

- Francis, E. K., "Religious Pluralism in a Peasant Community," *Religious Education*, (1955), pp. 23-26.
- , "Multiple Intergroup Relations in the Upper Rio Grande Region," *American Sociological Review*, XXI (1956a), pp. 84-87.
- , "Padre Martinez: A New Mexican Myth," *New Mexico Historical Review*, XXXI (1956b), pp. 265-269.
- , Paul Kellermann, et al., *Eine Umfrage unter Jugendlichen in Südtirol*. Unpublished manuscript, Soziologisches Institut der Universität München (Munich, 1963).
- Leidlmaier, Adolf, *Bevölkerung und Wirtschaft in Südtirol*. Tiroler Wirtschaftsstudien. Schriftenreihe der Jubiläumsstiftung der Kammer der gewerblichen Wirtschaft für Tirol. Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner, 1958.
- Pan, Christoph, *Südtirol als volkliches Problem: Grundriess einer Südtiroler Ethno-Soziologie*. Ethnos: Schriftenreihe der Forschungsstelle für Nationalitäten- und Sprachenfragen, Marburg/Lahn, Vol. 9. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1971.

C. Secondary Ethnic Groups

INTRODUCTION

Migrations of individuals over long distances, usually but not necessarily across international boundary lines, create conditions favorable to the formation of secondary ethnic groups. Yet similar conditions may be brought about by other factors. In Section B we have found instances in which primary ethnic groups were transformed into secondary ethnic groups because of endogenous changes, such as modernization, shifts in the balance of political power, transculturation, or loss of leadership. Even annexation may lead directly to the formation of secondary rather than primary ethnic groups; this seems to be the case when the population that is being transferred from one national society to another conforms to the modern industrial rather than to the premodern agrarian type.¹

In this section we are confining ourselves to secondary ethnic groups that have been formed as a result of migration. This is the most common type found in the United States and in other highly modernized nations. Many of the ethnic groups discussed in Section A, particularly in Chapters 12 and 13, belong to this type. Again, not all migrations lead to ethnic group formation. In Section D we shall tackle the problem of what happens to ethnics who, after their immigration, do not form distinctive subgroups.

Before we can specify the general conditions under which secondary ethnic groups are formed by migrants, we should recall that large-scale migrations to modern societies have mainly been the outcome of industrialization and nationalization. As far as the receiving society was concerned, the expansion and modernization of the economy created a pressing demand for labor which could not be met domestically; it also increased the society's capacity to admit large numbers of people trying to escape the consequences of nationalization in their parent society. There are, however, other reasons for migration. Sometimes it is brought about through the use of physical force or the threat of violence. More common, however, is the voluntary migration that has been triggered off by social forces of push and pull.

¹Although we have not found sufficient empirical material to study such a situation more closely, we are under the impression that after the annexation of Eupen-Malmédy by Belgium, for instance, or during the temporary French rule over the Saarland there were no indications of primary ethnic group formation among the German populations of those territories.

People are usually motivated to migrate because they are dissatisfied with conditions at home and/or because they expect to find more favorable conditions abroad. Their motives are sometimes expressed in terms of freedom from oppression. Occasionally, they are forced to leave at the point of the bayonet or because their lives and liberty are in grave danger. In other cases, nothing more is involved than a desire to escape military service or penal sanctions or the wish for new experience and adventure. More frequently, poverty and starvation or the necessity to care for destitute relatives plays a major role, or just the hope of finding the "pot at the end of the rainbow." For whatever reason individual migrants leave or chose a particular destination—and there are a great variety of motives—once they arrive their immediate and most pressing concerns are economic: to make a living and, in time, to better their lot. Thus we come to the conclusion that *economic factors are of paramount importance in secondary ethnic-group formation, whilst in primary ethnic-group formation political factors take precedence.*

CONDITIONS OF SECONDARY ETHNIC GROUP FORMATION

Ethnics who, in their quest for economic satisfaction, are confronted not only with the handicap of an unfamiliar social setting but also with the resistance of the natives, are inclined to seek the support of people with a familiar background and similar experience. In addition, they feel the need for more intimate social relationships on the level of *commensalitas* and *connubium* which, as a rule, are denied to them, at least on equal terms, by the host society. Finally, they have an urge to create for themselves a more familiar milieu than the host society can offer. The need for mutual aid and the desire for intimate social relations and a familiar social environment are likely to lead to an association with fellow countrymen and consequently to the formation of secondary ethnic groups *if the following conditions are fulfilled:*

1. There must be sufficient opportunities of communication between dispersed ethnics and sufficient freedom of movement to permit the concentration of a relatively large number of them in one locality.
2. Communication with the parent society must be restricted and the chance of returning home, either for short intervals or permanently, must be limited, so that the ethnics can find satisfaction of their basic needs only within the host society (which also includes all the subgroups of which it is composed).
3. The economy and institutional framework of the host society must be sufficiently elastic to accommodate considerable numbers of ethnics in one locality, and to permit them to function as a segmental subgroup of the host society.

NATIONAL CULTURE AND THE FORMATION OF ETHNIC GROUPS

The opinion is widespread that ethnic problems have their source in a clash of cultures: the culture of the immigrants' country of origin, on the one hand, and that of the receiving country, on the other. By implication, this suggests that the formation, maintenance, and dissolution of ethnic groups may be explained in terms of differences between the cultures of the parent and the host society. This viewpoint raises two difficulties. One concerns the concept of national culture that is derived from Herder's and Hegel's notion of "Volkgeist"; in this sense one speaks of a specific Polish, French, Italian, Russian, or American culture. *In the context of interethnic relations, such a generalized concept of national culture has negligible explanatory value; it neither lends itself easily to operationalization nor does it distinguish sufficiently between the manifold subcultural levels within a complex society.* We have shown earlier that typical differences between premodern, that is, prenational and preindustrial, societies on the one hand, and modern societies that are subject to the processes of nationalization, on the other, are of strategic importance in interethnic relations. These differences, however, are not linked definitely to any particular national cultures.

Furthermore, empirical evidence reveals that no constant relationship exists between variations in the behavior of different ethnic groups and specific differences in the "national culture" of their parent societies. In many instances, immigrants of the same national origin behave quite differently, while the behavior patterns of ethnic groups having another national origin resemble each other rather closely. Thus, the behavior of Polish immigrants who came to the United States, say in 1880, may be more similar to that of Italian immigrants who arrived at about the same time than to that of Poles who immigrated half a century later. In fact, Polish immigrants who arrived at the same time often behaved quite differently, some forming ethnic groups while others found their niche directly in American society at large without associating themselves with any Polish community. By contrast, the secondary ethnic groups formed by immigrants of quite different origin—Poles, Hungarians, Italians—may run through the same typical "life cycle"; this fact has been indicated by Warner in his study of Yankee City (Warner, 1941). As will be shown in the following chapters, *the crucial factors in ethnic group formation are not unique differences between particular "national" cultures but typical structural differences between parent and host society.*

STRUCTURAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PARENT AND HOST SOCIETIES

Most of the immigrants to the United States who eventually have formed secondary ethnic groups did have two things in common: (1) they had been

RESERVE
COLLECTION

peasants in Europe, more often poor landless folk than independent farmers; and (2) they were transferred to highly industrialized areas of America. This suggests that in speaking of their parent and host societies respectively we must not think in terms of an entire national society or a generalized national culture area. For at this period American society still comprised large sections in which the prevailing premodern and preindustrial conditions resembled those of the European peasant. Yet some of the European countries from which the immigrants came were becoming modernized and industrialized. Thus, we must focus our attention on the cultural type of local community and regional subsociety that constituted the immediate and socially significant milieu of the migrants, both in the country of origin and in the receiving country. We must picture the conditions under which the European peasants had been living in Poland, Italy, or Hungary. We must base our judgment not on what we know of modern Poland, Italy, or Hungary, but rather on what we have learned of the old Hispano core in New Mexico. And we must keep in mind that the European peasants who subsequently formed secondary ethnic groups settled in American cities where industrialization and modernization were farthest advanced.

BASIC THEOREMS

In the following chapters we shall single out some of the factors that seem to influence the formation, maintenance, and dissolution of secondary ethnic groups. We shall proceed from the following assumptions:

1. Specific differences between the generalized national cultures of parent and host society may safely be neglected because they do not appear to be definitely linked to observable differences in the typical behavior of ethnics and ethnic groups.
2. The crucial factor in the formation of secondary ethnic groups and their subsequent behavior is to be sought in the difference between the premodern agrarian type of their respective parent societies and the modern industrial type of their host societies.
3. In speaking of parent and host societies we must focus attention on the particular section of a national society in which the migrants participate, especially on the local communities and regional subsocieties that constitute their immediate social environment.

PLAN OF SECTION C

To demonstrate the validity and heuristic value of these theorems we shall make use of a kind of *ex post facto* experimental design without however attempting any quantification. Our quasi-experiment rests on the selection of

comparable cases which permit us to hold some factors constant while varying others. To test the theorem concerning the irrelevance of "national culture" we shall show that (1) the behavior of ethnics of Polish origin follows the same pattern in the United States, Germany, and Belgium; and (2) in the United States ethnics of different national origin (Italians, Hungarians, and so on) behave quite similarly to ethnics of Polish origin. In the first case we shall keep constant the "national culture" of the parent society of ethnics while varying the "national culture" of the host societies; in the second case the "national culture" of the host society (America) will be held constant while varying that of the parent societies. The result in both cases is the same type of secondary ethnic group behavior.

With regard to the theorem concerning the relevance of the structural differences between parent and host society it will be shown that in the cases studied, secondary ethnic groups have emerged when the host societies (the United States, Belgium, Germany) were of the industrial type, and when the ethnics, regardless of national origin, were of peasant origin.

Other cases to be treated in chapter 19, however, deviate from this general prototype of ethnic group formation. Among the Polish soldiers and refugees who were settled in England after World War II we shall find somewhat similar behavior patterns as among the other groups studied in Section C, although these immigrants do not conform to the peasant type; in addition, both parent and host societies have an analogous modern structure. In a similar manner the German expellees from Eastern Europe who were settled in Western Germany, as well as the Poles from Eastern Poland who, at about the same time, were settled in the Western Territories of Poland, tended to form quasi-ethnic subgroups within the German and Polish national society respectively, although remaining within one and the same national culture area. Here parent and host society appear to be identical. As these last three instances of ethnic group formation are not covered by our second theorem, they will require some supplementary hypotheses.

REFERENCE

- Warner, Lloyd W., and Paul S. Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community*. Yankee City Series, Vol. I. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

RESERVE
COLLECTION

*The Formation
of Secondary
Ethnic Groups:
The European
Peasant in America*
17

In the United States secondary ethnic groups have emerged in the main since the conclusion of the Civil War, at a period when processes of nationalization and industrialization became fully effective. This time of transition also marks the dividing line between what has been called the "old" and the "new immigration." To the old immigration belong those ethnic elements, mainly German and Scandinavian, who arrived at a time when American society was still predominantly agrarian, and before it had clearly developed into a modern nation. Most of them took part in the colonization of what became the Middle West, along with the old stock American pioneers from the Atlantic Seaboard and New England States. Together they built the new American nation whose heartland was, for a century, those central regions of the country where descendants of the old immigration were most heavily represented. In cases where distinctive ethnic communities were formed, these were mostly of the primary type. Although the Irish chronologically belong to the old immigration, they conform in type to the new immigration; for, unlike other immigrants who came before the Civil War, they were deliberately directed by Catholic church authorities to the early urban industrial sections where conditions compelled them to form secondary ethnic groups.

During the period of the new immigration, which began in the 1870s and continued until the early years of World War I, nearly twenty million European peasants were attracted to the rapidly expanding industrial cities of the country, and once again threw out of gear an emerging national society which, only a

few years earlier, had been reconstituted and consolidated in the cauldron of the Civil War. The natives countered the threat to social stability by a general suspicion of foreigners and a resistance to close association with them. When it became apparent that the majority of immigrants had come to stay and would have to be fully integrated into American society, the same homogenizing pressures were brought to bear upon them which we have found to be a concomitant of nation-building in general. After all, the ideology of Americanization and the "melting pot" is nothing else than the American version of demotic nationalism. American nationalism demanded the undivided loyalty of the immigrants as did the risorgimento nationalism, embraced at about the same period by their European parent societies. The propagation of national ideas which, in their practical consequences, were incompatible, created tensions and conflicts between the ethnics and their hosts that retarded the integration of the ethnics into the American national society.

In earlier sections of Part III our presentation followed this pattern: Starting with the description of a particular case, we proceeded to its analysis in order to arrive at some more general theoretical insight. In this and the following chapter we propose a somewhat different approach. It would be tedious first to digest a great variety of case studies on different European ethnic groups in America, which have already been adequately summarized by such authors as Schermerhorn (Schermerhorn, 1949; cf. also Francis, 1956; Handlin, 1959). For this reason we shall confine the descriptive part of our investigation to a synopsis of what has been found common to all these groups by many scholars writing on the subject. As a type case, however, we shall use the Polish peasant in America, and here again we shall rely heavily on a classical work by W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki (1958).

Before approaching the problem of secondary ethnic-group formation in the United States, three stages in this process should be clearly distinguished: (1) a preparatory stage lasting a few years after the first arrival of ethnics from a particular country; (2) a period of settling down permanently in American communities, during which ethnic groups and subcommunities were formed on the local level; and (3) a final stage during which alliances were organized to tie the local groups together into a "supraterritorial" or subsocietal system operating within American society at large.

THE PREPARATORY STAGE

The general background of the type of immigrants that is under scrutiny may be summed up as follows: The first arrivals were characteristically males; as they were mostly illiterate and unskilled (except in agriculture), they could only be employed as manual workers. They were propertyless strangers, unfamiliar with the language and culture of the host society. Only a minimum of accommodation, though, was required to integrate them into the industrial economy at

RESERVE
COLLECTION

the bottom of the occupational scale. As most of them expected to return eventually to their native villages with the savings made in America, they could hardly object to their hosts treating them as foreigners of temporary residence. The immigrants, who usually arrived singly or in small bands, tended to associate with chance acquaintances with whom they could converse in their mother tongue and share common interests. Frequently, males of the same ethnic background lived in cheap boardinghouses situated in the blighted districts of the city where they had found employment.

Soon, however, other countrymen followed. The reasons for this chain migration were mainly twofold. Immigrants often made a conscious effort to encourage relatives and acquaintances to join them. Moreover, favorable reports to the people back home were publicized in their native villages and adjacent areas, and influenced others to follow suit. Earlier immigrants, in their turn, welcomed any new arrivals from the Old Country as a relief from the isolation and loneliness that they had suffered in a strange and unfriendly environment. As soon as the immigrants realized that their stay in America would be more permanent than they had anticipated or feared, they sent for wives and children or asked their parents to arrange for a bride willing to join them in the New World. In this way people hailing from the same European region (even from one town) frequently concentrated in particular American communities.

THE FORMATIVE STAGE

Once sizable numbers of immigrant families with the same ethnic background had settled down in a given locality, the stage was set for the formation of a distinctive ethnic subgroup. As opportunities for extending mutual aid and also for more association on the level of *commensalitas* and *connubium* multiplied, a web of informal relationships began to tie together immigrants from one country. Thus, their sense of ethnic identity and solidarity was strengthened, and they were all the more ostensibly set apart from the host society and from other ethnic groups. As they tended to collect in one locality, concentrations of ethnics were soon found in particular streets and neighborhoods. In time, one ethnic group would occupy an entire city district, which had been abandoned by other residents because of its changed character. In these areas social life assumed a striking resemblance to that which the ethnics had led in their Old World villages. Their native tongue was generally used in public; restaurants, saloons, and stores catered to their tastes and offered additional chances for casual encounters.

Voluntary Associations. Informal social relationships were supplemented by voluntary associations. These were not alien to the peasant immigrants, for they had been introduced in many parts of Europe when, in the course of modernization, the rural community had lost its comprehensive social functions. In the New World such organizations, however, had even to assume

functions which, in the Old Country, had been the responsibility of the extended kinship group, the church, or the state. Mutual benefit societies, which had been organized during the preparatory stage and whose original purpose had been to provide a measure of social security, now expanded their scope to include convivial gatherings and recreational activities such as had been offered by Old World village inns. Eventually, the entire social life of the ethnic group outside the family became focused on what has been popularly called "the Society" (or a set of similar voluntary associations). These "societies" were particularly needed in America where the state has long been reluctant to undertake subsidiary functions and where the disestablished churches themselves often assumed the character of voluntary associations.

In point of fact, the ethnic "societies" were instrumental in the establishment of "national" parishes and denominational schools in which the mother tongue of the ethnics was at least partly used. The significance of parish and parish school for ethnic subcommunities has been discussed at length in earlier chapters. The necessity to take care of and to support churches and schools strengthened the sense of common purpose and solidarity among the members of the "society" who represented the active core of the ethnic subcommunity. The proliferation of voluntary associations—in a large parish there might be as many as seventy associations having an average of ten officers or committee members—provided a chance to attain a position of prestige for almost every active community member. Overlapping club membership intensified the network of communication and interaction encompassing the entire local group.

Supraterritorial Organizations. As the number of ethnic subcommunities increased, alliances of local associations were organized for the whole of the United States. Because we have not yet had occasion to deal with this type of ethnic institution, an explanation is appropriate here. Although voluntary associations and other institutions of a basically voluntary character, such as church or parish school, mainly served economic and "cultural" interests on the local level, supraterritorial federations were deliberately created by ethnic leaders primarily for political reasons.

By way of example we shall single out the Polish alliances. A first attempt was made to assemble delegates from various parishes to discuss common problems. It failed mainly because local interests were too different to offer many opportunities for common action. Of lasting success, however, was the Polish National Alliance, founded in 1880, which reflected the spread of risorgimento nationalism in Europe. Polish peasants coming from premodern agrarian sections of Europe had not yet been affected by the national movement which had already taken hold of the upper classes and above all of the educated middle classes. Immigrants belonging to these strata were mainly responsible for spreading nationalist ideas of the parent society to the Polish communities in America. When they organized the Polish National Association, they conceived of the Poles in America as the "Fourth Province" of Poland, with the

RESERVE
COLLECTION

responsibility of contributing to the reunion of the three other "provinces" in Russia, Prussia, and Austria into a single nation-state.

As a reaction to liberal and anticlerical tendencies in the Polish National Alliance, priests and other Catholic leaders founded the Polish Roman Catholic Union. Its purpose was less the creation of a *Polonia Americana* than the preservation of Polish traditions, which had always been also Catholic traditions; this to forestall the Americanization of the Poles in America, which was thought to lead inevitably to their secularization. The Alliance of Polish Socialists, finally, was considered a branch of socialism in Poland rather than a federation of Polish communities in America. Its avowed goal was the liberation of Poland and the return of all Poles living in exile. Although the intellectual level of its members was high, it had no great appeal to the masses of American Poles. For these had come to consider themselves permanent residents in America rather than temporary exiles; moreover, improving economic conditions reduced their interest in the socialist point of view.

Another institution of a supraterritorial scope was the foreign-language press. It was either directly supported by the supraterritorial organizations, or its publishers and editors played a leading role in them. It served local ethnic groups as a bulletin and clearing center of information about Polish activities throughout the United States. By facilitating communications between the several ethnic communities and between scattered Poles who would otherwise have lost contact with their fellow countrymen, the press strengthened ethnic solidarity, aided the formation of a Polish-American public opinion, and initiated common actions in the entire Polish subsociety in America. In addition, it provided an important channel through which news from the parent society reached the ethnic group. Like the ethnic school, it promoted literacy, helped to preserve the native language and cultural heritage, mediated ideas of nationalism, and generated national consciousness and pride. Although the foreign-language press helped to create a measure of ethnic particularism in America, it also contributed to the adjustment of ethnics to the host society by interpreting its culture and by familiarizing the ethnics with new developments in a manner that could readily be understood by them.

FACTORS INVOLVED IN GROUP FORMATION

In turning to an examination of the factors involved in the formation of secondary ethnic groups, we are once again confronted with the questions: Why do ethnics from one country prefer to associate with each other, and why do they eventually tend to flock in particular neighborhoods and districts of American cities? It is best to begin with an analysis of the sociopsychological needs of immigrants. By and large, people tend to satisfy their affiliative needs by associating with those available in a given situation who are most familiar to them in terms of language and culture. This permits the most intimate relationships and the most vivid sentiments of solidarity, which is particularly true in

situations that engender anxiety (Schachter, 1959). Such is certainly the case when immigrants arrive in a foreign country either singly or in relatively small bands.

Strangers in general, and uneducated peasants in particular, develop specific psychological needs:

1. On the cognitive level, an unfamiliar and thus unstructured situation, especially if it is felt to threaten survival, creates an immediate and urgent need for information and orientation. This presupposes not only unambiguous means of communication with potential informants and interpreters of the situation but also the likelihood that the informants have an intimate knowledge and understanding of the social and cultural background of the questioner.
2. On the instrumental level, a stranger is usually confronted with numerous and persistent exigencies with which he cannot hope to cope without assistance. Yet in a heterogeneous industrialized urban community, cooperation and mutual aid are rarely extended to complete strangers.
3. The emotional needs of immigrants are perhaps still more important. Many of these cannot be properly satisfied except where relationships of considerable intimacy already exist or can readily be activated. By way of example, we may mention the desire to share new and exciting experiences, to relieve tensions and anxieties, to find comfort and consolation for the profound personal crisis experienced by most immigrants due to culture shock and sudden loss of status (not just high status but any status at all), to offer and receive affection, to find response to the expression of feeling.
4. There is a wide area of expressive behavior that requires collective action: religious, esthetic, recreational.
5. Isolation and a strange environment bring about the compelling need of new social anchorages, status definitions, and social security, which the host society is rarely willing or able to offer immediately.

Migrants to a strange society will tend to seek satisfaction of their needs in a manner that has become familiar to them in the course of their early socialization and enculturation. Consequently, they will make an effort to create a social setting for themselves in which this will be possible. They will try to persuade relatives and acquaintances to join them; failing this, they will look for suitable substitutes among fellow countrymen who, although previously unknown to them, are equipped to understand their needs and to respond to them in familiar ways. Concentration of large numbers in compact settlements is important to them, as this provides opportunities for the establishment of familiar services, agencies, and institutions enabling them to lead as full a communal life as possible, without having to rely on corresponding services and institutions offered by the host society.

COLLECTION RESERVE

The manner in which members of the host society define the situation is as important for the development of interethnic relations as the needs and attitudes of the ethnics themselves. Migrant laborers were socially defined as foreigners and temporary residents. Probably few Americans bothered to give much thought to their ultimate fate; those who did had vague and conflicting notions about the most desirable outcome of the new immigration or the practical measures by which such goals might be accomplished. To employers, the immigrants represented little more than a much needed supply of anonymous labor; to business men, new customers; to native laborers, fellows with whom they would have to cooperate at work as well as compete with for work; to politicians, potential voters; to churchmen, objects of charity and missionary zeal.

When ethnics showed signs of settling permanently in America, the reaction was uneasiness or worse—*anxiety and hostility*. For the natives with whom the ethnics were in direct contact, no real motivation existed to associate with the newcomers on a more intimate level. Their social needs were already satisfied by their own families, religious congregations, and other local groupings. The addition of strangers could only be felt as disturbing to the "American way of life." The arrival of large masses of immigrants caused discomfort and created the fear of being overwhelmed by them and their strange manners. From the standpoint of any American community, the threats of profound social change, adulteration of traditional values, and social disorganization were undoubtedly real, so that resistance appeared justified. Even differential treatment of people unable to converse freely in the language of the host society or to observe its norms of conduct seemed to be legitimate.

But it often happened that differentiation because of foreign origin, which may have been functional at one time, was retained after the original reasons had lost their validity. It was at this point that differential treatment and discrimination caused peasant immigrants to withdraw as much as possible from association with members of the host society. At first they did not think of their hosts' reactions as being entirely unjustified; for, on the basis of their own cultural standards, they could hardly expect any other treatment. Not before the immigrants and their children had become acquainted with American standards of equality and with the basically liberal creed of American society; and not before—in the process of acculturation—they had accepted these principles as generally valid and applicable also to themselves; indeed, not until they had already lost most of the characteristics that had excused their unequal treatment, were these new Americans in a position to question the legitimacy of differential treatment or to resent the discrimination to which they had fallen victim.

In addition to spontaneous reactions to ethnics on the part of those who were in direct contact with them, ideologies that were widely accepted in the host society also played a major role, particularly among those who determined

public policies. Laws providing for selective immigration according to the countries of origin and the system of labor permits have been introduced to America relatively late and in the face of grave misgivings. In the heyday of mass immigration, however, no measures were taken to settle groups of immigrants in one place or to disperse them, to direct them to particular occupations or to prevent them from competing with the natives in others, such as was the case, for instance, in Canada. It was in line with the principles of economic liberalism to keep state interference to a minimum, and to leave such arrangements to the operation of social and economic forces emerging spontaneously within society. Thus, the correction of maladjustments, which were the result of the uncontrolled influx of large masses of immigrants, was long left to the initiative of individual citizens, churches, and voluntary associations. Systematic legal measures to compensate for the gross inequalities that had been allowed to arise among Americans because of ethnicity were not introduced until the New Deal, and even then, only with respect to Indians and blacks.

IDEOLOGIES OF AMERICANIZATION

The ideologies that tried to cope with the problem of interethnic relations arising from conflicting interests have been classified by Milton M. Gordon (1964) as follows: first came the idea that immigrants and their progeny should ultimately conform with the Anglo-Saxon Protestant standards; next came the melting-pot concept; and finally, the doctrine of cultural pluralism. Although these ideologies have been evolved at different times—the transition from old to new immigration corresponding to the gradual replacement of the first by the second concept—different sections of American society and official policies have always been prone to waver uneasily between all three of them.

The transition from the preparatory to the formative stage corresponds to a redefinition of the situation by both ethnics and host society. Immigrants were no longer viewed as foreigners and temporary residents but as citizens or at least prospective citizens. Although the accent may have differed concerning the ultimate outcome, in both cases their integration into the mainstream of American life was recognized as the most pressing task. Yet the hosts, while clamoring for rapid and complete assimilation of ethnics, excluded them from full and direct participation in American society. The ethnics, animated by the nationalism emerging in their parent societies, countered by voluntary withdrawal, and made an attempt to provide—in the familiar setting of segregated communities—for their human needs, which had greatly increased with the shift from temporary residence to permanent settlement. As the setting which was familiar to them was the Old World peasant community, they tried to reconstruct its pattern in the subcommunities of American industrial cities. Because complete isolation and self-sufficiency was not feasible in a modern society, such groups, however, remained segmental in that they satisfied social

RESERVE
COLLECTION

needs mainly on the level of *commensalitas* and *connubium*. The situation is made very transparent in the following analysis offered by W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki:

The local Polish American group does not pretend to cut its members off from their wider social environment, to concentrate all their interests within any territorially limited Polish colony. On the contrary, it seems to endorse in the form of social recognition any activities by which its members participate in American economic, political or intellectual life. . . . But it presupposes that each member personally appreciates most and is most dependent upon the recognition he gets from his Polish milieu, and particularly that he desires social response exclusively from Poles. He is never permitted to put into his relations with Americans the same warmth and immediacy of social feelings as in his relations with Poles; the former are expected to be entirely impersonal, institutional . . . , whereas all purely personal contacts must be limited to his own *gens*. This distinction can be best expressed by saying that the only primary-group connections a Pole is supposed to maintain are those which his racial group offers, whereas his relations with racially different social elements must belong exclusively to the secondary-group type . . . the American Pole is permitted to take whatever part he desires in American life provided he does it as a Pole, and the only forms of participation which are socially condemned are those which tend to incorporate him into American primary groups and to draw him away from his Polish *gens*—that is, marriage, personal friendship and all kinds of intercourse implying direct personal solidarity (Thomas, Znaniecki, 1958, pp. 1584 f).

Gordon, taking his cue from Cooley's concept of the primary group, makes a distinction between primary relationships "which are personal, intimate, emotionally affective, and which bring into play the whole personality," and secondary relationships "which are impersonal, formal, and segmentalized, and tend not to come very close to the core of personality" (Gordon, 1964, p. 32). In applying these concepts to ethnic group behavior, he states that:

. . . within the ethnic group there develops a network of organizations and informal social relationships which permits and encourages the members of the ethnic group to remain within the confines of the group for all of their primary relationships and some of their secondary relationships throughout all the stages of the life cycle of the individual members (Gordon, 1964, p. 34).

He adds:

Economic and occupational activities, based as they are on impersonal market relationships, defy ethnic enclosure in the United States more than any institution except the political or governmental, but even here a considerable degree of ethnic closure is by no means a rarity (Gordon, 1964, p. 35).

Once we realize that an ethnic group is not a separate society that happens to be geographically located like an enclave in the territory of another society but an integral part of the host society, unable to survive apart from it, the difference between the essential segmentality of the ethnic group and the potential comprehensiveness of the host society becomes intelligible. The ethnics are

members of the host society by virtue of their membership in the ethnic group; they participate in the host society directly in some dimensions, and indirectly in other dimensions, as indicated by Gordon and before him by Thomas and Znaniecki, through the mediation of the ethnic group, which is simply a particular subsystem of the overall social system.

THE ETHNIC SUBCULTURE

The processes of ethnic group formation also have their cultural and institutional implications. In forming subgroups, ethnics develop a culture pattern that is neither identical with that of the parent nor of the host society, but is a new "secondary" growth. This is meant when sociologists speak of an ethnic "subculture" in the sense of a typical variety of the host culture. Gordon describes such a subculture as consisting of the culture of the host society "blended with or refracted through the particular cultural heritage of the ethnic group" (Gordon, 1964, p. 38). It "parallels the larger society in that it provides for a network of groups and institutions extending throughout the individual's entire life cycle" (Gordon, 1964, p. 39).

This characterization seems adequate enough for ethnic subgroups already in existence for a considerable period, but not for ethnic groups in their formative stage. The culture complex that a migrant has internalized during the process of early enculturation in his parent society is not changed simply by his transfer into a host society having a different culture. In order to actualize the internalized culture of the parent society, the immigrant needs a suitable social environment, that is, people who are able to interact in accordance with the same cultural norms. This is the most important incentive of secondary ethnic-group formation. Yet the reconstruction of a familiar setting, in which primary ethnic groups such as the Mennonites may succeed to a remarkable degree, is not possible when immigrants are also forced to interact directly with members of the host society in terms of their culture. Both the individual ethnic and the ethnic group are therefore compelled to adjust their traditional culture to the culture of the host society.

This may be achieved in several ways: (1) by adopting the components of the culture of the host society vital to their survival and/or prosperity in the novel situation; (2) by imitating adjustive behavior patterns adopted in analogous situations by other ethnic groups; (3) by inventing original culture patterns suitable to master the unique situation in which they find themselves. In addition, an ethnic group may also make adjustments to the parent society, which may have developed new culture patterns since the migrants left. Depending on the degree of contact and communication between parent society and ethnic group, some of the new components of the parent culture will subsequently be added to the culture complex of the ethnic group while components of their common traditional culture, which have been abandoned by the parent society, are often religiously preserved by the ethnic group.

RESERVE COLLECTION

Thus, we conclude that Gordon's attempt to treat ethnic subcultures in the same way as subcultures developed on the basis of social class, rural or urban residence, and so on, needs correction. He is probably right in describing subcultures of this kind as modifications of a general theme represented by the culture of the large society, but the same is not true of secondary ethnic groups. Their subculture is not simply a refraction of the culture of the host society through the prism of that of the parent society. Not only the parent but also the host culture, and above all—despite all its seeming conservatism—the ethnic subculture, are constantly changing, at times converging, yet at other times diverging still further.

Ethnic Institutions on the Local Level. Institutions may be considered as constitutive components of culture. The emergence of separate ethnic institutions correlates with the formation of ethnic groups. *Primary ethnic groups start the process of adaptation to the host society with a full set of institutions necessary for their functioning as a viable subsociety; they tend to lose these gradually, first in the political, then in the economic sphere. The formation of secondary ethnic groups, on the other hand, begins with the creation of new institutions of their own.* As ethnics of this type have no chances of achieving political autonomy and/or economic autarchy, their efforts are concentrated on satisfying the more intimate social needs of their members and on establishing social controls with regard to *commensalitas and connubium*. In this way immigrants and their descendants are put in a position to preserve their ethnic identity in the face of the homogenizing pressures exerted by the host society. As the frequency and intimacy of social interaction between ethnics and host society are reduced, and opportunities are increased to confine relationships to members of the ethnic group, social controls that prevent individual ethnics from participating directly in the host society are strengthened. The relative closure and self-sufficiency of sizable groups, however, and their permanency beyond the life span of the founding generation cannot be achieved on a purely personal and informal basis; they require a formal organization.

The Institutional Backbone of the Ethnic Subsociety. Supraterritorial organizations supplement and support ethnic institutions and voluntary associations on the level of the local community. They are particularly important in modern societies with their complex fabric of social relations and the thoroughgoing interdependence of their component parts. In the same way as local communities are integrated into the national society, secondary ethnic groups emerging on the local level are sustained by forming a larger subsocietal unit within the framework of the host society. Ethnics residing in a given locality do not only interact frequently on a personal and intimate basis, they also assemble periodically in one place (the church, the community hall, the lodge). Thus the subcommunity is a matter of direct and vivid personal experience. The

identity and solidarity of ethnics dispersed widely throughout the host society, however, cannot grow spontaneously but must be promoted deliberately; for this requires more abstract symbols and complex forms of organization that cannot be conceived by simple peasants, but must be supplied by the educated leaders.

This elite acts as a mediator between local ethnic groups, the host society, and also the parent society. Within the framework of supraterritorial alliances, local leaders and delegates meet periodically for conventions, festivals, and demonstrations which provide opportunities for expressive behavior and the elaboration of common symbols. More important still, such associations offer channels of communication between local groups, initiate collective action, and promote cooperation in matters of common vital interest. The network of communication and interaction provided by the foreign-language press and voluntary associations thus represents the backbone of the ethnic subsociety within the host society.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion two highly general propositions may be advanced concerning the formation of secondary ethnic groups:

Proposition 1. Whenever members of a parent society are transferred as individuals into a host society which is not isomorphic with the parent society with regard to essential elements of the social structure, then the individuals transferred will not be able to take their places directly in the host society, and will therefore tend to form a secondary ethnic group.

Proposition 2. Conversely, whenever members of a parent society are transferred as individuals into a host society which is isomorphic with the parent society in regard to essential elements of the social structure, then the individuals transferred will be able to take their places directly in the host society, and thus no secondary ethnic group will be formed.

REFERENCES

Additional publications of a more general nature touching upon the subject matter of this and the following chapters will be found in the Selected Bibliography at the end of the book.

- Francis, E. K., "Minority Groups in the United States of America," *Integration. Bulletin International*, XXXI (1956), pp. 54-61.
Gordon, Milton M., *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 32.

RESERVE
COLLECTION

- Handlin, Oscar, *Race and Nationality in American Life*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co. 1957.
- *Immigration as a Factor in American History*. Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1959.
- Schachter, Stanley, *The Psychology of Affiliation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Schermerhorn, R. A., *These Our People: Minorities in American Culture*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1949.
- Thomas, William I., and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (3rd ed.). New York: Dover Publications, 1958. This book was first published in 1927.

The Maintenance and Dissolution of Secondary Ethnic Groups in the United States

18

The factors supporting maintenance and causing dissolution are, as we have mentioned before, complementary, and for this reason we shall treat them together. Ethnic groups undergo processes of dissolution if they suffer the loss of group members through assimilation and absorption into the host society. The dissolution of an ethnic group does not imply the disappearance of its members. The erstwhile group members are transferred to some other structural component of the host society; their participation in the host society is now direct and no longer mediated through the ethnic group.

When the loss of group members is not balanced by a surplus of births over deaths, by an additional immigration, or by the adoption of new group members, for instance, through intermarriage, an ethnic group may be so weakened that it is unable to continue functioning. One necessary condition for the existence of any societal or subsocietal unit is the maintenance of "a sufficient number and kind of the members at an adequate level of operation" (Levy, 1952, p. 151). Accordingly, the maintenance of an ethnic group depends on its capacity to prevent losses to the host society and to preserve a sufficient number of members to guarantee the group's functioning as a viable subsocietal unit. Since members of a secondary ethnic group (being a segmental group) always participate partially in the ethnic group and partially in the host society, the maintenance/dissolution of the ethnic group also depends on the number and kind of social relationships which it is able to monopolize. *The increase of the area of participation promotes maintenance, its decrease spells dissolution.*

RESERVE
COLLECTION