## The Metropolitan Frontier.

i

a

C

A

a

re

p

ai C

K

 $^{\mathrm{th}}$ 

ge

fre

ca

sh

dy

the

mo

bac

Ep

to .

cor

of 1

the one decade will have become misleading and unjust in the next. The forces of modern society are kinetic rather than static, with the pneumatic, in the highest spiritual sense, pervading the whole structure, and often determining the result, as with the breath of God, when all the known agencies of our poor little social laboratory leave us in the dark, helpless and alone. The centers of influence, therefore, whether of light or storm, are elusive, fitful, refluent, variable. "The Bend" of Mulberry Street long ago put on the filthy garments of squalor and wickedness which the historical Five Points, with the aid of Christian philanthropy, had cast away. But far into the future still, this old Five Points, the phrase stereotyped in literature, must bear the odium of its discarded history. And are there not even modern sermons, perhaps the far-away rural echo of an older metropolitan description, but possibly resting with easy conscience at the top of some contiguous pastor's "barrel," in which poor old Five Points is made to bear the same homiletic burden it assumed twenty years ago?

But these reflections aside, there are certain contrasts of population which indicate, with tolerable accuracy, the possible storm-centers of the metropolitan frontier. Contrasting the seaboard States with those of the national interior, we find that New York contains a native-born population of 4,426,000 and a foreign-born population of 1,571,000, a proportion of nearly three to one in favor of the American element: this against 1,279,000 native-born people in the State of Kansas to 147,000 foreigners, an American preponderance of more than eight to one. In Massachusetts we find a native-born population of 1,581,000 and a foreign-born population of 657,000, a proportion of nearly two and one-half to one in favor of the American element; but this against 1,587,000 native-born Americans in the State of Iowa, with only 324,000 of foreign birth, an American preponderance of about five to one. In California, the census reports that 841,000 of the population are native-born, while 366,000 are of foreign birth, a proportion of two and one-third to one in favor of native Americans; but this over against Missouri, with only 234,000 foreign-born people to 2,444,000 native Americans, a native preponderance of more than ten to one.

These figures make it very plain that Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri were settled by emigration, with its accompanying displacement, rather than by immigration. And the general contrast of the seaboard territory with the interior sustains the general conclusion, while the exceptions presented in Wisconsin and Minnesota only make the ruling fact the more conspicuous. For the superior enterprise of the foreign population of these latter States over the average of their brothers by the sea, calls instant attention to the division of the army of immigrants on their arrival in this country, by which those who are indolent or purposeless are deposited, to "wait for something to turn up," in the already crowded ports of entry.

306