overridden on one of the vetoes.

Wilson as Presidential Candidate on Immigrants

During his first year as Governor of New Jersey Governor in 1911, when Wilson was already testing the presidential waters, he turned down offers of support from tabloid publisher William Randolph Hearst. Wilson despised Hearst for his “yellow journalism.” “Tell Mr. Hearst to go to Hell,” was Wilson’s response to the overtures. “God knows I want the Democratic presidential nomination,” Wilson said on another occasion, “and I am going to do everything legitimately to get it; but if I am to grovel at Hearst’s feet, I will never have it.”⁴

Hearst subsequently threw his support to House Speaker Champ Clark (D-Mo.) for president and assumed leadership of the anti-Wilson forces, beginning on January 29, 1912. As Wilson biographer Arthur Link notes, day after day Hearst’s papers in New York, Boston, Atlanta, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, “emblazoned on their front pages Wilson’s uncomplimentary opinion of southern and eastern Europeans,” and the resulting protests from Polish-, Italian- and Hungarian-American groups across the nation “were glorified and made front page headline stories.”⁵

What Hearst had found in Wilson’s *A History of the American People*, published in 1901, 1902, was a clear prejudice on the part of the author against the new wave of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. Commenting on the census of 1890 which showed U.S. population had increased by over 12 million from the previous decade, Wilson noted that, “Immigrants poured steadily in as before, but with an alteration of stock which students of affairs marked with uneasiness.”

Up to that time, Wilson contined, “men of sturdy stocks of the north of Europe had made up the main strain of foreign blood which was every year added to the vital working force of the country.... but now there came multitudes of men of the lowest class from the south of Italy and men of the meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland.” These new immigrants had “neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of quick intelligence,” Wilson added, and they came in such numbers that it seemed the countries of the south of Europe “were disburdening themselves of the more sordid and hapless elements of their population.”⁶

Wilson noted that in 1892 the people of the Pacific Coast had gotten what they wanted in a federal statute that excluded all Chinese who had not already acquired the right of residence. But even these Chinese “were more to be desired, as workmen if not as citizens, than most of the coarse

crew that came crowding in every year at the eastern ports.” The “unlucky fellows who came in at the eastern ports were tolerated because they usurped no place but the very lowest in the scale of labor.”⁷

Wilson found himself on the defensive in the immigration issue throughout most of his presidential campaign of 1912, holding frequent meetings with delegations of ethnic groups and editors of foreign language newspapers in the U.S. For the purpose of this essay I tracked all of Wilson’s speeches and writings in which he mentioned the immigrant issue during the 1912 presidential campaign. What soon became apparent was that the more Wilson was forced to confront the issue, the more confident he became in his response and the more it seemed he was undergoing a changed attitude about the newer immigrant groups to our shores. To use modern political parlance, he was able to spin himself into a true believer in the virtues of almost all immigration. The remainder of this section will give examples of this evolution in Wilson’s thinking.

In a St. Patrick’s Day Address before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Elizabeth, New Jersey, Wilson tackled head-on the prejudice of some against the new immigrants: “Some people have expressed a fear that there is too much immigration. I have the least uneasiness as to the new arrivals all being gripped as we have been gripped. The vast majority who come to our shores come on their own initiative and have some understanding as to what they want and a definite object in view.” “The country should be divested of all prejudices,” Wilson continued, and he denounced the use of hyphenated terms to describe Americans (e.g., Irish-Americans, German-Americans, Jewish Americans). “We are all Americans when we vote. There is a common Americanism which is gripping the composite race which peoples this Republic. We have not gotten together as yet, but when this nation once gets together it is going to be irresistible.”⁸

A week later, in an address before 2,000 mostly Polish-Americans in Milwaukee, Wilson again launched into his campaign against using hyphenated American terms, noting that the original stock of immigrants from Great Britain, Scotland and Ireland were now a minority, while those from other European countries are a majority. “Is it not about time to stop the practice of prefixing some race before the names of these Americans? I somehow feel that America is bigger than the continent on which it has been placed.... The first Americanism is that we must love one another—forget race and creed.”⁹

In April 1912, James Duval Phelan, a wealthy banker, real estate developer and leading Wilson backer in California, wrote to the Governor eliciting his further views on the Chinese exclusionary law and immigration generally. Having read Wilson's *History of the American People*,

Phelan wrote: "I have concluded from reading your works that as you are opposed to immigration of the dregs from Europe, as opposed to the better element, you would logically be opposed to Oriental coolieism." Wilson responded by letter on May 3, "In the matter of Chinese and Japanese coolie immigration I stand for the national policy of exclusion (or restricted immigration). The whole question is one of assimilation of diverse races. We cannot make a homogeneous population out of people who do not blend with the Caucasian race....Oriental coolieism will give us another race problem to solve, and surely we have had our lesson."¹⁰

On May 17, Dr. Frederico Luongo of Orange, New Jersey, representing the ItalianAmerican Alliance, made public a letter from Wilson explaining the statements made about immigrants in his

History of the American People. Here in part is Wilson's response:

The passage so often referred to in my history, and so grossly misrepresented, referred to a particular period in our history when certain practices were in vogue with regard to immigration which it had become necessary for Congress to put a stop to by legislation in the well-known prohibition of the importation of laborers under contract.

Wilson went on to explain that "the character of our immigration was very seriously affected at that time by the practices of the steamship companies and the employers of labor in the country, who were bringing over from the more shiftless classes in a great many of the European countries, great numbers of unskilled laborers intended to displace laborers on this side of the water, and lower the scale of wages. The immigrants thus brought over were of an entirely artificial kind and were not really representative of the countries from which they came."

Wilson went on to praise "the elements which the Italian and other southern peoples have contributed to our composite population," saying our country was "enriched in every way by the elements thus added to it." Wilson concluded his letter by commending the "racial strength and character which is being added to our population by the immigration out of Italy, Austria, Hungary

and the other countries of Europe which have so abounded in the spirit of our liberty, and which have given so many touches of ideal conception to the whole history of the race.”¹¹

On June 16, at the request of Josephus Daniels, of Raleigh, North Carolina, Wilson submitted draft planks for the Democratic Party Platform. The draft immigration plank called the issue one of the most difficult facing the nation “yet one which must be faced with frankness and courage. The plank goes on: “Reasonable restriction safeguarding the health, the morals and the political integrity of the country, no one can object to, but regulation should not go to such an extent as to shut the doors of America against men and women looking for new opportunity and for genuine political freedom.”¹²

However, the Democratic Party Platform was silent on immigration during both of Wilson’s runs for the presidency in 1912 and 1916. The Republican Platform of 1912, on the other hand, called for “appropriate laws to give relief from the constantly growing evil of induced or undesirable immigration, which is inimical to the progress and welfare of the people of the United States.”¹³

On July 22, Wilson met with New York Hungarian newspaper editor Gezea Kende, who had come to Wilson’s home at Sea Girt, New Jersey, to get his response to the Hearst newspapers’ recounting of Wilson’s reference in his *History of the American People* to “men of the meaner sort from the south of Europe.” According to a news accounting of the meeting, Kende told Wilson that “thousands of Hungarians considered him their enemy and were withholding their support until they could learn more about his view of them as immigrants.” Wilson dictated a statement to a stenographer which he then signed and gave to Kende for publication in his paper. The statement read, in part:

I believe in the responsible restrictions of immigration, but not in any restrictions which will exclude from the country honest, industrious men who are seeking what America has always offered—an asylum for those who seek a free field....Any one who has the least knowledge of Hungarian history must feel that stock to have proved itself for liberty and opportunity.¹⁴

Apparently still hemorrhaging among certain groups from his earlier writings on immigrants, Wilson reached out to his friend Edwin Bird Wilson in New York for assistance. On August 14, E.B. Wilson wrote to Governor Wilson conveying a list of names of recognized leaders of various ethnic groups (mostly foreign language newspaper editors in the U.S.) who might be

favorably disposed to Wilson, and who could be invited to confer with him “on the subjects touching the wide interests of their people, e.g., naturalized citizenship, immigration, distribution of immigrants, etc.” In E.B. Wilson’s words, “the situation is serious, but not hopeless and I believe that you can win back a large percentage of these people, by careful action along the lines suggested.”¹⁵

While the Governor did not meet with these leaders in Sea Girt, as suggested by E.B. Wilson, he did meet with most of the same persons in New York City on September 4, and delivered a major address, outlining his views of what would constitute reasonable and sound immigration legislation.

Quoting from Wilson’s speech:

...if we all take the American point of view, namely, that we want American life kept to its standards, and that only the standards of American life shall be the standards of restriction, then we are all upon common ground, not of those who criticize immigration, but of those who declare themselves Americans. I am not saying that I am wise enough out of hand to frame the legislation that will meet this ideal. I am only saying that that is the ideal and that is what we ought to hold ourselves to.¹⁶

Beyond placing reasonable restrictions on immigration, Wilson said the Federal government had an affirmative obligation to help accommodate immigrants once they arrived on our shores. This would mean building more ports of entry to avoid over-crowded labor markets and housing conditions. “Therefore, it is in the interest of the government that the government itself should supply, or at any rate encourage, the instrumentalities that will prevent that very thing,” that “will ease and facilitate and guide the process of distribution, and will above all things else supply the sympathetic information which is the only welcome that is acceptable to those who come.”¹⁷

On August 28 and September 5, 1912, Wilson entertained two different delegations of Italian-Americans at his Sea Girt home, regretting to them that things he had written had been “most grossly misinterpreted.” He explained to the first group that, “In my history, I referred to conditions which did exist when I wrote, and which afterward were corrected by legislation. These abuses were brought about by the steamship companies attempting to force immigration, and I believe in legislation that will correct all abuses.”¹⁸

He reminded the second delegation of Italian-Americans that the Democratic Party was born in opposition to the Federalists' alien and sedition acts in the late 1700s that "struck at one and the same time against immigration and against freedom of speech in America....It would be inconsistent

with those old traditions [of the Democratic Party], therefore, if it adopted any other policy."¹⁹

At a campaign address in Carnegie Hall on October 19, Wilson began fusing his evolving ideas on the contributions of immigrants into a larger vision of what America was and could be:

I should now like to think of America in the terms of these men who have made their homes here in comparatively recent times, because America has, so to say, opened its doors and extended its welcome to men who were Americans everywhere in the world. She has invited all the free forces of the modern civilized peoples to come to America where men can be free, and where all free forces can unite and forget all their differences of origins.²⁰

Wilson went on to say he would hate to see the U.S. government "adopt any niggardly immigration policy," because, when you consider "the largess of genius" and the "infinite variety of capacity" that other nations have conferred on the U.S., "it would seem certainly an act of self-denial, an act of folly, to shut our doors against such enrichment."²¹

On October 21, Wilson responded to a letter from Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning in Philadelphia, agreeing with him "about the immigration policy the country ought to observe, while declining to comment on the specifics of pending bills in Congress. "I think that this country can afford to use and ought to give opportunity to every man and woman of sound morals, sound mind, and sound body who comes in good faith to spend his or her energies in our life, and I would certainly be inclined so far as I am myself concerned to scrutinize very jealously any restrictions that would limit that principle in practice."²²

Wilson did not mention the immigration issue again in his public utterances prior to the election on November 5. However, a week after the election, he did weave it into a speech given at the dedication of the Wilson Cottage—a corrective institution for girls in Trenton: "The men who founded this country had a vision. They said: 'Men are brethren'....We have had a vision of brotherhood, of mutual helpfulness, of equal rights; we are going to spread a great polity over this continent which will embody these things and make them real. We are going to keep our doors wide open so that those who seek this thing from the ends of the earth may come and enjoy it."²³

In looking back at how Wilson handled the immigration issue during the campaign, biographer Arthur Link takes a dim view of some of Wilson's attempts to redeem himself with the offended ethnic groups:

It is difficult to believe that Wilson was really sincere in these fawning letters. Had he straight forward admitted that he was mistaken when he wrote the passages in 1902 and that subsequent events and experience had convinced him of his error, he might have convinced more persons of his sincerity. Instead, he endeavored to prove that he had not meant what he had written in 1902, with the result that he satisfied the complaints of few of the organizations of foreign-born voters.²⁴

Link goes on to recount “the climax in Wilson’s great apology” when a Polish-American group in New York suggested he have an “erratum slip” retracting his remarks inserted in all unsold copies of his history, that he rewrite the passages for his next edition of the work, and that he make a public apology to the offended groups. Link says there was a time when Wilson would have dismissed such a rebuke as “impudence,” but that now “he was a politician and quaffed the bitter draught,” promising to contact his publisher asking to rewrite the passage. He kept his promise with a letter to Harper and Brothers on March 4, 1912, saying there were one or two passages he would like to reconsider and rewrite in order to remove the false impressions which they seemed to have made.²⁵

Wilson as President on Immigration

A month prior to Wilson’s inauguration in March 1913, his predecessor, Republican President William Howard Taft had vetoed an immigration bill that would, among other things, have imposed a literacy test on immigrants as a condition for admission— as Democratic President Grover Cleveland had done before him in March 1897. Neither veto was overridden.

The 1913 bill was the product of the U.S. Immigration Commission (1907-1910) which had released its 42-volume report in 1910-1911. The Commission was composed of nine members, three from each house of Congress and three presidential appointees. The Commission was chaired by Senator William P. Dillingham (R-Vt.) who also served as chairman of the Senate Immigration Committee for four terms (1902-1911). The Commission’s report concluded that the “degenerate” racial stock from southern and eastern Europe was incapable of assimilation and was responsible for a host of social problems. The Commission recommended numerous options for restricting immigration.

Senator Dillingham assumed leadership for introducing the Commission's recommendations as legislation and steering it through Congress. The bill included provisions providing for the deportation of any immigrant convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude within five years of entry, and for any immigrant who became a public charge within three years of entry. The centerpiece of the bill, though, was the literacy test that was to be given to all aliens over 16 years of age. It required them to read a portion of the Constitution either in English or some other language or dialect. After extended debate, Dillingham was able to successfully steer the bill through Congress only to have it vetoed by his own party's president. It was one of Taft's last acts as President and also one of Dillingham's last acts in the majority as Republicans lost control of the Senate in the 1912 elections and would not regain it until 1919.²⁶

Wilson was barely settled in the White House when Democratic Congressman John L. Burnett of Alabama, the Democratic chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, reintroduced the literacy test measure in June 1913.²⁷ The chief proponent of severe restrictions on or exclusion of immigrants was the American Federation of Labor (A.F. of L.) because it viewed unlimited immigration as both depressing wages and making more difficult the task of organizing workers in basic industries. By 1913, organized labor was joined by other opponents including leading sociologists who saw dire consequences resulting from unrestrained immigration, and a large nativist element that feared Catholic and Jewish immigrants flooding our shores.

Wilson did not attempt to interfere with the legislation in the House, and in February 1914 the House passed the bill. In the Senate, Wilson was at least able to temporarily block the measure by threatening a veto over the literacy provision. However, pressures continued to mount for passage. As Arthur Link describes it, "The pressures for restriction mounted so enormously during the summer and autumn of 1914, however, that the Senate ignored the President's warning and adopted the Burnett bill by a vote of fifty to seven on January 2, 1915." Link goes on to assert that the Senate vote marked "a turning point in federal policy." Waves of proponents and opponents of the bill turned their attention on the White House as Wilson contemplated what to do. Samuel Gompers brought the entire executive committee of the A.F. of L. to the White House on January 16, 1915, to urge the President to sign the measure.²⁸

Six days later Wilson held a public hearing at the White House on the bill which was attended by labor leaders, farm organization spokesmen, patriotic societies and students of

immigration. One farm spokesman charged that those protesting the literacy test “want to Russianize the laboring world” in the U.S. Those opposing restrictions on immigrants included railroad managers and basic industry employers, spokesmen for various ethnic groups, the leadership of the Jewish community, and Roman Catholic leaders—all of whom made clear that the President’s action on the legislation would be a test of his good will.²⁹

Wilson was clearly conflicted as to what to do. In a letter to Senator John Sharpe Williams (D-Miss.) on January 7, 1915, Wilson wrote:

I find myself in a very embarrassing situation about the bill. Nothing is more distasteful to me than to set my judgment against so many of my friends and associates in public life.”

But then Wilson identified what would probably be the deciding factor in his decision:

I myself personally made the most explicit statements at the time of the Presidential election about this subject to groups of our fellow-citizens of foreign extraction whom I wished to treat with perfect frankness and for whom I had entire respect. In view of what I said to them, I do not see how it will be possible for me to give my assent to the bill.³⁰

On January 28, 1915, Wilson did veto the Burnett immigration bill (H.R. 6060), “An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States”). Wilson conceded in his veto message that the legislation would “undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling” immigration, but that his duty to the Constitution left him no choice but to dissent. The two particulars of the bill that Wilson said forced him to this conclusion were its “radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of the country” to be an open gate to those from other countries seeking asylum; and the even more radical change of a literacy test that turns “away from tests of character and of quality” and imposes tests which exclude and restrict those who coming seeking the opportunity of education by requiring that they already have had an education to gain entry. Wilson said it is the people’s right to “reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them,” but that he does not believe they have made that choice. “Let the platforms of the parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.”³¹

The House sustained the veto on February 4, 1915, but it would not be the last Wilson would see of the measure. The following year, in the new Congress, Burnett again reintroduced his immigration bill, and this time it passed the House by a bipartisan vote of 308 to 87 on March 30, 1916, and the Senate on December 14, 1916. A compromise cleared the two house conference committee in January 1917 and was sent to the President. On January 29, Wilson returned the measures to the House with his veto message, echoing similar sentiments from his earlier message.

Again Wilson praised the bill in part before condemning it: “In most of the provisions of the bill I should be very glad to concur, but I can not rid myself of the conviction that the literacy test constitutes a radical change in the policy of the Nation which is not justified in principle.”³²

This time the House overwhelmingly voted to override the veto, 287 to 106, and the Senate followed suit, 62 to 19. As Arthur Link notes, “Thus the open door to America—long the gateway of opportunity for countless millions—was partially closed for the first time in general legislation.”³³

In one of his last acts as President in 1921, Wilson pocket-vetoed an even more restrictive immigration bill passed by a Republican-controlled Congress, that for the first time would have placed immigration quotas on nationalities from the eastern hemisphere, set at 3 percent of a nationality’s U.S. residents, based on the 1910 census. But it was a temporary setback for the forces of exclusion. President Warren G. Harding signed a similar bill in May of the same year. When the act was renewed by the Quota Act of 1924, entry quotas were limited to 2 percent of a nation’s presence in the U.S. population according to the 1890 census.³⁴ It wasn’t until the 1965 Immigration Act that nationality quotas were finally lifted.

One final irony that brings us full circle is the earlier argument used by Wilson to the offended ethnic groups in 1912 was that the Democratic Party had been founded in protest to the Alien and Sedition Act of the Federalist Party in the late 1790s. In the aftermath of World War I, it was Wilson’s Administration that pushed through a new set of alien and sedition laws in response to the “red scare” of that era.

Conclusion

Wilson was a product of his time and his region. His racist attitude toward blacks is well-documented, and his WASPish attitude toward immigrants from southern and eastern Europe is also documented in his own *History of the American People*. It was the unfortunate passages in that history that landed Wilson in so much hot water during his campaign for the presidency in 1912, and for which he expended so much time attempting to explain away as being “grossly

misinterpreted.” Whether Wilson had a genuine conversion to his new posture of openness to all immigrants (except from the Orient, that is), is a matter of conjecture and speculation.

One thing is certain, though, by his own admission: the commitments he was forced to make to the offended groups during the campaign were a matter of honor with him and it was that honor and commitment which was decisive in his vetoes of the restrictive immigration bills in 1915, 1917, and 1921. The epigraph to this essay about hyphenated-Americans³⁵ is one that he sincerely believed in and repeated in numerous speeches, and that is the idea of the idea of the American melting pot that dissolved all distinctions of national origin and assimilated people from all over the world in our American common culture, language, and set of democratic ideals. The argument of the American melting pot dissolving bonds to previous homelands was especially pertinent (though not successful) during the run-up to U.S. entry into World War I when German- and Irish-Americans lobbied heavily against a U.S. alliance with Great Britain.³⁶ It was only after the formal declaration of War that the anti-British and pro-German groups dropped their massive protest and peace rallies and rallied to the larger cause of their newly adopted country.

A more recent President, Bill Clinton, reportedly offered a more ethnically correct version of the melting pot ideal by observing that, “We are a nation of many melting pots.” The point remains, however, that our shared identity as Americans has, for the most part, been strong enough and enduring enough to spare us the kind of ethnic and sectarian conflict, violence, and even genocide that we have witnessed in other parts of the world. Nevertheless, the issue of immigration continues to touch sensitive nerve endings in the American populace as the newest waves of immigrants from south of our border, both documented and undocumented, become a larger presence in our country. The political ramifications continue to play-out in the halls of Congress in debates reminiscent of those that marked earlier periods in our history. And, as before, the people and their elected representatives, and Congress and the President, are engaged in the ongoing tug-and-pull of redefining America and what it is to be American.

Endnotes

1. *Encyclopedia of American Immigration*, James Ciment, editor (Amonk, New York: Sharpe Reference, 2001), 2:502.
2. *Major Acts of Congress*, Brian K. Landsberg, editor in chief (New York: MacMillan Reference USA, 2004), 2:180.
3. *Encyclopedia of American Immigration*, 2:502
4. Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: The Road to the White House* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947), 382.
5. Ibid.
6. Woodrow Wilson, *A History of the American People* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1902), 98-99.
7. Ibid, 99-100.
8. “Wilson Says Big Problems Face America: Governor Gives Address at Dinner of Friendly Sons of S. Patrick,” A News Report of an After Dinner Address in Elizabeth, New Jersey, March 18, 1912, in *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Arthur S. Link, editor (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 24:252.
9. “Gov. Wilson Addresses Two Big Audiences: New Jersey Candidate Gets Warm Reception from Milwaukee People,” News Report of three Addresses in Milwaukee, March 24, 1912, in *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 24:260-261.
10. Ibid, 24:353, 382-83.
11. Ibid, 24:405-06.
12. Ibid, 24:481.
13. *The Encyclopedia of the Republican Party*, George Thomas Kurian and Jeffrey D. Schultz, editor and associate editor (Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe Reference, 1997), 2:474.
14. A News Report, July 22, 1912, *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 24:564.
15. *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 25:27-29.
16. A Talk in New York to Editors of Foreign-Language Newspapers, sept. 4, 1912, *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 25:94-97.
17. Ibid.

18. "Wilson Talks with Brandeis on Trusts and Immigration, Greets Foreigners," Aug. 28, 1912, *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 25:59-60.
19. Remarks to an Italian-American Delegation at Sea Girt, Sept. 5, 1912, *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 25:107-109.
20. A Campaign Address in Carnegie Hall, Oct. 19, 1912, *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 25:441.
21. *Ibid*, 25:441-42.
22. *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 25:450.
23. Remarks at the Dedication of Wilson Cottage, Nov. 12, 1912, *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 25:538.
24. Link, *The Road to the White House*, 386.
25. *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 25: 386-87.
26. *The Encyclopedia of the United States Congress*, Donald C. Bacon, Roger H. Davidson, and Morton Keller, editors (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995), 2: 1094-95.
27. *Encyclopedia of American Immigration*, 1:150.
28. Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: The New Freedom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956), 274-75.
29. *Ibid*.
30. *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 32: 26.
31. To the House of Representatives, *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 32: 142-44.
32. A Veto Message, *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 41:52-53.
33. Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: Campaigns for Progressivism and Peace, 1916-1917* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), 328.
34. *Encyclopedia of American Immigration*, 2:504.
35. An Address on Commodore John Barry, May 16, 1914, *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 30:34. Wilson's remarks were delivered at the dedication of a statue to the memory of the Revolutionary War hero.
36. *Encyclopedia of American Immigration*, 1:151. The German-American Alliance and GermanAmerican press were especially active in promoting American neutrality, holding

rallies in support of an arms embargo prior to U.S. entry into WW I. Americans interpreted their efforts as a threat to national security and many were arrested and detained. After the U.S. declared war, President Wilson issued a set of 12 “enemy alien regulations” that restricted the movement and rights of non-citizens from countries with which we were at war. Six-three hundred enemy aliens were subsequently interned, including 2,300 civilians. Congress followed suit with enactment of the 1917 Espionage Act and the 1918 Sedition Act to

prosecute citizens who obstructed the draft or criticized the war effort. Attorney General Mitchell Palmer subsequently used the 1917 deportation law to jail 6,000 suspects and deport 600 aliens.