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PREFACE

Writers occasionally use the Preface to "explain" how and why they became interested in their chosen specialty. Since such information may be helpful to readers in detecting eventual strong points as well as eventual biases, I will here briefly indicate how my own interest in refugees developed.

In 1943, or almost twenty years ago, when I was only seventeen years old and used to keep myself busy at nights by cutting German military telephone wires, I was suddenly deported to a German labor camp. There I realized for the first time the supreme importance of one's philosophy of life, of social relationships, and, above all, of the impact of attitudes of one's fellows and "superiors."

When the war with its sufferings was finally over, the communists exchanged places with the Nazis in my homeland and I decided to remain in the Free World. Long, dragging, never-ending years in refugee camps followed. Two letters stood for each of us, a "D" and a "P," letters that seemed to mean so very little to the outside world, but pressed with an enormous weight on every aspect of our lives.

In the beginning we thought we would soon return to our liberated homelands, perhaps next week, perhaps next
month, or at least in time for universal free elections in which, we were certain, democracy would triumph. Later we realized that elections took place without us and that they were not free. Emigration to a foreign land, which in 1945 and even in 1946 looked so very much like treason, gradually became to appear as the only possible (although only a temporary) solution.

In 1947, after having served a few months as interpreter, I was put in charge of a newly established International Refugee Organization's emigration office. Only a few weeks later, I was made IRO's Repatriation and Resettlement Officer, the youngest person ever to occupy this position with the International Refugee Organization, and soon perhaps also the busiest. In the months that followed, my co-workers and I prepared, except for the consul's stamp and signature, thousands of visas and other documents for refugees of many nationalities. We saw their sufferings and their growing anxieties and easily forgot about the eight-hour working day for which alone we were "paid." The first eight hours often were used for interviews only, while the remaining work continued until midnight or even until 4 A.M. of the next working day, which again started at 8 A.M.

In many cases, a refugee could not be accepted for emigration or for IRO support without first presenting a complete life history. I therefore prepared hundreds of life histories of refugees. Unfortunately, it never occurred to
me at that time what a sociological treasure copies of such life histories could become. But the value of my extensive, first-hand acquaintance with lives of so many refugees has been, I hope, at least partly preserved.

After refugees emigrated, I corresponded with many of them as they were struggling to establish new homes in Argentina, Brazil or Ecuador; in England, Norway, or France; in Canada, the United States, or Australia. Thousands of such letters are now in the files of the Slovenian Research Center in America.

In 1950 I emigrated to the United States and discovered for the first time that, since I was away from home, refugees have become my second "family," an ingroup to which I was more closely tied than I ever realized before.

Since it became clear that, as a person without a country, I could not become a politician as, in perhaps a somewhat youthful idealism, I had once planned, I decided to study philosophy. Was it not a false philosophy of life that precipitated all the chaos of the last two decades (not to mention millennia of history)? What then was more important than to find, and to spread, a "true" philosophy? But philosophy, as a college discipline, proved to be disappointing. Much of it seemed to be dry and remote from reality, and only relatively few courses gave me an intellectual satisfaction.
As a philosophy major in Cleveland, I registered in a course called "race relations." The author of the textbook we used was Dr. Brewton Berry. And this was, that far, the only text in which I underlined almost every line (my way of indicating what was important and should be remembered for further study). I then and there decided I would take up sociology after I obtained an M.A. in philosophy.

I did not know at that time, however, that it would be my good fortune to write a dissertation in this field under Professor Berry as my adviser. I wish now to express my lasting gratitude to Dr. Berry whose book helped me to find a field that is so completely interesting and challenging. At Ohio State University I also discovered that Professor Berry's scholarly and comprehensive knowledge of the field was always matched with his great kindness and helpfulness to immigrants, myself among them.

May I also express my thanks to Dr. Robert Bullock, my patient and ever helpful professor of methodology, and to Dr. C. T. Jonassen, an expert in the field of ethnic research. Together with Dr. Berry they read the first draft of this dissertation and made many valuable criticisms and suggestions. Thanks also are due to Mrs. Esther D. Whaley for her expert editing help and to Mrs. Eleanor Sapp for her excellent typing.

I am also grateful to my fellow-members of the Slovenian Research Center in America who contributed valuable data,
and to my fellow-refugees who completed an exceptionally comprehensive 14-page questionnaire.

Last, but not least, I owe gratitude to my aunt, the late Alma Karlin of Celje (Cilli), Slovenia. As author of several books in which she describes beliefs and customs of natives of Lapland, Japan, Korea, China, the South Seas, Australia, Siam, India, Arabia, and South and Central America (among whom she lived eight years as a participant observer) and as frequent visitor at my home in Slovenia, she early aroused my curiosity and interest in the fascinating ever changing patterns of culture.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation is threefold:

1) To explore, and to increase the objective factual information on, an ethnic group in America that is relatively little known;

2) To study adjustment and assimilation processes as they are exemplified by Slovenian refugees in America; and

3) To examine various assumptions and theories with regard to adjustment and assimilation processes in general, to indicate some major theoretical difficulties as seen by this writer, and to make a few suggestions with regard to their possible solution.

The writer is fully aware that none of these aims can be fully and completely attained within this dissertation. The very nature of such and similar studies compels him to search not for final and complete knowledge, but merely for greater knowledge. Bogardus, referring to his study Immigration and Race Attitudes, voiced a broadly applicable warning when he said: "... more problems exist at the close of such a study than at the beginning."¹ Perhaps it would be more correct to say: "... more problems are seen or apprehended

at the end." If so, it would seem that the study increased one's insight with regard to the complexity of the problem, exposing possible oversimplifications of the past, which, indeed, would be a positive contribution.

With regard to our first purpose, the dissertation was planned merely as a preliminary investigation which will be followed by a much more comprehensive study of the Slovenian ethnic group in America to be published, at a later date, under the title *Americans from Slovenia*. Only a limited amount of available information on only one major subgroup—the refugees—can be presented in this study.

In addition to printed sources quoted in footnotes, the dissertation is based primarily on the data provided by 115 Slovenian refugees in the United States and Canada who completed and returned a 14-page questionnaire. Since these questionnaires were completed in 1961, they reveal what refugees felt and thought in 1961, or, what they thought in 1961 that they thought, for instance, in 1945. Retrospect data may not always give us reliable information on the past, since past experiences may be judged in the light of our present attitudes. For this reason, we also present a sample of correspondence covering the period 1945-55. Here we see just what refugees, and those corresponding with them, thought at that time. Percentages which follow in later chapters also become more meaningful with the help of
correspondence; in this way we become more aware what emotional impact a certain word or question is likely to have for refugees.

The following plan of presentation will be followed: Chapter I will be a critical, although necessarily incomplete examination of some basic definitions, assumptions, views, and "theories" on adjustment and assimilation in general. We are not always conforming to the prevalent views; however, we try to logically justify our divergence when we differ. In Chapter II a sample of letters covering the period 1945-1955 is presented. Some of these letters reveal not only useful information on life in camps but also on philosophies and attitudes of refugees which the refugees wanted to preserve but found increasingly threatened. In Chapter III we first correct some misconceptions and errors in various texts on Slavs in general and on Slovenes in particular. Then we turn to the questionnaires which remain our main source of information. First, general characteristics of 115 respondents are presented. In Chapter IV adjustment, and in Chapter V assimilation processes are discussed. Chapter VI presents some concluding observations.

In Bibliography we list under "A" all sources which are quoted in the dissertation; under "B" various books are listed which may be of value to persons who may wish to pursue their study of the Slovenes further.
CHAPTER I

EXAMINATION OF CONCEPTS

1. Adjustment

Although adjustment is "one of the most widely used terms in contemporary biology, education, psychology, social psychology, and sociology, it is also one of the vaguest and most ambiguous, ranging from Spencer's 'Life is adjustment of internal relations to external relations' to Dale Carnegie's 'Success means adjustment to others.'"¹ Lundberg defines science as "a technic of adjustment" where "adjustment" is "a word used to describe a situation under which activities of an organism come to rest or general equilibrium"; but he is challenged by Simpson who claims that "science is not a form of adjustment, but a critique of human adjustments that have been made."² Giddings speaks of sociology as "the science of reciprocal adjustments of life and its environment."³


Some sociologists speak of competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation as "adjustment processes." To them, adaptation is merely one of the many processes of adjustment. To others who conceive of adjustment in a narrower sense, as opposed to maladjustment, adjustment is precisely the opposite, namely, a process of adaptation.

Indices of many excellent sociological texts do not show the word adjustment. Lumley, while referring to "adjustment" only in connection with "the mating impulse," gives, however, the following valuable hint: "See also Accommodation, Adaptation, Evolution."

Following Lumley's suggestion, we discover a long list of texts which deal with "basic processes of interaction":

---


These processes are at times themselves believed to be dimensions of a general adjustment process (e.g., Landis), while other authors often use adjustment interchangeably with adaptation or accommodation. The term accommodation, according to Park and Burgess, was first used "with reference to changes in habit which are transmitted in the form of social tradition" by Baldwin in the *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*. Before Baldwin, social scientists adopted from Darwin's theory of the origin of the species by natural selection the term adaptation and used it for both biological and social modification. Baldwin, however, proposed that the term "adaptation" be applied to organic modifications which are transmitted biologically; while accommodation should be used with reference to changes in habit, which are transmitted, sociologically, in the form of social tradition.\(^9\)

Further investigation discloses that Baldwin was not the only social scientist who was aware of the need for such a distinction. Alfred Fouillée, the French social philosopher (1838-1912), also spoke of the "three great forces ... that ... create and maintain the constitution and temperament, as well as psychic character, of a people: first heredity, which fixes the race; second, adaptation to the physical milieu; and third, adaptation to the moral milieu. In proportion as a nation approaches the modern type, the

\(^9\)Park and Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 663.
action of the social milieu outweighs that of the physical; and more than that, the physical factors tend themselves to be transformed into social factors."\textsuperscript{10}

Emory Bogardus, at a later date, also points out a similar distinction, first made by L. F. Ward, into passive and active adaptation. "Plant and animal life show the effects of passive adaptation . . . while man gradually learned to anticipate changes and to prepare for them . . . Instead of being made over by his environment, he begins to make his environment over. . . ." Active adaptation as a concept was recognized by Ward in 1883. Ward proclaimed the rightful supriority of mind over matter and of intelligence over instinctive behavior. A useful distinction, following Ward, has been made by Bristol, between active material and active spiritual adaptation. The first has led to material conquests; the latter has led to new epics in literature, new moral codes, new philosophic, religious, and scientific concepts.\textsuperscript{11}

In spite of the fact that several thinkers were forming their own theories and distinctions with regard to the basic processes of group interaction, the scheme of Park and


Burgess seems to have become extraordinarily influential among American sociologists. According to Park and Burgess, "the four great types of interaction are: competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation... Competition takes the form of conflict only when it becomes conscious; when competitors identify one another as rivals or as enemies."12 Competition also determines the distribution of population territorially and vocationally.13 Accommodation, however, is the process by which the individuals and groups make the necessary internal adjustments to social situations which have been created by competition and conflict.14 Assimilation, as distinguished from accommodation, implies, according to Park and Burgess, a more thoroughgoing transformation of the personality—a transformation which takes place gradually under the influence of social contacts of the most concrete and intimate sort.15

"The four great types of interaction"—competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation—formed the theoretical basis for a large (perhaps the largest single) number of chapters in sociological and social psychological texts dealing with group interaction processes.

12Park and Burgess, op. cit., p. 507.
13Ibid., p. 509.
14Ibid., p. 510.
15Ibid., p. 511.
To show the persisting influence of Park and Burgess through the following decades, let us enumerate only a few leading sociological texts which follow, at times with some modification, the scheme that was outlined by these two authors in 1921:


The list is not exhaustive, but it serves to demonstrate how persistent, how powerful—and repetitive—a sociological approach may become.
The strength of this approach lies in its focusing of attention on "the four great types of interaction." Its weakness, however, seems to be in the fact that it became somewhat "standardized" and therefore, once the original contribution was made, theoretically somewhat sterile. Those interested in the complexity of personal and social adjustments will find, because of this standardization, considerable areas entirely untouched.

Following the predominant channel of thought, accommodation was often viewed merely as "the conscious adjustment of a conflict."16 In this way attention was directed too exclusively to situations which were perceived as conflicts (or competitions) and to conscious processes attempting to reduce conflicts.

Park and Burgess, after mentioning Baldwin's division of accommodation into three fields: acclimatization, naturalization, and equilibrium, include under the "forms of accommodation" acclimatization, naturalization, subordination and superordination (slavery, caste, etc.), sublimation, peace (as accommodation to war), and compromise.17 Kimball Young describes the following "forms of accommodation": coercion and domination (including slavery and political

---


17Park and Burgess, op. cit., pp. 671-725.
dictatorship), compromise and arbitration, conciliation, toleration and participation, and conversion. John F. Cuber, in a recent, very popular book gives the following list of "forms of accommodation": (a) the truce, (b) the compromise, (c) subordination—superordination, (d) arbitration, and (e) toleration.

Implied in the scheme of Park and Burgess was a certain amount of dogmatism, as, for instance, in a crucial statement: "Conflict is always conscious, . . . it . . . enlists the greatest concentration of attention and effort." It has not yet been scientifically demonstrated that "conflict is always conscious." And while conflict does at times concentrate effort, it would seem that it also often dissipates it or avoids it. It seems to us that there are many unconscious conflicts, not only those that keep psychoanalysts busy but also others which find expression in intergroup relationships, such as frustration-aggression mechanisms in race relations, identification by some Poles or Slovenes of "Americanizers" with "Germanizers" of the "old country" (which may be entirely unconscious and yet produce resentment), etc.

Inasmuch as accommodation was conceived of as a conscious "working out" or "acting out" of conscious conflicts, 18

18 Kimball Young, op. cit., pp. 846-860.
20 Park and Burgess, op. cit., p. 574.
there prevailed a tendency among followers of the approach of Park and Burgess to repeat, or to invent names which described instances of conscious adjustments. The study of the complexities of the adjustment process received only limited attention.

Bennett and Tumin are among writers who disregard the Park-Burgess model and deal with the question of adjustment as one of the aspects of social adaptation. Social adaptation consists of "the ways groups of individuals adapt to the social positions and life chances which the society offers them." The authors warn that "the particular terms and definitions we shall use here may not agree entirely with those used by others. For example, the word 'adaptation' has been chosen as the most generalized term referring to a process often described by such terms as 'adjustment,' 'normal,' 'deviant,' 'conformable,' 'disorganized,' and so on. Other writers use 'adaptation' synonymously with 'adjustment.'"

We may note in passing that several French authors, like Bennett and Tumin, seem to prefer the word "adaptation" (l'adaptation).

---

21 Bennett and Tumin, op. cit., p. 361.
22 ibid., p. 362.
MacIver, too, uses the term "adaptation." He distinguishes between three levels of adaptation: "physical adaptation which occurs whether we will it or not" (e.g., the sun will tan our skin if we expose ourselves to it); "biological adaptation, meaning that the life is fitted to survive or to prosper under the conditions of environment" (e.g., fish are adapted to a marine environment or tigers to the conditions of life in jungle, . . . a tiger is mal-adapted to the conditions of the desert); social adaptation which is "adaptation in terms of a standard of values, a conditional adaptation. It is what is called by various sociological writers a process of adjustment, or accommodation, though the latter term stresses particularly the adaptation of the social being to the given conditions. . . . In this social sense adaptation definitely implies valuation. . . . "\(^2\)

Thus, apparently, the more authorities we consult, the greater is the conceptual confusion. Accommodation which is considered by some writers as synonymous with adjustment\(^2\) or with social adaptation is, according to Bogardus "the conscious adjustment of a conflict"\(^2\) and,  


\(^2\)Bogardus, op. cit., p. 346.
according to MacIver "the adaptation of the social being to the given conditions." Values, which have been disregarded before in the development of these concepts, are universalized to all social adaptation by MacIver. Thus, consciousness and valuation which are undoubtedly important in some accommodations, adaptations or adjustments are by some authors neglected, by others universalized; yet, neither omission nor universalization seems to be scientifically justified, since one suspects that both consciousness and valuations are matters of degree and their presence or absence, strength or weakness, vary from case to case and from situation to situation.

Similarly, authors fail to agree on the origin of accommodation. It would be superfluous to examine here all differences of opinion; a few instances will suffice to illustrate this divergence. Bogardus, as we have already seen, sees the origin of accommodation in conflict. Gillin and Gillin\(^2\) challenge this narrower view: "Contrary to the opinion of some sociologists, it appears to us that accommodation grows out of conflict, contravention, or competition instead of out of conflict alone."\(^2\)


prefers the term "social adjustments" to "accommodation,"
again views adjustments as solutions of conflicts; he warns,
however, that not only overt but also covert conflicts may
activate adjustment processes.29

Our examination of a number of standard sociological
(and a few social psychological) texts discloses a consider-
able vagueness and disagreement in the use and interpretation
of such basic concepts as adaptation, accommodation, and
adjustment. And yet we are told in the Preface to the
Dictionary of Sociology that "scientific accuracy demands
that precise and limited meanings should be assigned to
these [sociological] terms, in order that they may be used
uniformly by specialists, students, and amateurs in the
field. . . . No science . . . can have more precision and
exactitude than the words or other symbols . . . in which it
is embodied."30

Perhaps we should derive the meaning of "adjustment"
from the verb "to adjust" and turn to the Dictionary of
Sociology for its definition. What do we find? "Adjust
[means] to modify personal behavior, as through accommodation,
into harmonious and effective relationship with the cultural
environment."31

29 Floyd Henry Allport, Social Psychology (Boston:
Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924), Ch. XIV.

30 Fairchild, op. cit., Preface.

31 Ibid., p. 4.
This definition, while partly correct, disregards the internal personality adjustments and seems to reduce (external) adjustment too exclusively to modifications of personal behavior into harmonious and effective relationship with the cultural environment. It expresses an underlying conformist philosophy which, even in a predominantly conformist environment, is not universally true. Persons not only modify their behavior "into harmonious relationship with their cultural environment," they also try to modify their cultural environments into harmonious relationship with their own ideas, ideals, and goals. Not only prophets, revolutionary leaders, missionaries, dictators, politicians, and inventors but every leader, educator, writer, and even every culturally condemned deviant who has effected even the slightest cultural change even in the smallest community, such as a break with a traditional practice, an innovation, or a fusion, had also adjusted the cultural environment to himself.

We may illustrate various possibilities with the help of the following example. What can a pluralist who is forced to live in a narrowly conformist environment do? (1) He can conform, i.e., modify his personal behavior into harmonious relationship with his cultural environment (the type of adjustment which is alone recognized by the Dictionary). He must modify his own views and behavior. If he modifies his behavior without a corresponding modification in his views and convictions, he will attain social adjustment but suffer a conflict between his internal tendencies
and external acts which may lead to personality maladjustment. (2) He can try to change the attitudes of the environment and succeed in substituting tolerant pluralistic attitudes for narrowly conformist or assimilationist attitudes. (3) He can try to change the attitudes of the environment, but succeed only to a certain degree and settle for a partial solution. (4) A new solution may be found which corresponds neither to his nor to his environment's original attitudes, e.g., segregation with only limited, formalized cultural exchanges on special occasions, etc. Obviously, to adjust means much more than merely to modify one's personal behavior into harmonious relationship with one's cultural environment; it may mean also precisely the opposite, with all shades of variations between these two extremes.

Adjustment always takes place in reference to an object or an area, real or imaginary. This object may be a process in the subject's own personality; or it may be another individual, a group, a country, an economic or a political system, or a vision of future beatitude in heaven or damnation in hell. Accordingly, we may speak of internal or personality adjustments, and of external or cultural adjustments (leaving physical or biological adjustments to non-sociologists).

By personality adjustment we mean (1) a state, a condition or a level of harmonious integration of all the
processes and tendencies of a person's personality, and (2) the process by which such harmonious integration of all the processes and tendencies of a personality is achieved. (It is unfortunate that only one noun exists in English where two would be needed, namely, one for (1) adjustment as a state, or level, or a point of achievement at a given moment or as the highest point of harmonious integration, and another for (2) adjustment as a process of a definite duration or as a transition from one level of integration to another.)

Cultural adjustment, on the other hand, could be defined as (1) a state, a condition, or a level of a harmonious, integrated relationship of a person, or a group of persons, with its total cultural environment and any part thereof at a given moment or period of time, and (2) the process through which such harmonious integrated relationships are achieved. This definition would cover such types of adjustment as social, economic, educational (including philosophical in the sense of orientation toward the world or cosmos), political, religious, and, indeed, any other type or subtype that may at a given time need special and separate emphasis.

The relative importance of any specific type of adjustment will vary from culture to culture and from group to group. At times, improvement in one type may lead to an
improvement in several other types, as when a person whose financial problems have been solved can buy a car, have dates, increase his self-confidence and social adjustment, be better able to obtain and keep an acceptable employment, etc. But one type of adjustment may also produce maladjustments in other areas, as in the case of the nouveau riche. "Conspicuous consumption, as Veblen knew, ... prevails especially among one element of the new upper classes—the nouveau riche of the new corporate privileges ... with ... grievous effects on the standard and style of life. ..."

In some cultures, religion may be relatively unimportant for social adjustment and have little or no influence on economic life. There were times, however, when most areas of cultural adjustment were subordinated to religion and when the Church was the ultimate authority in the determination of interest.

This fact of differential emphasis or evaluation becomes of great importance in understanding adjustment


problems of immigrants who come from cultures with widely differing "hierarchies" of values. In the opinion of one investigator who studied adjustment of Slovenian Displaced Persons in the New York Area "the strongest barrier to a complete adjustment had proven to be the difference between the sets of values upon which the American and Slovenian cultures are built. While the former places great emphasis on material values, the highest criteria of the latter are morality and intellect. Most Slovenians are to a certain degree aware of these value differentials and have no desire of adjusting their scale of values to the American. Hence, they have better adjusted to those traits of the American culture which hold a higher position on the American than on the Slovenian scale . . ., but were reluctant to accept the traits which would imply any lowering of the values on the Slovenian scale. The conflict of the value sets has had an especially strong negative influence upon adjustment of the more educated Slovenian newcomers, since in an educated mind the moral and intellectual connotations lie in the foreground and the discrepancy between the two cultures in this respect is more pronounced."35

We may not accept all the conclusions by K. P. Mejac; the statement, however, is significant since it illustrates how differential attitudes of refugees may produce sets of simultaneous but opposite motivations, i.e., to adjust in some areas and to resist adjustment in others.

Brewton Berry aptly describes the negative effect of economic success on other adjustments (especially personality and social) among the Puyallup. Sudden wealth which had unexpectedly fallen into the hands of these Indians upset and distorted their previous scale of values, broke down their social organization, led to feuds and murders and even to a biological decline. Similarly, many of our respondents report that their educational success could be achieved only for the price of a disruption in their social adjustment, since they simply had no time for social life and that they have become more "nervous" (personality maladjustment).

These observations should serve to emphasize the complexity of adjustment process. When a high economic adjustment means social, moral, and personality maladjustment, is it at all possible to measure adjustment in general? When good educational adjustment means a deterioration in social and personality adjustment, is the refugee's general adjustment better or worse than before he re-entered the school?

---

Thus, as Ogburn and Nimkoff point out, a very difficult question remains: "What is good adjustment?" For instance, is a student who spends ten hours a day studying in the stacks of the library better adjusted than the college athlete? It seems that such questions have not received sufficient attention as yet. Ogburn and Nimkoff ask this question but their answer seems to add little to clarify the issue. They say merely, "We will answer this question differently according to our particular system of values."

This short answer reveals, however, that the writers have confused a sociological question with an ethical question; and, since they conceived the question as ethical, the system of values became decisive in the formation of its answer. If the question, when directed to a sociologist, were ethical, then we would of course assume that, for instance, in cultures where a high premium is placed on physical development the adjustment of the athlete would be thought of as good, while a French "savant" or a German "moral philosopher" would probably think that the student who spent his time in the library made a superior adjustment. Intellectual activities are always more distinctly human, and therefore higher and more valuable than athletics which are


38Ibid., pp. 64, 65.
merely a means to a higher end, a Catholic ethician would argue.

But sociologists are not, as sociologists, interested in the ethical question and in the ethical answer. The sociological question on the relative adjustment of the good student and the good college athlete calls for a sociological answer. This answer, of course, cannot be given a priori as could be an ethical answer but only a posteriori, this is, after adjustment of both students has been studied and compared. This does not depend on sets of moral values, but on scientific ingenuity and skill. Both students may have comparable personality adjustment if their respective activities are fully enjoyed and also respected, or at least tolerated, by their social environments. If they are adjusted also in other areas that are considered important by themselves and their environments, they may have about equally good harmonious integrated relationships with environments and, therefore, also a comparable cultural adjustment. If the athlete should be scorned on one campus and the "scholar" respected, the chances are the latter will have more harmonious relationships with his environment; but the situation may be reversed on another campus. When adjustment is good except in one area, for instance, the athlete is maladjusted only in educational area and the "scholar" only in athletics, then the sociologist can still answer that their adjustments are comparable, except in
areas specified. If adjustment is good in some areas and poor in others, then it would seem to us that, at the present stage of scientific sophistication, it would be better to specify adjustments for each area separately than to attempt a generalized answer in terms of "general adjustment." But, an athlete that is looked up to on a campus may be well adjusted socially, even if a poor scholar, for he excels in what his environment considers important, while the scholar may excel on a neighboring campus. Zuni Indians would probably find both of them "out of line."39 Thus, it is possible for the best adjusted person in one environment to become the most maladjusted individual in another with opposite valuations.

Dr. Grinker, a leading American psychiatrist, makes these sociologically relevant observations: "The expectation of how one should feel—depressed, anxious, guilty, etc.—is derived from the compulsions of the subject's social group. Adjustment to society is dependent on what society expects and on its threshold of intolerance. Secondary adjustments through escape hatches facilitating movement in space, change of spouse, job, class, or isolation are possible to some degree in each society. Failures in these

39"A man who thirsts for power or knowledge . . . receives nothing but censure. . . . The ideal man in Zuni is a person of dignity who has never tried to lead, and who has never called forth comment from his neighbors." Ruth Benedict, Patterns of Culture (New York: The New American Library, 1953), p. 90.
escapes or defenses push the overly deviant over the line of eccentricity into the area socially defined as [mentally] sick."

Ogburn and Nimkoff obviously understood a sociological question as if it were an ethical or a philosophical question (which in exactly the same words, but a different frame of reference, it could well be). Sociologist, as sociologist, can, however, measure and compare adjustments. He will observe, measure, and analyze specific cases on the basis of their degree of harmonious integrated relationship with various areas of their cultural environment. When there is always harmonious integration, there he can speak of adjustment; when harmony and integration are lacking, of maladjustment. Usually, of course, a person's or a group's adjustment is somewhere in between these two extremes which are, indeed, the ideal types of a continuum. When specific adjustment processes do not run parallel nor with the same speed, as it is usually the case, specific adjustments and maladjustments should be pointed out.

If a sociologist bears in mind the importance of harmonious integrated relationships with a subject's cultural environment, he will be quite able to determine whether a particular athlete or a particular "scholar" is better adjusted in a particular environment; and he will not be disturbed

---

should he find that a habitually friendly person may be well adjusted among the Irish while "a naturally friendly individual is maladjusted in Dobu."\textsuperscript{41}

This would mean that an adjusted person has either to conform to social norms or be able to change them or to avoid them. Persons whose behavior conforms to "norms" are adjusted or "normal." The observations of Gordon W. Allport are particularly relevant in this connection. Says he: "The word norm means 'an authoritative standard,' and correspondingly normal means abiding by such a standard. . . . But . . . we immediately discover that there are two entirely different kinds of standards that divide the normal from the abnormal: one statistical, the other ethical. The former pertains to the average or usual, and the latter to the desirable or valuable.

These two standards are not only different but, in many ways, stand in flat contradiction to each other. Society's authoritative standard for a wholesome sex life is, if we accept the Kinsey's Report, achieved by only a minority of American males. Here too the usual is not the desirable. . . . It is not the actualities, but rather the potentialities, of human nature that somehow provide us with a standard for a sound and healthy personality. . . .

\textsuperscript{41}Benedict, op. cit., p. 239.
It was frequently pointed out," Allport continues, "that an animal who does not adjust to the norm for his species usually dies. It has not been pointed out that a human being who does so is a bore and a mediocrity."\textsuperscript{42}

The dilemma which arises from Allport's observations is, of course, first the question of determination what is ethically sound, a question which falls in the realm of the moral philosopher, moral theologian, and of the sociologist as citizen, not as sociologist. The question which interests the sociologist and the social psychologist, however, is whether an ethically sound personality can remain psychologically and sociologically sound and healthy (adjusted) when it finds itself in a minority and under constant majority pressure to conform\textsuperscript{43} or to descend to an ethically lower level? This writer, unfortunately, knows of no scientific study which would illumine us on this point. Veblen, who in many ways proved to be a keen observer of human nature, made this interesting remark: "Only individuals with an aberrant temperament can in the long run retain their


\textsuperscript{43}Ruth Benedict believes that American tendency toward conformism is extreme. "Eccentrism is more feared than parasitism. Every sacrifice of time and tranquility is made in order that no one may have any taint of nonconformity. . . . The fear of being different is the dominating motivation recorded in Middletown." \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 252. See also David Riesman, \textit{et al.}, \textit{The Lonely Crowd} (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1953), pp. 98, 150, 176, 211, 278, 295 ff.
self-esteem in the face of the disesteem of their fellows. Apparent exceptions to the rule are met with, especially among people with strong religious convictions."44

In our opinion, sociologists should not confuse a sociological question with an ethical, or moral philosophical, question. When they speak of adjustment, sociological, not ethical adjustment is under discussion. Their primary criterion is that of harmonious integrated relationships with cultural environment. At the same time it seems that sociologists should be aware, and should make their readers aware, of the fact that these integrated harmonious relationships that constitute adjustment in the sociological sense need not always be the most desirable and the most valuable adjustments for the individual and for society. As Allport has pointed out, "psychologists . . . intoxicated with the new-found beauty of the normal distribution curve . . . considered departures from the mean abnormal and for this reason slightly unsavory."45 By failing to distinguish between statistical and ethical norms, psychologists [and probably also sociologists] may have unintentionally conveyed the impression that the majority is necessarily right which would, eo ipso, mean that minority is necessarily wrong.

44Veblen, op. cit., p. 38.
45Allport, op. cit., p. 156.
Should such beliefs have always and universally prevailed, modern mankind should still believe, as so many generations of our ancestors did, that the sun revolves around the earth.

2. Assimilation

Park and Burgess defined assimilation as "a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life." 46

The first weakness of this definition (which boasts some uncritical repetitions) seems to be the word "fusion." Such words as "fusion" or "blending" need not be universally applicable to the process of assimilation. The word "fusion" is derived from the Latin verb *fundere*, *fusum*, which means "to melt." It is, within the limits of analogy, properly used to define assimilation in the sense of Zangwill's dramatic parable of *The Melting Pot* (and Zangwill actually does speak of all races in America as "melting"). 47 In a pluralist society, however, assimilation is not at all characterized by *fusion* but rather by *integration*. Cultural

---

46 Park and Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 375.

patterns are not expected to "fuse" into a uniform culture, nor are all minority patterns expected to disappear; on the contrary, integration of all acceptable patterns, no matter how different, is the goal. Diversity disappears after fusion takes place; a pluralist society, however, fosters diversity as a source of strength, interest, and beauty. In such society, the process of assimilation may be completed through integration rather than fusion.

The second criticism of the definition by Park and Burgess is its overemphasis on "memories and history." In a society that is not past-oriented, an immigrant with a vivid interest in its "memories and history" could very well be dissimilar rather than similar (assimilated) because of this interest. Our hypothesis would be that in many societies, especially in modern industrial societies, common interests and goals (rather than common memories and history) are the unifying elements.49

The definition of assimilation by Park and Burgess seems therefore to apply only to assimilation in certain societies, primarily those that are assimilationist or conformist and history-oriented (history which may be true or


imaginary). Assimilation in a pluralist, goal-oriented society would be better described if "fusion" would be replaced by "integration" and "memories and history" by "interests and goals." Even these additions would leave the definition subject to challenge, as we shall demonstrate later on in this study.

Gillin and Gillin who deviated from the classical definition by Park and Burgess obviously became aware of the fact that common goals may often be more important than common memories. They defined assimilation as "an advanced process characterized by decreasing differentiation between individuals and between groups as well as by increased unity of action, attitudes, and mental processes with respect to common interests and goals."50

While this definition avoids the two mentioned weaknesses of that by Park and Burgess, it still views assimilation as a process toward uniformity and conformism; it is, also, not definite enough. It may not always be possible to distinguish, on the basis of this definition, some socially well-adjusted immigrants from assimilated immigrants. Most important, the definition tells us nothing about the extent to which differentiation should decrease and that to which unity of action, attitude, and mental processes with respect to common goals and interests should increase.

50 Gillin and Gillin, op. cit., p. 523.
Some other investigators think that this precisely is of crucial importance. "The basic question is the degree of similarity or dissimilarity implied in the notion of assimilation."

How similar to the members of the dominant group should, then, the immigrant become? Fairchild, on one extreme, thinks that "traits of foreign nationalities can be neither merged nor interwoven. They must be abandoned." In this case, the immigrant could do nothing but blindly and completely adopt the culture of the native majority. He is expected to become not only similar (as the etymological meaning of assimilation suggests) but exactly alike (if this were, of course, possible). On the other hand, an unidentified writer, or a group of writers, maintains in a very stimulating book published by UNESCO that there are only two essential phases in the process of assimilation: one is the development of loyalty toward the country that accepted the immigrant; the other is the positive contribution by the immigrant to the activities of his new country. In this sense, many an immigrant may be assimilated in less than a year, perhaps in less than a month, especially when an

51Cf. UNESCO, op. cit., p. 145.


53UNESCO, op. cit., p. 145.
unacceptable regime in his "old country" (such as communism) makes political loyalty to a new democratic state so much easier by comparison.

Both points of view—and many shades in between—are held by scholars and laymen in both America and Europe. The logic on which some of the views are based is, however, at times questionable. "It is beyond the scope of the present study to argue the relative merits of cultures involved," writes Donald P. Kent, "but complete integration demands that all original identity is lost." Without being concerned about the soundness of a policy which "demands that all original identity is lost," this assertion (and others of the same kind) can be disproved by logic as well as by observation. Only functionally distinct parts, each of which has its distinct identity, can be integrated into a unified working system; where there is no distinct identity of at least two components, integration is obviously impossible. A university functions as an integrated system not after all members have lost their original identity. On the contrary, integration develops only to the extent to which proper differentiation into professors, administrators, students, janitors, etc., is developed and maintained.

But let us take a concrete case from the field of American-ethnic interaction. A young Polish engineer Tadeusz Kosciuszko certainly did not lose his original identity before his integration into General Washington's army and into American people was possible. "What can you do?" asked the American commander, according to an apocryphal story. "Try me," said the Pole. He became an aide to the Revolutionary Commander-in-Chief, and a very useful one. Military engineers were scarce in the new United States. The victory at Saratoga was credited in great part to plans he had worked out. He was made a brigadier general and chief of engineers. He also excelled in other branches of military art; in fact, he acquired the title of the "Father of American Artillery."55

The role played by this particular ethnic shows, first, that integration, rather than fusion, may at times be the better goal; second, it shows that original identity need not always be lost before complete integration could be achieved.

Kosciuszko, apparently, would have some difficulty getting assimilated were we to follow the criteria of Fairchild or Kent; yet, George Washington fully accepted him and Jefferson called him "the purest son of liberty."56

56 Ibid., p. 290.
other hand, Kosciuszko fits perfectly the mentioned UNESCO criteria of assimilation: his loyalty to American cause (perhaps as a specific dramatic instance of a world-wide cause), and his contribution to American activities were beyond doubt.

Closer to Americanization (as a specific instance of assimilation) in this broader sense are the views of Bogardus. "Americanization," says he, "is the education unifying both native-born and foreign-born Americans in perfect support of the principles of liberty, union, democracy, and brotherhood. It selects and preserves the best qualities in our past and present Americanism; it singles out and fosters such traits of the foreign-born as will contribute to the welfare of our people."57 After having set these ideals by means of which true Americanization could be achieved, Bogardus observes that "some of the foreign-born have reached a higher point on the scale of Americanism than some native citizens."58

It is clear that Bogardus gives us an ethical model for Americanization rather than a definition of Americanization as an actual process of becoming Americanized. Americanization as an ethical goal or ideal and Americanization as an actual process of becoming American are, of course, two distinct concepts; it is doubtful whether they often


58 Ibid.
coincide in practice. Yet, unless they do so most of the time, the definition is philosophical rather than sociological.

Gillin, Dittmer, and Colbert similarly seem to identify Americanization with the "democratization" when they observe: "Just what we mean by Americanization has not been satisfactorily defined, but perhaps the central idea was expressed by Abraham Lincoln as 'government of the people, by the people, for the people.'"59 This definition seems to be tantamount to a conviction that a thoroughly democratic person (he may be so in Switzerland or in New Zealand as well as in America) has been Americanized!

Theoretical "definitions" of assimilation obviously have been influenced by opinions of various authors on what policy would be the most beneficial. Many scientists, like laymen, became advocates of a particular policy or "strategy" of ethnic groups interaction and presented the criteria of their preferred policy as criteria ("requirements" or "essentials") of the sociological definition of assimilation. Even verbs used often took not a descriptive (affirmative) but an imperative form. Fairchild, for instance, does not say that in the process of assimilation the traits of foreign nationalities are abandoned; he says, they must be

abandoned. This clearly is not a scientific observation; it is a precept of the policy the author adopted. Similarly, Kent's integration demands that all original identity be lost. Implied in the example of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln (as fathers of the nation) seems to be a demand for a broader, more democratic interpretation.

The confusion of the criteria of the policy adopted with the criteria of a scientific definition of assimilation may be responsible for a considerable part of theoretical difficulties which are recognized but not quite resolved in L'assimilation culturelle, as well as by E. B. Reuter, Milton L. Barron and others.

Policy, indeed, does have an effect on the process of assimilation; but this does not mean that its criteria may become the criteria of a scientific definition of that process. It merely means that policies should be studied along with other factors and attitudes that are activated and "activators" in the process of assimilation. If, however, social scientists make the criteria of policies which they as citizens support also criteria of their definitions of assimilation, then it becomes clear that there will be as

---

60 UNESCO, op. cit., p. 10.
61 Quoted by Berry, op. cit., p. 222.
many different (and often mutually exclusive) definitions of assimilation as there are policies that social scientists as citizens support.

It seems that much confusion could be avoided if sociologists kept in mind two final subjective criteria of assimilation (which may, but need not be influenced by actual objective similarities and differences between the majority and minority groups): First, for a person (or group) to be assimilated it is necessary for this person (or group) to identify himself (or itself) with the group (people or nation) into which he (or it) is being incorporated. Second, it is at the same time necessary for the dominant group (people or nation) to identify the in-coming person (or group) with itself (the majority). The process of assimilation is, therefore, the development of reciprocal identifications between the minority and majority group members, for instance, between the immigrants and the people of the country that accepted them. The assimilation process has been completed when former members of minority groups (e.g., immigrants) habitually and unreservedly identify themselves with the majority group (the people of the host country) and when the members of the majority group habitually and unreservedly identify the former minority group members with themselves. This definition seems to apply to the general process of assimilation as well as to any specific process of assimilation, such as Americanization or
Germanization. A person has become Americanized when he habitually and unreservedly thinks of himself as an American and when Americans habitually and unreservedly think of him as an American. A Carinthian Slovene has become Germanized when he habitually and unreservedly thinks of himself as a German and when Germans who are in any way aware of him habitually and unreservedly think of him as a German. These identifications may be conscious or unconscious; or perhaps better, they may at times be conscious and at times unconscious.

The criteria for the sufficiency of identification by minority group members with majority group members are established by the expectations of majority group members, just as the criteria for the degree of identification by the majority group members with the minority group members depend on the expectations of the minority group members. Thus, for instance, whether an immigrant's identification with America should be absolute, primary, or secondary will depend on the expectation of the American group which constitutes the social environment for the immigrant. Some environment might expect an absolute identification on the part of the immigrants with their American environment before it would be willing to accept the immigrants as its "full" members. The immigrant would not be accepted unless he first relinquished all "foreign traits," which might mean that he, and even his children, would not be thought of as Americans by
Americans. In another environment, it may suffice that an immigrant's primary identification be with America; he is an American now, even if he is an American from Norway or an American from Italy. His secondary identification may well be with Norway or Italy, just as an "old stock" American's is with England. There even may be environments where only secondary identifications are required. For instance, strongly religious parishioners may think that an immigrant's first identification will of course be with his Church; but he will be thought of as an American if in the temporal order his identification with America follows immediately that of his Church. We know, for instance, that even for native Americans it is at times questioned whether their primary identification is with their Church or with America as it was evidenced by the concern, or strategy, of some groups in John Kennedy's presidential campaign.63

On the other hand, the extent to which Americans should identify the immigrant with themselves before this identification will be sufficiently convincing to the immigrant will depend on the differential expectations of immigrants. For some, tolerant treatment at work and lack of social abuse will suffice. Others will feel rejected unless they are "welcome" at every American party and in every

exclusive club. Some may be more sensitive to economic barriers, others to social rebuffs. Some may think they can "manipulate" Americans very well and already "fit in" entirely. Others may feel that an immigrant's condition is best described in such words as the following by Panunzio:

If the immigrant is polite, he is charged with being veneered and double-faced; if he is direct and positive he is called "rude" or "cheky"; if he takes on American ways rapidly and becomes a citizen as soon as possible, he is considered fickle in loyalties; if he shows reluctance to relinquish his hold upon native memories and ties, he is denounced as an ungrateful guest, a hyphenated, a menace to America; if he remains aloof and out of a sense of delicacy does not express himself on American social and political issues, he is said to lack civic interest; if he does express himself he is reminded that he is "a foreigner" and must keep his place. In poverty he is a pauper. In wealth he meets with a double envy, the envy success usually evokes and that which unsuccessful and lazy native competitors usually feel for the "damn foreigner." His frugality is said to contribute to the lowering of standards of living, his free spending is called "showy." If he clings to his kind he is "clannish," if he approaches the American community he is rebuffed and repulsed as an "undesirable."64

It is important to bear in mind that the dominant group determines to what extent the minority group member should identify with the majority group before it reciprocates by identifying the minority group member with itself; the latter must meet the standards of the former. But these standards vary from environment to environment. National costumes of various ethnic groups may indicate an "all-

"A m e r i c a n " g a t h e r i n g  i n  C l e v e l a n d , " w h i l e  i n  s o m e  o t h e r  c o m-
munity the same costumes might suggest the presence of un-
American, unassimilable foreigners. Conversely, the immi-
grant determines the extent to which he needs to be
"approached" by the majority group members before he is con-
vinced that he is accepted as one of their group; he will be
able to reciprocate with his own identifications only in
proportion to which his standard of proper acceptance is met
by the majority; and this standard again varies from immigrant
to immigrant and from group to group. Except in some
unusual situations where reality-testing fails, neither group
can develop identifications to any appreciable degree without
being supported by simultaneous reciprocation. A Russian
immigrant cannot think of himself as an American unless he
thinks that he is thought of by Americans as an American
(which is discovered from speech, attitudes and overt acts).
Americans cannot think of him as an American unless they
feel that, by their standards, he is becoming an American
(which is discovered from the Russian's speech, attitudes,
and acts).

Our definition, unlike those examined before, seems to
be applicable to every instance of assimilation, regardless
of differential policies, expectations, and durations of the
process. It covers the situations where groups are expected

---

65Louis Adamic, My America (New York-London: Harper
to develop a common culture, whether by "melting" and fusion in Zangwill's sense, by copying of the dominant culture in Fairchild's sense, or by the development of decreased differentiation between individuals and groups and of increased unity of action, attitudes, and mental processes with regard to common interests and goals in the sense of Gillin and Gillin. But the definition is also applicable to assimilation in pluralist cultures in some of which it may suffice to be loyal to the host country and to contribute to its welfare; where, indeed, individuals and groups may develop mutual identifications not on the basis of cultural similarity and uniformity but rather on that of mutual complementarity.

Yet, this our concept, while allowing for all possible variations in assimilation processes, also goes an important step further, since it brings into focus the final essential criteria of assimilation which are neglected by other definitions, namely those of reciprocal identifications. Immigrants may well be loyal and their contributions average or even above average, yet they become assimilated not at

---

66 The extent of contribution is also subject to majority group pressures. Since unassimilated immigrants are psychologically "outsiders," it would be interesting to test, on the assumption of analogy, whether they are subject to differential punishment for non-conformity. Compare with the following passage by Hughes: "Apparently a girl [in Polishing Room] who is well established in the group can break the rate a little with only mild teasing as punishment. But outsiders who break the rate are severely punished by ridicule and scorn; if they persist, they remain outsiders and may be forced off the job." Everett C. Hughes, Where Peoples Meet (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1952), pp. 183-84.
the time when their loyalty and contribution are established but during the period when they increasingly identify themselves with their host environment and when that environment increasingly identifies them with itself.

Similarly, a common culture is not a valid test of assimilation. English Americans do not habitually think of English Canadians as Americanized, nor English Canadians of English Americans as Canadianized, which would be the specific instances of their respective assimilations. Although Americans in the northern states have an almost identical culture with English Canadians, perhaps more so than they do with Americans of such southern states as Mississippi, Americans remain Americans and Canadians and there is neither fusion nor integration of the two groups into one single group. Why not? Because the two final criteria of assimilation are lacking—those of reciprocal identifications. Canadians identify with Canadians, not with Americans. Their secondary identifications are likely to be with England, not with America. Americans identify with Americans. Even their secondary identifications will be with their various countries of origin, not with Canada (unless they are Americans from Canada which is only a small fraction of the American nation). Assimilation, which may, or may not, require cultural uniformity (depending on degrees of cultural variations tolerated by various societies) does, however, always require reciprocity of
identifications. No one is Americanized, no matter how close he may be to Americans culturally, as long as he does not habitually think of himself as an American and is thought of by Americans who constitute his environment as an American. On the other hand, a person may absorb American culture only to a relatively small extent and yet be Americanized if he is thought of by Americans, and thinks of himself, as an American. Immigrants with "star" status in America may perhaps sooner be thought of by Americans as Americans, since they are believed to be valuable and worth having; and such immigrants may themselves sooner feel that America gave them a greater opportunity, and, therefore, more easily identify themselves with the country of their success and growth. Yet, as specialists in a narrow field (e.g., army, movies, sports) they may have absorbed less American culture than many less appreciated immigrants who may still be considered, and consider themselves, "foreigners." Either group becomes Americanized not by extent of cultural similarity but only on the basis of reciprocal identifications.  

---

67 Note that our concept of Americanization (or any other instance of assimilation) depends on the same final criteria as those applied to the Jews by Professor Louis Wirth. According to Wirth, "a Jew is a person who thinks of himself as a Jew and is treated by others as a Jew; but that has varied throughout history and in different parts of the world." Quoted by Brewton Berry, op. cit., p. 57. Note also that cultural differences and similarities are not important as they actually are, but as they are conceived to be. E.g., English with a slight accent may be better English than uneducated slang and yet point to a "foreigner" in an English-speaking culture which slang does not. "We
It is interesting to note that in times of national stress this crucial test of assimilation becomes more generally recognized.

Germans in America are, for instance, considered to be an "assimilable" ethnic group, apparently more so than Polish or Greeks. Says Carl Wittke: "The German-language press is rapidly dying. Most German churches have long since given up their services in the German language and German societies of every description find it increasingly difficult to maintain their membership."\(^68\) Dieter Cunz thinks that "the assimilation of the German immigrants and their descendants have advanced to such a degree that one can hardly speak of the German Americans as a distinct minority."\(^69\)

Yet, this highly "assimilated" group that could hardly be spoken of as a distinct minority (i.e., it had so fully adopted American culture that external differentiation became difficult) caused considerable concern and unrest

---


before and during the Second World War. Not culturally less assimilated groups (Polish, Russian, or Greek), but the highly assimilated Americans of German origin were feared. What, then, was the test of assimilation during a period of crisis? Certainly not cultural similarity. The real question was whether Americans from Germany would identify themselves with America or with Germany. In crisis, it was realized that many cultural externals were relatively unimportant and that the final test of Americanization depended on an immigrant's identification with America. (As we have seen earlier, similar criteria seem to have prevailed during and immediately after the Revolutionary War.) Cultural similarities of Germans alone were not sufficiently convincing to be accepted as evidence of assimilation in the absence of certainty about identifications. On the other hand, cultural differences became of little consequence whenever strong reciprocal identifications prevailed.

Reciprocal identifications, factors or indicators on which they are based, areas to which they should extend, the degrees of exclusiveness and inclusiveness permitted, etc., depend, of course, on the matrix of attitudes of all persons and groups involved in the process of assimilation. These attitudes will vary from time to time, from person to person, and from group to group. Not only there can be little

---

assimilation as long as attitudes of both minority and majority groups are unfavorable; assimilation also fails to occur when one group wants it and the other refuses it.

For more than a millennium Germans wanted to Germanize the Slovenes. Yet, although most Slovenes learned German and "many of them attained high rank in the [Austrian] Imperial Service, . . . the people always resisted Germanization and remained Slovenes. This characteristic has annoyed the Germans: the Slovenes are the perfect reply to arguments of massification."71 The Slovenes learned German and their culture was considerably influenced by that of the Germans. The contact and interpenetration lasted more than a thousand years. Their number, as compared with that of the Germans, was insignificant. Why, then, did they not disappear in the German majority? Only because they refused to identify themselves with Germans, because they persisted in thinking of themselves as Slovenes, a small, but distinct people. We have here an instance where a small minority refused to get assimilated and where a powerful majority remained helpless in its persistent attempts to assimilate it.

In America, Negroes exemplify the second possibility, that of a minority that wants by all means to be identified with the majority and of a majority that refuses to develop
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reciprocal identifications.\textsuperscript{72} In spite of the fact that Negroes share with American whites a common American culture, the whites tend to think of them as unassimilable; two groups, separate and distinct, persist in spite of a common culture. A Negro may share in the same American culture and he may even be white in appearance; yet as long as he is thought of first as a Negro rather than as an American, he remains a member of an "unassimilable" minority.

Thus, no matter what case we consider, the final universal test of assimilation seems to be that of mutual reciprocal identifications. A definition, to be valid, must describe the essential and the universal. For instance, the definition of personality must point out the "whatness" of personality and be applicable to Zuni as well as to Americans, to Andamanese as well as to Russians. Similarly, a valid definition of assimilation must, in addition to denoting the "whatness" of assimilation, cover the process of assimilation in any and all societies.

3. Concepts in Their Interrelations

In the remaining part of this conceptual analysis we shall critically examine, and interrelate, a number of concepts which are frequently used in connection with adjustment and assimilation in ethnic research (as well as in popular thinking).

\textsuperscript{72}Cf. Brewton Berry, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 273, 325 ff.
Assimilability. There seem to be great variations in the facility with which some persons give up their previous identifications and establish new ones (a process which one may observe in parent-child relationships, in marriage-divorce-remarriage phenomena, as well as in changes of nationality). Whenever reciprocations by the second "party" (in assimilation the environment of the dominant group) take place, such persons are considered to be highly "assimilable." Quite frequently this differential assimilability has been generalized from persons to entire groups. Some ethnic groups (and their "stocks" in the Old World) became considered as "assimilable," others as "unassimilable," or at least as "less assimilable." Brewton Berry observes how prejudiced persons frequently "infer that some groups possess an innate quality of 'assimilability' while others are 'unassimilable' and that the ease with which one assimilates is proof positive of superiority."73 Stoessinger reports on several members of the Congress who opposed admission to the United States of post-World War II refugees from Central and Southern Europe on arguments of race as connected with their supposed unassimilability.74

Our definition, based on indispensable reciprocity of identifications between minority group and majority group

73Ibid., p. 234.

members, immediately destroys the myth of inherently assimilable or inherently unassimilable ethnic and racial groups. Since assimilation is the joint product of reciprocal identifications, it follows that we know nothing about the assimilability of any minority group as long as we remain unfamiliar with the degree of willingness of the majority to identify the members of that minority with itself.

Comparative method sheds further light on assimilability as a joint product of reciprocal identifications. Judging by the Bogardus' Social Distance Scale and by various studies of Russian immigrants in the United States, the "assimilability of the Russian ethnic group in America" is relatively poor. (Note how differently the same statement sounds from a Russian's point of view: "The fidelity of Russian immigrants to their religious, moral, and cultural-spiritual ideals has generally been high and firm." Yet, in France Russians are thought of as a very adaptable immigrant group. Now contrast these two statements: "Without calling in question the worth of the Slavic race, one may note that the immigrant Slavs have small reputation for capacity . . . [This is "confirmed" by the statement made by

75Ibid., p. 265.


a teacher:] 'You may grind and polish dull minds all you want to in the public schools, but you never will get a keen edge on them because the steel is poor.'"  

And the second statement: "Dans l'ensemble l'élément russe paraît très recommandable et présente des facilités d'adaptation et probablement d'assimilation vraiment remarquables." (Generally speaking, immigrants from Russia seem to be highly recommendable and they adapt themselves, and will probably get assimilated, with a remarkable facility.)  

The two statements are probably not scientific conclusions based on reliable studies. They seem to express primarily the differential attitudes of two majority group members, perhaps thought by them to be typical of their majority group in general. One can, however, easily see that the former attitude will repulse and the latter will attract. The result is the supposed unassimilability of Russian immigrants in one environment and the supposed remarkable facility in their adaptation in another environment (in spite of the fact that both American and French cultures are non-Slavic, and it may be just as hard, or harder, for a Russian to learn French as to learn English).  

Obviously, assimilability is not an inherent attribute which some ethnic groups posses in greater and others in

---

79 Paon, op. cit., p. 200.
smaller degree; it is rather a universally present poten-
tiality which can be activated only by reciprocal identifica-
tions of the second group (the "partner" in the assimilation
process). It seems safe to assume that the assimilability
of Russians in France and in the United States does not
essentially differ. What probably does differ is the degree
of willingness (and therefore also the ability) of the
dominant groups to assimilate this particular ethnic group.
Where the ethnics are considered to be inherently, culturally
and racially, inferior there will be reluctance to incorporate
them and have them "melted" with much more "valuable
materials" into one nation.

Since the resulting assimilability is the joint
product of both the ethnic group and the majority group, it
is always a great oversimplification to speak of relative
assimilability of any ethnic group as such. We cannot speak
of assimilability of the Russian ethnic group but merely of
Russian-American or Russian-French assimilability.

Even here, there will be great variations in identifi-
cations from environment to environment and from immigrant to
immigrant. This writer knows, for instance, a number of
second generation Americans, children of Slovenian parents,
who seem to be completely assimilated; even their names and
neighborhoods are strikingly English. Yet, a questionnaire
returned by a second generation "American" of Slovenian
parentage reveals a much lesser assimilation than even that
of the least assimilated refugee (none of whom has been in America more than fourteen years). This "American" conceives of Americans as hateful persecutors of all minorities and sees the only salvation in either repatriation or in the creation of a separate "minority state" within the United States. Although he more easily expresses himself in English than in Slovenian, he considers Slovenian culture immensely superior. To achieve greater identity with other minority group members in New York he has learned some Spanish and reads not only Slovenian but also Spanish ethnic papers. It would seem that similar variations between assimilability and unassimilability "poles" exist in every ethnic group; even the "unassimilable" Negroes "pass" and disappear in the white majority; and not a small proportion of "highly assimilable" ethnics from England cannot develop sufficient identifications with America to adopt American citizenship (as we shall see later). In the case of every such intra-variation the differential orientations of both individual immigrants and members of various dominant environments should be considered, just as scientifically generalized "assimilability" of an ethnic group must always be juxtaposed to the scientifically generalized "ability of the dominant environment to assimilate" that particular group. Assimilability is the result of the interplay of reciprocal orientations and attitudes which either facilitate or prevent reciprocal identifications.
Language as indicator of assimilation. The importance of language "as a carrier of culture and as a tool for acquiring a culture" has been properly emphasized by Brewton Berry.\(^8^0\) We would, however, be less inclined to agree with those sociologists who claim that the adoption of the dominant group's language is per se a reliable index of assimilation or of assimilability.\(^8^1\)

As we have pointed out earlier, a large proportion of the Slovenes, and practically all Carinthian Slovenes, knew German and often had to speak it daily; and yet most of Slovenes did not get Germanized in more than a millennium of interpenetration. German language for them was a tool and a necessity, just as were additional languages that many of them tried to master. It was not a means for, nor an expression of, Germanization as a specific instance of assimilation; the German language, per se, did not affect their identifications which were with the Slovenian, not with the German people.

In cultures and environments which expect the immigrant to speak the dominant language and consider him an outsider as long as any trace of a foreign accent can be detected, or as long as more than one language is spoken in the immigrant's household, the lack of mastery of the

\(^8^0\) Berry, op. cit., p. 242.

dominant language is, indeed, indicative that such immigrant has not yet been assimilated, since we know that the dominant group will fail to develop identifications in his case. But, conversely, a perfect mastery of the dominant group's language tells us merely that the immigrant possesses an important tool which can, but need not, be used for assimilation. Just as contact between racial groups can promote or deteriorate mutual adjustment, so also language as a tool of communication can work in the direction of greater reciprocal identifications and lead to assimilation or it can strengthen the negative attitudes which will preclude such identifications. For instance, one of our respondents reports that his knowledge of English on his arrival in America was a definite disadvantage; he understood various remarks which he was believed not to understand; he could never quite manage to trust and like Americans again. His introduction into parts of American life was too sudden; language facilitated his introduction to all phases of American culture immediately, before he was culturally and psychologically ready to handle its various aspects without an emotional shock.

Knowledge of the dominant language, and of the dominant culture, may remain entirely meaningless for the process of assimilation in the absence of reciprocal

---

identifications. This statement is especially well illustrated by foreign diplomats in America. Only recently this writer had a four-hour conversation with a foreign consul general; the consul's English was perfect and he was surprisingly well informed on every aspect of American culture, from literature, history and politics to farming, industry and finances. Judging by the objective absorption of American culture alone, this consul, to use Bogardus' terms, would be much more Americanized than most Americans. Yet, obviously, he is not Americanized or assimilated at all; he represents a foreign government and he never thinks of himself, nor is thought of by others, as an American. Again, not the language and culture known and "applied" but rather the degree of reciprocal identifications indicate assimilation.

Nor is persistence of an ethnic language a reliable index of unassimilability; attitudes and identifications remain crucial. At the present, an increasing number of Americans seem to realize that America can establish better foreign relations only by gaining a better understanding of other peoples for which knowledge of foreign languages is highly useful if not indispensable. Thus, to learn a foreign language may gradually become a patriotic duty for every "well-rounded" American (just as this seems to be true of the younger Russian generation). A reflection of this new

trend may be seen, for instance, in the United States Army School for Languages at Monterey, California, where even apparently (but not necessarily actually) insignificant languages of relatively small peoples are beginning to be taught. Obviously, it would gradually appear as somewhat inconsistent, if not absurd, if when children would master an ethnic language at home this would be an indicator of their unassimilability, while if they learn it later to a small extent at federal expense in an army school this would be an indicator of American patriotism. And, as it sometimes happens, the trend may in the years to come even be completely reversed and every ethnic family may be expected to teach its children also the ethnic language and every child, even at the grade school level, may be expected to take that language, or some other foreign language, for credit. With such a reorientation of attitudes (which some crisis or, otherwise, influential reasoning may bring about), not to learn one's ethnic language may be considered backward and provincial just as learning it may at other times be thought of as clannish, unassimilable and inferior.

The value which an ethnic group itself places on its ethnic language may greatly vary from time to time (and from culture to culture). "As late as 1862, foreign-born Germans in the United States tried to get the German language
recognized as an official language, along with English." If Germans had succeeded with their request in America (as, in 1867, French Canadians did with a similar request in Canada), one could be today a full-fledged German-speaking American, fully assimilated, and thinking of himself as an American, and being thought of by others as an American, in spite of his German language. Again, the reciprocity of identifications, not the use of a given language, would be the crucial test of assimilation. Yet, on the basis of valuation of the ethnic language alone, Germans of a century ago would have been the most unassimilable group and Germans of today a highly assimilable group. Language, in the absence of reciprocal identifications, does not indicate whether or not an immigrant, or a minority group, has, or has not, been assimilated.

Religion and assimilation. In some cultures religion seems to be more important for the development of reciprocal identifications than other variables. Post-World War II Moslem refugees hesitated to emigrate to a Christian country for fear they would be discriminated against because of their Moslem religion. Moslem Turkey was their "Promised Land."

Turkey showed similar reciprocal identifications based on the community of religion even before any contact between the refugees and the host group occurred. The Turkish government "declared itself ready to admit all such [Moslem] refugees irrespective of sex, marital status, health, or profession... The Turkish authorities also caused a sensation in Geneva by announcing to IRO officials that Turkish nationality with all attendant rights would be conferred upon the refugees immediately after their arrival on Turkish territory."\(^86\) In this case it would seem that religion was an exceptionally powerful factor in creating reciprocity of identifications. "Unlike many other governments, the Turkish authorities admitted that every community including the refugee community had its dependents, its sick, and its infirm and that in the long run it was neither humane nor wise economics to break up these family units by attempting to 'skim the cream.' In fact, in the report submitted by the Turkish government to the director-general [of IRO] in March, 1950, the government of Turkey 'was pleased to report the successful integration of the overwhelming majority of IRO refugees into the Turkish Republic.'\(^87\)

Religion which may be relatively unimportant in some cultures seemed to be the "prime mover" in the development

\(^86\)Stoessinger, op. cit., p. 120.
\(^87\)Ibid., p. 121.
of reciprocal identifications between Turks and Moslem refugees, a new instance which again shows the relativity and subordination of various "indicators" of assimilation to the universal criteria of reciprocal identifications.

**Naturalization and assimilation.** The extent to which naturalization is a step toward, or an expression of, the development of reciprocal identifications is especially problematical. Since greater economic, political and financial security, political pressures, social status aspirations, ability to bring over to America one's relatives or friends, greater facility in travel, etc., may be among the motives for naturalization, it is generally impossible to know to what extent naturalization is of a predominantly utilitarian character rather than an expression of reciprocal identifications.

When, however, it is an expression of identification, this is likely to be of a narrower political character rather than of a universal kind. Statistics would seem to support this interpretation. Refugees, for instance, become citizens much sooner, and in a much higher proportion, than any other immigrant group. The median number of years in America before citizenship was obtained has been for the refugees of 1933-41 period only six years; the corresponding number for

---

non-refugees from Russia is 33 years, for immigrants from Czechoslovakia 24, for immigrants from Great Britain 22, and for immigrants from Canada 21 years.\textsuperscript{39}

It is doubtful that refugees should get assimilated so much sooner than any other immigrant group (which we should assume if naturalization actually means Americanization). It seems, however, quite probable that refugees who were persecuted in some sense by the regime that is in power in their "old country" find it very easy by comparison to formally express their disloyalty to that regime and to promise loyalty to American government which is for them usually symbolic of freedom and liberty. For Englishmen, no matter how close they may be culturally to Americans, it obviously must be much harder to declare their disloyalty to their king or queen and to a government which they may at times consider superior in its well-established diplomacy. It takes them an average of 22 years to do so; even then, only about two-thirds of them manage to get naturalized, a lower percentage than among refugees and immigrants from Denmark, Wales, Sweden, Norway, Germany, Northern Ireland, and Switzerland (in that order).\textsuperscript{90}

Since one cannot be certain whether naturalization has been utilitarian or an expression of identification and since

\textsuperscript{89}Kent, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 31.

even when identification has been the motive this is likely to be limited to the political sphere, citizenship per se reveals nothing or little about assimilation. Furthermore, citizenship is conditional; the State can revoke it and the new citizen can give it up if he so desires. Many citizens express their desire, or intention, to return some day to their "old country." This circumstance also seems to hint the incompleteness of identification in the act of naturalization. Naturalization may, of course, foster assimilation in some cases, but it need not do so. It is not a reliable indicator per se.

Cultural kinship and assimilation. Since the development of a common culture (or at least of the compatibility of cultures in contact with one another) may greatly facilitate assimilation (although, without the reciprocity of identifications it is insufficient for the completion of the process of assimilation), cultural kinship would, at first sight, seem to be of supreme importance. In some instances such is the case; in others not.

Similarity (kinship) in languages of the dominant and of the immigrant group may indeed make it easier for the immigrants to learn the dominant language. Italian and Spanish immigrants in Brazil are, for instance, the first two ethnic groups there to adopt the Portuguese language and to give up their ethnic tongues. (By this standard they should be highly assimilable in Brazil; they are much less
so in the United States). But the case of Germans and Austrians, who both speak German, does not any longer follow the expected rule. If similarity in language alone was important, Germans and Austrians should learn and adopt Portuguese and give up German at about the same time. What actually happened was that Germans were the second slowest group to adopt the Portuguese language. Only the Japanese ethnic group was slower. After Germans came Russians, then Poles, and after the Poles the German-speaking Austrians. Thus, German-speaking Austrians adopted the Portuguese language relatively soon, while German-speaking Germans were relatively slow. It is not clear from the study whether other factors were sufficiently equalized; yet it is quite conceivable that differential attitudes, rather than linguistic similarities, are essential in the adoption of the dominant group's language.

The second assumption in arguing for the importance of cultural kinship for assimilation would be that of the "consciousness of kind." Groups that are in some important respect similar have often felt to belong together, at least psychologically, as it has been demonstrated by such movements as pan-Slavism, pan-Germanism, or by actual unions such
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as the British Commonwealth. Yet, historically, culturally "close" peoples have also warred and quarreled with one another (e.g., Prussia vs. Austria; Poland vs. Russia; Serbia vs. Bulgaria; France vs. Italy; Japan vs. China; America vs. England, etc.).

History clearly shows that cultural kinship may, or may not produce reciprocal friendships and, at times, identifications. From everyday observations we are similarly aware that two persons need not be friends just because they are both illiterate or both scholars; neither are scholars and illiterates natural enemies. It all depends on attitudes toward each other. Similarly with groups.

Sutherland emphasizes the importance of primary or private contacts for assimilation. More often than not, the immigrant is isolated from the private American culture. He sees the "new country" through the secondary media of press, political and business activity, and other such aspects of a highly dynamic culture. The standards of the public culture are misrepresentation, sharp practices, graft, grasping competition, and disregard for human beings. Sutherland believes that the American private culture is completely alien to the immigrant. The sympathetic behavior so necessary to complete assimilation is lacking.

---


Infering from Sutherland's keen observation, the extent to which an immigrant participates in the American private culture would be an important tool, if not one of the most important indicators, in an immigrant's assimilation process. Again, this may or may not be so. First of all, the question arises whether such participation would be typical of Americans at large? If not, how could it "Americanize" the outsider? If seems that not only the immigrants, but a considerable number of Americans, too, are excluded from participation in the private culture of other Americans. Zorbaugh describes the dwellers of furnished rooms; their participation in the private culture of other fellow-citizens seems to be almost nil.94 "Private-type" warm, habitually and "naturally" guest-oriented relationships which develop in some cultures as soon as a new member enters his new community (whether a village or a metropolitan university) are denied not only the immigrants but also countless native Americans. In an individualistic, self-oriented, competitive environment where genuine altruistic attitudes have not been allowed to develop and to initiate and animate private culture contacts, such contacts, even when for a specific reason they may occur, may frequently be characterized by tendencies to display one's own

superiority rather than to create a feeling of equality and
closeness; an inferiority-superiority battle, in overt or
overt terms, may fill the atmosphere, and even the super-
ficial identifications which might have developed in less
"proximate" contacts may again break down. Obviously,
this is not always the case. Yet, to the extent that the
emphasis is on differential status rather than on equality
and congeniality, "private culture" contacts are not likely
to strengthen those deeper identifications that are needed
in assimilation. Allport, reviewing several studies in an
analogous context, found that contact sometimes decreased
and sometimes increased inter-group prejudices. Contacts
were usually effective when they were on an equal status
basis and there were also some goals or interests common to
participants of both groups. "The effect is greatly enhanced
if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports
(... custom or local atmosphere), and if it is of a sort
that leads to the perception of common interests and common
humanity between members of the two groups." 

If, therefore, contact meets the necessary criteria
for bringing minority and majority group members closer

95Veblen, op. cit., Chs. 2-7.

96For some interesting and at times extravagant altru-
istic orientations see Piritim A. Sorokin (ed.), Forms and
Techniques of Altruistic Spiritual Growth (Boston: The

together, it may help to develop reciprocal identifications (in the sense described). If these criteria are not met, contact may work in the opposite direction and strengthen a minority group member's identifications with his minority group, as well as to increase the majority group member's reluctance to think of the minority group member as an insider in his own--dominant--group. In fact, a minority group member may be strongly motivated to avoid painful contacts. One of the strongest reasons why he strives for higher occupational status may be his realization that "... other things being equal, the higher the income and occupational status, the more successfully can he avoid direct contact with prejudice. Avoidance, in fact may become part of the culture of upper class members of a minority, as in the case of American Negroes."98

As it is true of language, religion, and naturalization, contact per se is not a valid indicator of assimilation. What is important is the matrix of reciprocal attitudes in which it occurs. Depending on the type of attitudes, contact may increase or decrease reciprocal identifications.

The value of indicators in general. Variables such as language, religion, naturalization, education, economic status, civic participation, private culture contact, etc.,

have frequently been used to measure assimilation. Says Kent: "Assimilation, like perfection, consists of little things, even though the end result is no little thing. In this study [The Refugee Intellectual] we have noted the progress toward assimilation in several categories: acquiring facility in the use of English, making friends with native Americans, becoming a citizen, earning a living, utilizing abilities and talents, participating in community affairs, and contributing to the cultural and social life of our society. This is not to imply that these constitute all the aspects of an assimilated American. They are but a few, but they are important ones."

T. J. Woofter writes that "the evidence of the progress of the Negro in the acquisition of American culture . . . may be briefly generalized as follows:

Rapid improvement of health, . . .
Advance in farm ownership and tenancy, . . .
Increase in urban homeownership, . . .
Advance in business enterprises and finance (especially insurance), . . .

Entrance in large numbers into industry and advance to some degree into semi-skilled positions, . . .

---

99 D. P. Kent, op. cit., p. 8. For development of a quantitative index of assimilation see Dudley Edward De Groot, "The Assimilation of Postwar Immigrants in Atlanta, Georgia" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus, Ohio State University, 1957), and also Nancy M. Krueger, "Assimilation and Adjustment of Post-War Immigrants in Franklin County, Ohio" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus, Ohio State University, 1955).
Increase in school attendance, especially in the elementary grades, and decrease in illiteracy, . . .

A growing political consciousness . . . and the development of conscientious and alert leadership."100

It seems to us that the study of such "indicators," while necessary and valuable within limits of their relevance, may become misleading as soon as it is assumed that progress in such specific areas as facility in the use of English, improvement of health, advance in ownership, naturalization, etc., eo ipso describes and measures assimilation. What such studies have ignored is precisely the final and crucial test of assimilation, i.e., the accompanying development of reciprocal identifications. Many refugees, for instance, have learned Italian while in Displaced Persons camps in Italy; many also participated in Italian community affairs (some of them more so than in America) and they also developed a taste for spaghetti—without getting Italianized. For they did not for a moment think of themselves, nor were they thought of by others, as being Italian. Similarly, learning English (which for most Slovenian refugees is their third or fourth language), participating in American affairs (one may do so to assert one's own nationality and raise its status in America) or eating hamburgers

(which may bring back memories of a European harbour) may be irrelevant for an immigrant's level of Americanization. All "indicators" of assimilation derive their relevance for assimilation only to the extent that they facilitate, or express, identifications.

When assimilation is still in process, the question: "Do you think of yourself as an American?" may lead not to a straight answer (which would be the case if there was no assimilation or if it was already completed) but to various additional questions and "reasoned" answers. Consider the following monologue by one of Slovenian refugee respondents:

"Am I a Slovenian or an American? The answer is: YES and NO. I work in America and in a sense for America. I pay taxes to American government and I obey American laws. I am an American citizen and in case of war I would have to fight for America and perhaps give my life for America. . . . Well, in culture, I am a little Slovenian, considerably West-European and a little American; but in aspiration I am cosmopolitan. By nationality I am Slovenian. The very word nationality comes from Latin mascere (particip: natum). In Slovenian, similarly, narod (nation) comes from the verb roditi se (to be born). Nationality refers to the people into which you are born. This, for me, of course is the Slovenian nation. By nationality I am Slovenian. No one can change this and no one should ever try to change this. I think I can be a good American and a good Slovenian at the same time. In fact, if I was a bad Slovenian, how could I
be a good American? If I should find it easy to deny my own mother and her language and Slovenia in which I grew up, how could Americans ever trust me? They should, indeed, think that if I could that easily betray my own blood and my native Slovenia it would certainly be even easier, at any time when it payed, for me to betray America. But if I give Slovenia what is her due, Americans have more reason to believe that I will also give America what is America's due. If I am honest, no matter what the consequences, with one, I am an honest person and so I will also be honest with another. That's why I say that I who was born in Slovenia cannot be a good American without being a good Slovenian. 101

When the process of assimilation is completed, the ethnic will, however, habitually and unreservedly think of himself as an American. Asked whether he was an American, he would tend to give a definite positive answer: "Yes," or "of course," "what do you mean," "one hundred percent," "wouldn't be anything else," or something similar. Similarly, Americans knowing him when asked whether he was American would answer in the affirmative, without buts or ifs.

Any variable becomes a valid indicator of assimilation only to the extent to which it contributes to the development of reciprocal identifications. This, of course, does not

mean that such variables should not be studied as part of 
adjustment and assimilation processes when identifications 
are not known. To know "what takes place or what goes on 
in what area in what direction and to what extent" is always 
very valuable. To confuse, however, good knowledge of 
English, possession of citizenship papers and ownership of 
a washing machine with Americanization seems to us to be a 
great oversimplification. The final test of habitual unre-
served reciprocal identifications by which the immigrant 
believes himself to be a full-fledged member of the American 
people, an American "just like anybody else" and is at the 
same time habitually thought of by Americans who know him 
as an American—this final test of Americanization alone 
can reveal the relevance for assimilation of other variables.

Adjustment versus assimilation. We have pointed out 
in the beginning the considerable ambiguity with which these 
two concepts have been treated by various authors. After 
having reached a definition of adjustment which makes it 
quite possible sociologically to compare adjustment of, for 
instance, a college athlete and a student who spends ten hours 
a day in the library regardless of different value systems 
of various scientific investigators, and after having 
developed a definition of assimilation which is applicable 
to American Negroes as well as to Slovenes and to members 
of industrial goal-oriented societies as well as to tradition-
oriented folk societies (which we found was not true of other
definitions), we have, of course, eo ipso demonstrated that adjustment and assimilation are two analytically distinct processes.

Since, however, this is not yet universally recognized in racial and ethnic research and the two terms are frequently assumed to mean the same thing and used interchangeably, we shall more fully demonstrate the need for making a clear distinction.

Adjustment, as we defined it, is a process in which harmonious, integrated relationships with one's cultural environment are established. Assimilation, however, is the process in which the minority group members increasingly habitually and unreservedly identify themselves with the majority group members, while the majority group members at the same time begin to think of these minority group members as being full-fledged members of the majority. Adjustment and assimilation processes, as here defined, may run parallel in the same direction or they may also run in opposite directions with numerous minor reversals in either case. These extreme possibilities should make us aware how greatly differentiated the two processes may become.

Parallel development of adjustment and assimilation processes may frequently be observed (where adjustment helps assimilation and assimilation helps further adjustment, etc.).

---

102Stoessinger, op. cit., p. 127 ff.
Let us consider just one example, that of a German refugee intellectual who was fortunate to establish himself at an American university. At the university, he is accepted by his colleagues as a member with equal status, equal duties and privileges. He enjoys teaching and intellectual exchanges, as well as social life, with his colleagues. He translates scientific works from German into English which is a relatively easy task which (cross-fertilization in general), however, is nevertheless needed in any social science if it is to achieve more than provincial perspectives. His work is appreciated and he becomes nationally known in his field. His intellectual background is considered complementary to that of his colleagues and the refugee professor is well integrated into American academic life on that basis. . . . He adjusted well; he is happy, satisfied with his success, has harmonious relationships with his American environment (debates on a mature level don't disrupt harmony; they make the debaters partners in wit) and he is well integrated into it.

Simultaneously with this progress in adjustment reciprocal identifications smoothly develop. After being integrated into American environment, the professor is thought
of first as one of the faculty, then as "one of us," finally as a "new American" or as "an American from Germany." Gradually, "new" or "from Germany" will be dropped completely, not only from language but also from thought and the context of attitudes. The professor also develops reciprocal identifications. First, he points out to newcomers: "Americans are all right." Then he is heard saying: "We in America. . ." Gradually he uses more frequently than before the phrase, "We Americans. . ." (He also uses this phrase more frequently than native Americans, i.e., the phrase has an important function for him: that of self-assertion, and that of social assertion of the professor as an American. He has, as it were, frequently to remind himself and to remind and convince Americans that he is one of them.) This instance is cited from careful observation and study. It exemplifies parallel development of both adjustment and assimilation processes.

In Canada, this writer also studied, among other cases, the adjustment and assimilation processes of a former Slovenian industrialist. During his first year in Canada, Mr. R. was a worker "in the wilderness," serving his one-year contract with the government. He felt that Canadians put him, like the Nazis during the War (although in subtler ways) into a labor camp, far away from any civilization. He did, however, master English in this one year surprisingly well and he saw a considerable part of Canadian "wilderness."
His adjustment during this time was very poor; he was not used to manual labor which he found both physically and psychologically hard to endure. He felt he was cheated and abused and forced to live in an environment in which none of the more "civilized" needs could be satisfied. In spite of his maladjustment and although he did not develop any conscious identifications with Canadians, he did acquire important tools for assimilation, above all the knowledge of English of which he was proud; he also gained some superficial acquaintance with Canadian customs and "mentality."

When Mr. R. fulfilled his obligation under contract, he immediately moved to a city in which there was a Slovenian ethnic community. Although the best employment he could find in the beginning was that of a dishwasher, he met many Slovenian friends and also joined a Slovenian choir. For the first time in the New World he now felt happy. Then he became a representative of a Slovenian ethnic paper and a travel agent. His knowledge of ethnic languages was very helpful and he soon became prosperous. Although he sent this writer, with an obvious purpose (to enhance his status), a picture in which he is photographed, a briefcase under his arm, with an American governor (he referred to the occasion as a "business meeting"), Mr. R. is not Canadianized or Americanized at all; indeed, he is a "professional" Slovenian, the type of the immigrant who makes it his mission to preserve his ethnic heritage in the New World. But he is very
well integrated in his new community, has harmonious relationships with Canadians as well as with the Slovenes; and he is serenely happy.

During his first year in Canada, we could say, Mr. R.'s adjustment went down while in assimilation, although no conscious identifications have developed, he was rapidly acquiring prerequisites for Canadianization. Then, when he moved into an ethnic community, the processes were reversed. His adjustment process rapidly improved while, at the same time, he strengthened his identifications with the Slovenian ethnic group and pursued the same goal also among other Slovenian ethnics; his dealings with Canadians were kept strictly on a secondary, business level. The case of Mr. R. shows how adjustment can go down while assimilation is going up and how the process can be reversed.

Drachsler believes that intermarriage may promote assimilation but "too rapid a mixture involves a sudden break with cultural tradition, a consequent demoralization of the individual and a loss to America of cultural contributions of the immigrant group--a loss that the country can ill afford to sustain."104 This, obviously, is again an instance where adjustment may run in a direction opposite to assimilation. Intermarriage may promote assimilation

but also lead to "demoralization," i.e., an acute form of maladjustment.

Unfortunately, proportions in which the processes of adjustment and assimilation run parallel with, or opposite to each other, are not known; nor do we know about the number and seriousness of reversals. That, however, adjustment and assimilation run at times parallel with, and at times opposite to each other, cannot be denied. And this suffices to demonstrate that a conceptual distinction between the two processes is imperative in racial and ethnic research and theory. The frequent disregard of this distinction may have contributed its share to the prevailing ambiguity in these areas.

In this connection, the question of the ethnic community becomes especially relevant. Davie considers ethnic communities as the first main factor which "opposes" assimilation. Fields, similarly, points out that "the refugee who settles down in an area in which his own nationals are concentrated finds the process of assimilation slow. His native tongue is spoken, home customs and ceremonies are retained, his life becomes an experience of self-centered occupation in a foreign land. He suffers from the faults of ethnic cohesion. His capacity for putting the

---

past behind him and living in the present for the future, becomes circumscribed. To offset this, every agency in the United States urges him to spread out."  

Similarly, the United Service for New Americans reached, early in 1941, these "inescapable" conclusions:  
"1. A refugee ghetto—a place where refugees cluster, clinging to their mother tongue and the customs of the homeland, spending their days in dreams of the past rather than hopes for the future—should not be permitted to develop in New York or anywhere else.  

2. The process of assimilation and integration into American life—which used to be a matter of generations—must be speeded up.  

During the period 1939-42, when the emigration from the Nazi terror reached its peak, the National Refugee Service in accordance with these 'inescapable conclusions' required of immigrants that they accept the agency's decision if they wanted to be eligible for the services of the agency in establishing themselves in this country. . . . By June 1942, however, the policy was changed to permit the refugee the final decision about the place of settlement."  

---

106 Fields, op. cit., p. 41.  
It would appear that the ethnic community is regarded as "opposed" to assimilation and is, to that extent, from the point of view of the dominant group, undesirable. However, at least two additional perspectives should be considered, namely the significance of the ethnic community for adjustment of ethnics and its importance for cultural contributions to the new country. The question of a richer, deeper assimilation in the long run should also be reconsidered.

It can hardly be doubted that the ethnic community is very valuable in facilitating an immigrant's adjustment to his new country. When one comes to settle in a new distant country this is, much more than in the case of a tourist, an overwhelming emotional experience. Every immigrant leaves "behind" many persons and places that he loved and he faces complete uncertainties of the New World, unsupported, perhaps in the fear of being unwanted, often unequipped with such bare essentials of finding: one's way around as the dominant group's language. Seeing other newcomers being greeted by their fellow-ethnics and being left out and alone is quite enough to deeply depress a new immigrant (as our files of correspondence with immigrants in Australia testify). Agencies, even when present, are never an equivalent substitute for fellow-ethnics whose language and culture, and emotional exchanges, one has absorbed from infancy.
An immigrant's introduction to new customs, new cultural items, a new job, etc., is enormously facilitated in an ethnic community, while the "old" needs for psychological closeness, spontaneous friendships, native songs, etc., which are frequently intensified with an immigrant's initial insecurity in the New World, can best be satisfied in an ethnic community. The shocks which the "greenhorn" usually experiences in a superiority-oriented environment do not psychologically cut so deep if he can forget, and perhaps laugh off, his problems in a more congenial environment. . . . If he becomes sick or unemployed, "older" ethnics will know where to find help or will give it to him themselves. During the periods "between jobs" many an ethnic should literally starve, commit suicide or steal if he wanted to survive. He may not be eligible for support, or at least he may not know where to seek help which is available. The agony which an isolated ethnic suffers in such circumstances can be fully realized only by those who ever were themselves in a comparable situation in a foreign land.108 But in an ethnic community there are always friends or at least sympathetic acquaintances who manage to keep an extra "boarder" free or to give or to loan him money, or to offer some temporary job—painting a house, building a fence or a

garage, cleaning up a store, or writing addresses for an
association—which helps him to survive the crisis. And he
will always hear from all sides that this is customary
(i.e., "nothing to be ashamed of"), that everybody had simi-
lar experiences at one time or another and the community
always helped. He can go through the crisis without anxiety
and without losing self-respect and considering himself a
failure or "victimized."

And he also has his joys and pleasures: songs, dances,
theatres, festivals, picnics, visits, drills, excursions,
pilgrimages, etc., where he "fits" and is not afraid of being
rebuffed, laughed at or watched for differences which will
inevitably be his "mistakes" or evidence of his inferiority.
His standard of living will usually rise much above what he
was used to before, especially since life in an ethnic
community is relatively cheaper and much of recreation is
free. If single, he has better chances to get acquainted
with several girls and find a compatible marriage partner.
He is, therefore, more likely to be well adjusted and happy.

Perhaps the assumption that he is, nevertheless, at
the same time isolated from the American community (and per-
haps merely postponing the problem of adjustment to it)
would deserve a careful reconsideration. More often than
not, a member of an ethnic community spends at least eight
hours a day, at least five days a week, at work with other
Americans. Since his ethnic community helps him to maintain
self-respect and diminish anxiety, it is possible that his
relationships with Americans are often better integrated
than they would be in the absence of ethnic support (when
inferiority complex and anxiety would be much more likely to
develop). One of the tasks of ethnic research would now be,
among other things, to establish whether members of ethnic
communities are, in the long run, better integrated into
American life than ethnically isolated immigrants. Further,
are their identifications with Americans weaker or stronger?
And what are the attitudes of the dominant group to the two
ethnic types respectively?

A UNESCO investigator points out that it is necessary
to distinguish between "immigration by infiltration" and
immigration in groups, i.e., ethnic communities (l'immigra-
tion par l'établissement en groupe). In the former case,
the assimilation is rapid, but immigrants are uprooted
(déracinement) and there is more criminality than in ethnic
communities (i.e., adjustment of isolates is worse). In the
latter case, the assimilation is slower but it has many
advantages.109

It seems safe to agree that initial adjustment,
especially of working class immigrants who seldom know the
language and customs of the new country on their arrival, is
better in an ethnic community. We are not entirely certain,

109 UNESCO, op. cit., p. 147.
however, whether the assimilation of isolates from other ethnics is always superior to that of ethnics who live in ethnic communities. A lower degree of identification with ethnics (if it is actually lowered in isolation; it may also be 'unrealistically' enhanced) does not eo ipso produce higher reciprocal identifications with the dominant group (just as a person who forgot all about his parents is not by this very fact proven to have more closely identified himself with his wife and children). Differential assimilation of ethnic group members and isolates from ethnics has yet to be scientifically tested.

Georges Mauco reports on an extreme case of isolates which sheds further light on our problem. In 1927-28 French papers were concerned about the appearance of Polish "gangsters" and mental cases in France. Poland was accused that it sent its "bandits" and "fools" to France. (Madame Curie and Chopin, just as Kosciuszko and Pulaski by E. A. Ross in America, were conveniently forgotten.) Mauco then launched a research project to establish the facts. He found that the relative number of mentally sick and of criminals was indeed twice as high for Polish immigrants as for native Frenchmen. Then he studied the situational factors. He found that, first of all, the chief source of the difficulty were Polish workers employed in French agriculture. Second, that these workers did not know any French and were sent singly to isolated French farms. They were, therefore, completely cut
off from all communication. French farmers were not at all aware of the psychological problems of their workers and, since there was no common medium of communication, could not develop any idea of the relative deprivation of the immigrant workers. Workers actually felt they were cut off from all life and "imprisoned." The isolation of farms, the absence of a common medium of communication, the lack of free time precluded any mental or affective exchanges. Workers lived in a social vacuum and their personalities began to disintegrate. Many therefore gradually reacted by refusing to recognize the painful reality (i.e., they lost contact with reality and ability for reality-testing) and they drifted into mental sickness; others revolted, left the farms, and were, often, forced to steal in order to survive while trying to find a tolerable environment. (Not all immigrants, of course, became so disorganized, but merely twice the amount normal for France).

Mauro then proposed to the government the following change of policy: (1) None of the agricultural workers who knew no French at all must in the future be sent alone and isolated to an isolated French farm. (2) Whenever possible, agricultural workers were to be sent out in groups so as to permit at least occasional contacts with their fellow-ethnics; social workers and interpreters were to be recruited to give proper instructions to French farmers and to serve as a liaison with immigrants whenever necessary. The policy
was adopted and the results were astonishing. Within a year the proportion of the mentally sick and criminal Polish immigrant workers dropped 68 per cent (or below the French rate) in the North where the policy was put into effect. In the South where no changes in policies were made the rates of crime and mental sickness remained unchanged.\textsuperscript{110}

These findings by Mauco are highly significant in their forceful demonstration of the importance of situational factors. They also suggest the great value for adjustment of immigrants of ethnic communities (at least until the language of the majority group is learned). Furthermore, the assumption that urbanism is per se the main cause of disorganization among ethnics from rural communities would be an oversimplification. When closely-knit ethnic communities can be established in a city, disorganization may well be reduced. When a person who was a member of a closely-knit and well integrated community with strong affective ties and stable, even if modest, economic security loses all affective supports and established social controls and lives at the same time in constant fear of unemployment, discrimination, and social rebuffs, he is likely to become disorganized in any environment, urban or rural. Conversely, moral, social, and sometimes, economic support by fellow ethnics,

as well as by majority group members, greatly reduces such dangers in any environment.

Allport observes: "If any generalization can be made it might be to the effect that victims of prejudice learn to lead their lives under a condition of mild dissociation. So long as they can move freely and act naturally within their own in-group they manage to put up with (and discount) rebuffs received outside. And they grow habituated to this slight split in their mode of living."

Thus, from the point of view of adjustment, ethnic communities appear valuable not only for reducing, or better solving, the problems of immigrants but also for reducing, or solving them, for the dominant group. Ethnic communities may apparently slow down the more superficial initial types of assimilation. Whether they also do so in the long run and on a deeper level (that may presuppose a certain degree of stable adjustment) will be demonstrated only by careful and widespread future research.

With regard to cultural contributions to America, the ethnic community is again the strongest mobilizer of ethnic resources. Churches, some of them valuable architectural and artistic contributions, cultural gardens with monuments, ethnic museums and libraries; ethnic schools and "national homes"; ethnic orchestras, choirs, drills and sports, and

---

folk dances; folk art, ethnic crafts, foods, and recipes; ethnic parks, playgrounds, picnic areas, resorts, vacation cottages and innumerable other contributions which in one, two or three generations will be incorporated in the general American culture often require extreme effort and sacrifice on the part of the immigrant. Only the ethnic community can mobilize this effort and coordinate it into a successful cooperative venture.

In Cleveland alone there are, for instance, over 200 churches which were built by ethnics; immigrants maintained, in 1960, 43 ethnic radio programs, owned at least 114 halls and picnic grounds; operated, at their own expense, over 30 ethnic language schools; had nearly 200 registered drama, music, and singing groups and 53 registered drill, sports, and gymnastics groups.112

It seems clear that without the existence of ethnic communities a large share of ethnic cultural (and at times economic) contributions to America could not take place. From available research, such as that by Mauco, the assumption that a much larger number of immigrants would be maladjusted without the support of their fellow ethnics (which is best provided in ethnic communities) seems equally justified. In this way, while contributions by ethnics would, in

---

the absence of ethnic communities, very probably decrease, the need for more agencies, social workers, policemen, prisons and mental hospitals would correspondingly increase. It, therefore, seems that for an intelligent total appraisal of ethnic communities they should be viewed not only in the perspective of rapid superficial assimilation but also in that of adjustment of ethnics and of ethnic contributions to their new countries.

Adjustment, assimilation, and education. The role of education in adjustment and assimilation seems to be highly controversial. One side apparently believes that the better educated persons should, in general, make a better adjustment. Lundberg observes that those more familiar with science know better "how things happen and how we can do something about it, if anything can be done . . . . In short, science can serve as a sort of mental hygiene to the individual enabling him to come to terms with many of his problems." 113 Gillin, Dittmer, and Colbert are similarly convinced that "as our social life becomes more complex, education becomes an increasingly important factor in effecting social adjustment." 114

Actual adjustment process of some immigrant intellectuals seems to confirm the foregoing assumptions. Stoesser-singer reports that the adjustment of the refugee specialists

113 Lundberg, et al., op. cit., p. 4.
in Venezuela and in Chile "surpassed all expectations. Not only did the majority of them contribute significantly to the wealth of their new country, but they became the protégés of the government and were given special privileges and social and economic benefits. The statement of the IRO mission at Caracas, in evaluating refugee settlement in Venezuela, neatly summed up the situation by reporting that there were but two classes of refugees in Venezuela--those who owned Cadillacs and those who washed them."115

This exceptionally good adjustment of refugee professionals in Venezuela and Chile is circumscribed, however, by two important conditions: refugee intellectuals were specialists and possessed those skills that were needed by these two countries. Professionals were therefore highly valued and they enjoyed a high social and economic status in their new environment. Their adjustment is not only a reflection of their superior education but rather of the interplay of that education with the need and appreciation by their new countries. In other words, adjustment, like assimilation, is a reciprocal process; it is not the result of attributes of an immigrant in isolation but rather the product of the interplay of these attributes with the situational environmental factors of the "new country." The South American experience suggests that the refugee

professional adjusts better than his less educated fellow-ethnics when the professional's roles and his economic and social status equal or surpass the level of role and status that had been normal for the professional in his "old country."

Unfortunately, assimilation of these refugee intellectuals and of their less educated fellow ethnics has, as far as we know, not yet been studied. It would be very instructive to know whether the unparallel process in adjustment of intellectuals and non-intellectuals is accompanied by parallel or opposed trends of assimilation in these two groups.

De Groot reports that Krueger's study of immigrants in Columbus, Ohio, showed that total education "was correlated with assimilation." The findings with respect to this variable were less clear-cut in De Groot's own study of immigrants in Atlanta, Georgia. "Generally, grade school education meant lower assimilation, although the Catholics did not conform to this finding. With the exception of the Catholics, Dr. Krueger's finding was substantiated."116 Interpretation of these findings will, however, vary according to one's willingness to accept the index of assimilation as fully valid. Furthermore, occupation (as the specific practical application of education) would seem to be

---

important, above all, the discrepancy of previously held occupation with that in the New World. "With only two exceptions," reports De Groot, "the clerical-sales and skilled immigrants had higher assimilation scores than the professionals and proprietors. The unskilled were least assimilated of all the vocational groups."117

On the other hand, numerous data suggest that the more highly educated immigrants, and highly educated persons in general, tend to be more maladjusted than the less educated individuals whenever they fail to maintain their normal level of self-expression and their normal (or normally aspired) social and economic roles and statuses.

Stouffer found, in 1941, that "the most frustrated group in the Army was that of the well-educated soldiers, many of whom felt that they were not getting a chance to show what they could do... . The educational level of the selectees was much higher than that of the old regular Army enlisted men; but the latter, because of experience, were necessarily serving as teachers of the new recruits and as advisers to company commanders with respect to promotions."118

One can easily realize that, for instance, those immigrant intellectuals who work under much less educated
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factory foremen find themselves in a similar situation and experience a similar frustration since they have no opportunity "to show what they could do." But they also lack feelings of solidarity which educated recruits may still have. The soldier with higher education, although subordinated to less educated men, was nevertheless not entirely deprived of company of comrades of comparable education. As long as there was some solidarity, even if only with a few "equals," frustrations were apparently easier to bear. An immigrant intellectual in manual employment, on the other hand, seems rarely to be privileged with the company of even one single other intellectual working next to him in the same shop or on the same farm. He is deprived, at least in his work situation, of that self-protection which comes from feelings of solidarity with sympathetic equals. He feels isolated and alienated, as well as bored. As Leys puts it: "Intellectuals and lowbrows bore one another. Athletes and persons of sedentary disposition do not usually seek each other's company." Such data, by logic of analogous processes, would suggest that those intellectuals who are employed at less than their normal (or "aspired") level and, consequently, feel relatively deprived with regard to their

economic and social status would tend to be less well adjusted than their less educated fellow ethnics.

This assumption is confirmed by Park and Miller who observe: "Our documents show that the 'educated' immigrant is usually more misadapted to American society than the workman. He does not, unless he is a technician (chemist, engineer) bring a commodity which we want to buy (as does the laborer)."120

The same authors quote a document which, in our opinion, well illustrates how the new "social atmosphere" is experienced by a destatured immigrant intellectual. Writes the intellectual: "There is the lack of social freedom, the oppression of the individual by all kinds of traditional or recently created social norms. I have not seen in Europe anything comparable to it except, perhaps, in small and very isolated provincial towns. Since I am not politically active, this social tyranny affects me much more than the amount of political despotism could do, particularly as it extends to the intellectual domain. I feel more bound in the expression of my opinion here than I felt under Russian censorship in Warsaw, in spite of the fact that I am not in the slightest measure inclined toward political, social, moral, or religious revolutionism of any kind, and was

considered in Europe, even by the most radical conserva-
tists, a perfectly 'inoffensive,' mildly progressive intel-
lectualist. . . .

... my incipient enthusiasm for American cultural
development never has any chance to mature, because I realize
at every moment that American society does not feel any need
for my or any other 'foreigner's' co-operation, is in gen-
eral perfectly satisfied with itself, and perfectly able to
manage its own future in accordance with its own desires, to
create all the values it wants without having any 'imported'
values 'thrust upon it.' . . . No European society I know
acts as if it possessed and knew everything worthwhile and
had nothing to learn, whereas this is precisely the way
American society acts toward a foreigner."121

It seems that the quoted immigrant intellectual uni-
versalizes his own experience and that of cases similar to
his own into a matrix of attitudes through which he views
entire American society. Intellectuals whose experiences in
Europe and in the New World were somewhat similar will
undoubtedly agree; this writer's files contain many similar
documents written only during the last decade. Intellectuals
who feel that they were allowed to succeed, sometimes on the
basis of knowledge acquired in the Old World, and who were
blessed with a more tolerant social environment would
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vehemently disagree or, at least, point out that some Americans seem to appreciate foreign values.

Ogburn and Nimkoff, referring to the American Negro, suggest that greater adjustment difficulties are experienced by more highly educated individuals:

It has been shown by means of objective tests that the better educated Negroes are more militant than are those with less training. The more thoroughly assimilated Negroes become [meaning, apparently, the acquisition of middle or higher class American culture], the more they realize the limitations and discriminations under which they must live and the more resentful they become. The more assimilated the Negro, the more nearly he approaches the white man in competitive skill; hence the greater becomes the white man's resentment against him.122

Davie and Koenig report that artists, scholars, and political leaders predominate among those refugees who wish to return to Europe.123 The desire to return would, apparently, suggest that this group is less adjusted to Americans and less assimilated than other less educated refugees.

The concepts of role and status may be especially helpful in understanding the greater maladjustment of immigrant intellectuals. When they conceive of their present roles as less important and less attractive than the roles of their past and of their aspiration and when they realize

122 Ogburn and Nimkoff, op. cit., p. 187.

that their social and economic status is lower than "tolerable," the more educated immigrants are likely to experience a regression to a lower level of personality and social adjustment. This, indeed, seems to be a general tendency under conditions of similar transitions to a lower level of role performance. We know, for instance, that children who are at first allowed to play with very attractive toys, then taken to an adjoining room containing only much less attractive toys (where, however, the desirable toys can still be seen through a wire net) regress to a lower level of adjustment.\textsuperscript{124} Educated Negroes who are capable of playing more important roles (and see them played by whites) and realize they are arbitrarily excluded, also find the situation more unbearable than Negroes whose level of education and aspiration is lower. According to Ogburn and Nimkoff they become more militant. If, however, they finally succeed to a higher level of role performance, avoidance of situations which would expose them to prejudice and discrimination (i.e., status protection) may become a pattern of their culture (as it was pointed out earlier). A person whose

concept of himself is higher than the role he is allowed to play and the status he is given by his environment is alienated from that environment and maladjusted to it. Similarly, a minority whose self-definition is higher than its definition by the majority group is also necessarily alienated from the majority and maladjusted, unless, of course, a secondary adjustment, such as avoidance, is possible.

Another neglected, but in our opinion highly useful, concept for a better understanding of differential adjustment of immigrants of high education is that of their trained incapacity for roles that permit less self-expression (or only self-expression on what is conceived to be a lower level) and less self-assertion, and bring rewards of social status that are below the level of aspiration and normal tolerance. The concept of trained incapacity was invented by Veblen; it is applicable to industry and we think it can also be used to promote the understanding of the differential adjustment of intellectuals and non-intellectuals (or any pronounced educational or occupational variations).

Says W. E. Moore:

To perform an occupational role effectively, it is necessary not only to perfect the appropriate skills, but also to learn and uphold the attendant attitudes. Thus the individual who has effectively mastered the demands of his position, and through long habituation has thoroughly accepted and promoted the special attitudes appropriate to that position, has a trained incapacity for other offices. The longer the individual has been in a particular position, or in a particular branch of
the organization, the harder is the transition to another position or organizational unit.\textsuperscript{125}

This seems to be a very useful concept; it needs, however, some elaboration. First of all, the time element may or may not be as important as Moore contends. The degree of difficulty of transition would depend also on the level and intensity of aspiration and on the extent to which the actual position coincided with the aspired position. Indeed, it is quite possible to develop a strong and rigid trained incapacity also on the basis of a merely aspired position which was never actually occupied for a single hour. A person who has, for instance, an extreme desire to be an astronaut and is unwilling to accept any substitute role and status will, psychologically, develop a trained incapacity for the job of a cook, bookkeeper or bricklayer. Hitler's extreme desire to play the role of Germany's leader incapacitated him for the role of an artist or a bricklayer.\textsuperscript{126} Duration, therefore, is \textit{per se} much less important than Moore implies.

Two other variables, however, which are not mentioned seem to us to deserve special attention, namely that of status and that of self-expression. Trained incapacity is


not developed indiscriminately for any position other than that which had been occupied, but only for certain positions which in the subject's opinion, and by social definition, would imply a lowering of the status of the subject, which are therefore viewed as less "respectable" and less desirable. For instance, a professor who spent several years teaching at a university has not developed a trained incapacity for the office of the college dean (unless he should conceive of that office as being a merely administrative job which would give him no opportunity for intellectual self-expression) nor has he developed a trained incapacity for the office of the United States senator. He would have, however, a trained incapacity for the position of a college janitor since a janitor's role and status would be discrepant with his self-image (reflecting, subjectively, his social status).

The second neglected variable is that of self-expression and self-assertion (a subjective experience of his social role). Self-expression is developed by levels or gradations from lower, less imaginative and less creative beginnings to gradations of higher creative imagination and creativity. A manual laborer finds, for instance, occupational self-expression in chopping wood; a sculptor in carving wood, in making matter conform to a higher form which exists at first only in his creative imagination and is then actuated in an artistic creation. Worker and
sculptor, each has a self-image; these are "healthy" only when they correspond to reality; a worker, as worker, will be adjusted when he is proud of (or satisfied with) his physical strength and skill; a sculptor when he sees his mission "verified" by his undiminished, growing creativity. A sculptor, therefore, having firmly internalized creative attitudes, incapacitates himself for a permanent role of a wood-chopper. Or, to return to the professor who normally expressed his creativity on an intellectual level of self-expression, a janitor's work could not satisfy his fully developed needs for social status of his aspiration and for self-expression by sharing and communicating knowledge. His training, therefore, incapacitated him for the role of the janitor; he is sociologically as well as psychologically unfit for role performance on that level. Should he be forced into it, with the accompanying loss of self-expression normal for his development and of status normal for his academic role, his personality, after ceasing to function on the higher level of his capacity, would probably regress to a lower level of adjustment. A lower level of role and status would either lead to a lower self-image (acceptance), to a condemnation of the group which he would consider responsible for his loss of status (aggression, hostility), to condemnation of himself (loss of self-respect, self-confidence; inferiority complex, guilt feelings) or to the denial of reality (psychosis). With the exception of perhaps the first
solution (which would probably need supports from additional compensations: religious, intellectual at home, leadership in a "lower" group, etc.) every reaction of the former professor would be socially defined as maladjustment; personality would correspondingly regress to a less "developed" and less creative form of adjustment.

Applying this more fully elaborated concept of trained incapacity to the destatused (do not include successful) immigrant intellectual--a former sculptor, professor, lawyer, or teacher now working on an assembly line, a doctor working as a technician or as an orderly, an architect assembling screws or an industrialist washing dishes--we can easily suspect that he will be less well adjusted in this situation than the less educated immigrants who are not handicapped with trained incapacity for such types of work. Very probably the intellectual's personality will somewhat regress or he will be in some way mobilize compensations (become an actual or imaginary leader of the ethnic group or a self-sacrificing pater familias; develop creative hobbies; or disregard social norms and "compensate" with greater personal "freedom," etc.).

Social adjustment is, of course, also related to social norms, i.e., to expectations of one's social environment. Persons who follow these norms are "normal" and more likely to have harmonious relationships with their environment. It would, therefore, be expected, that relative
adjustment would more or less correspond to the normal probability distribution and that extremes on each side, whether entirely uneducated or most highly educated, would, already because of their differences, be less likely to be as well adjusted as those more typical of the majority.

E. A. Ross observes: "Gifted men who are far above or ahead of their time are likely to be so neglected, misunderstood, or hawked at that in despair they turn misanthrope and hold aloof from their kind."\(^{127}\) Menninger describes acute maladjustment of such men as Thomas Aquinas, who was called by his classmates "bos mutus" (dumb ox),\(^{128}\) and of Woodrow Wilson who as child "did not know how to play" and was in adulthood characterized by "a queer sort of queerness."\(^{129}\) Samuel Taylor Coleridge "was a misfit;" Sir Isaac Newton "never took part in the ordinary amusements, . . . was constantly in books, avoiding and ignoring those that might have been his friends." Jeremy Bentham "was sensitive and retiring, felt inferior, hated social pleasures, and was solitary."\(^{130}\)


\(^{129}\)Ibid., p. 73.
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The founder of sociology August Comte reveled in his studies from 5 A.M. to 9:15 P.M.; after inciting an insurrection against school authorities, he was expelled; he had an illegitimate child and married a prostitute; he was nervous and maladjusted.\(^{131}\) Freud, the founder of psycho-analysis, developed many of his theories by studying his own acute maladjustment.\(^{132}\) Max Weber's teaching, research, and public activities were constantly interrupted by nervous and physical collapses.\(^{133}\) Maladjustment of men of genius was so common that genius was often regarded as a neurosis or a psychosis.\(^{134}\)

Our purpose for mentioning such extreme cases is, of course, not to suggest that immigrant intellectuals fall into this category (although a few of them may). It is merely to hint that social adjustment may become increasingly difficult for those persons who in either direction greatly deviate from what is commonly considered as normal by the environment in which they live and perform their roles.


More educated immigrants do, apparently, often have a competitive advantage for roles and accompanying statuses that may be more attractive from their point of view. The final proportion of destatused intellectuals and successful intellectuals will depend on the interplay of the attributes possessed by the intellectual and the degree of need for, and appreciation of these same attributes by the new environment. Proportions of maladjustment and adjustment will always be the product of several factors; never the result of education in isolation.

Assimilation will depend on a similar interplay of attitudes resulting in greater or lesser reciprocal identifications. Too little is known as yet of reciprocal expectations as conditioned by education on the basis of which such reciprocal identifications are developed to allow any elaboration in this analysis.

Adjustment, assimilation, and ethics. In a sociological or social psychological study we are not concerned with the question of morality of various acts and alternatives in adjustment and assimilation processes. We must, however, take into account that attitudes on adjustment and assimilation do often take, in actual social life, a moral tone, whether that of social mores or that of reasoned morals. For instance, not to get Americanized may be believed by an American to be sheer ungratitude to America, while the immigrant may conceive of his Americanization as ungratitude
to his native land. The act of naturalization is an expression of loyalty to the new country; it also implies disloyalty to the old country. The immigrant is likely to develop some guilt feelings and rationalizations in either case and often endow them with moral tones to feel at least self-justified.

Immigrants, as well as members of the majority group, are likely to give differential stereotyped tones to the same attitude depending on who the subject is (member of ingroup or of outgroup). Merton gives the following example how "firm" (a character trait that is by many considered to be a moral trait) is often declined in group-involved or ego-involved situations:

I am firm,
Thou art obstinate,
He is pigheaded. 135

Merton then proceeds to show how, by this differential evaluation, the outsider is likely to be condemned even if he has the very same traits that we so admire in Lincoln.

Personal and societal preferences become immensely strengthened when they are conceived to be precepts of proper decent morality. They may influence or determine the answer to many questions that seem wide open: adjustment—to what? To a higher level, to mediocrity, to a lower level? Is

assimilation ethical? Must one be denationalized merely because he was economically underprivileged or because, paradoxically, he wanted to escape denationalization in the Old World? Or, from the "other" point of view: how can one live and work in a land and get everything from it without accepting it as his country? How can he expect to "get" without being willing to give? And further: what is the proper "exchange," which obligations have priority, etc. Surprisingly, there is little "theory" in this field. More characteristic are short definite pronouncements, precepts which seldom are elaborated from innumerable possible perspectives.

Not only is it the layman who is involved in this turmoil of conflicts of ideas that at times are endowed with a moral tone and finality. "Nothing is more important in life than adjustment," an excellent professor that this writer used to have repeated during his classes frequently. Allport, on the other hand, expresses a different view: "I repeat the question--should 'adjustment' be regarded as one of the goals of this (or any other) social agency? Are not animals well adjusted to their environment and creative human beings seldom so? Objectives couched in terms of 'strength of character' and 'growth' seem ethically superior."136

Some Slovenian ethnic writers view adjustment and assimilation primarily from the point of view of ethics; these processes are of moral character; the duties and rights, and the corresponding expectations on both sides, should be governed by ethical principles. How is this "moral philosophy" on adjustment and assimilation developed? It is impossible to give here an elaborate presentation which, also, would be somewhat difficult to follow unless one is familiar with corresponding philosophical concepts borrowed most frequently from Thomistic philosophy. A few central ideas, however, should be presented since they undoubtedly exert some influence on the attitudes of Slovenian ethnics.

Assimilation is, from the point of view of the ethnic, denationalization. The language itself is obviously influenced by experiences of a given people; the Slovenes know the word "denationalization" and have the corresponding Slovenian term (raznaroditi). They have no literal translation for assimilation; its equivalent in Slovenian is "foreignization" (potujčenje). The very difference in terms suggests on one side a nation that occupied the position of the dominant group; on the other that of a small nation that occupied, historically, the position of a minority. Often, the Slovenes had no legal possibilities to ward off the denationalization; when they protected the rights of themselves as a minority in a non-Slovenian state they could
only appeal to moral principles. This may help to explain why in the New World, too, moral arguments are often advanced.

Professor Lenček presents a good summary on "the ethics of nationality." 137 Following Mausbach, Cathrein, and J. H. Mill, Lenček conceives of a nation as a community of persons of the same origin or blood (biological element) which has on a relatively stable common territory (geographical element) undergone the same cultural and political development (historical-cultural element) and hence possesses physical-spiritual characteristics of its own (characterological element). As such, the nation is, according to Lenček, a "natural good" which follows immediately that of the family after which it is modeled. In evaluating this good two extremes are to be avoided: overestimation (racism, fascism, nazism, etc.) and underestimation (exaggerated cosmopolitanism when it advocates fusion and disappearance of national characteristics, materialism when it overshadows ethical-spiritual values, etc.). Ethics, as the science of the mean, warns against both these extremes.

Since every person is a debtor to his nation, certain obligations naturally follow. One of these duties is a just appreciation of one's nation to which one is bound in blood,

culture, history, and character. As in himself as an individual, so also in his nation a person must work to develop its good qualities and diminish the bad ones. And just as a person does not seclude himself from other persons, so also a nation should not be exclusive of others (which would necessarily also delimit her cultural horizon).

Justly appreciating one's nationality, one tries to preserve it. If we remember the nature of the essential characteristics of nationality, we realize it is meaningless, and against piety, to think that nationality could be changed with a word or decision to do so. Besides, it would be unethical to reject a good which is naturally a component of our being.

Life in a foreign country does not in itself determine an individual to "sink" in a new nation. Forced assimilation is unethical, since it destroys a natural good in persons who are in virtue of their origin and culture entitled to it. Yet, inasmuch as one owes his physical-cultural character to his own nation (is of its blood and made a socialized human being by its culture), we may say that it is an ethical precept to resist also gradual assimilation. This does not mean that one should resist assimilation in other respects than those which of themselves destroy one's nationality. Thus, new working or dressing habits or the use of a foreign language and foreign manners with foreigners are in no way detrimental to one's
nationality and could, often should, be used in a foreign country. The habitual use of a language other than one's own in one's family (unless the family is mixed) is, however, a violation of an ethical precept. Hence, one is, even for ethical reasons alone, obligated to preserve those elements which are necessary for preservation of his nationality.

Essential for preservation of one's nationality are especially two elements, blood and language.

With regard to the first of these two elements we see that nationality is endangered by mixed marriages. Mixed marriages are a "collision" of two natural goods, that of the family and that of the nation. Whenever possible, collisions of goods ought to be avoided. Hence, when one can find acceptable partners for marriage of the same nationality, he is ethically bound to give preference to a partner of his own nationality. On the other hand, when such collision is inevitable, when there are no acceptable partners of one's own nationality, or when one is already so deeply in love with a member of some other nation that he may not hope for an equally happy marriage with any member of his own nation, then the family, being a higher natural good than a nation, justly prevails, and such marriage may be considered fully ethical and good.

The second most important element which, according to Doctor Lenček, one should preserve is one's native
language. Hence, in one's family (if not mixed), one should habitually speak one's native language. Besides, one should not neglect whatever preserves one's language and culture--books, papers, performances in one's own language--especially since language is the main vehicle of culture and culture is the best preserver of language.

Such, very briefly, are some of the main points of the theory on the ethics of nationality and of assimilation as presented by Professor I. Lenček in *Vrednote* (Values, a Slovenian Ethnic Cultural Review).

Dr. A. Odar, a Slovenian jurist and philosopher, explains these same principles in a popular way in the *Yearbook of Free Slovenia*, 1953. Let us quote only a few paragraphs:

> Just as one can have only one mother, so one can have only one nationality. No one can choose his own parents, nor is it in anybody's power to choose one's own nation. And just as one can never change his parents so one can never change his true nationality.

> States may be chosen at will and given up at will; not so nationality. No one can justly force his nationality on another. He will never make him a national of his own nation; he will, at best, succeed, in making him an anational. Yet, an anational is always a spiritual cripple.

> It is our obligation to endeavor to discharge our duties as citizens of the new country in the best way we can and to serve it faithfully. At the same time, we ardently love our Slovenian nation and preserve our nationality. We are like children who had to leave their own home to live in the household of someone else; such children must discharge all their duties as members of this new household, whatever these may be. Yet, they
cannot—and only those of the most dubitable character ever would—deny the intimate ties with their own family and home. Similarly with refugees.138

Unfortunately, we do not know what proportion of immigrants shares this view. From the frequency with which it occurs in the Slovenian ethnic press and in Slovenian refugee correspondence, we suspect that it is fairly wide spread among Slovenian immigrants. Their differential adjustment and assimilation, such as their quick learning of the dominant group's language or adoption of citizenship, coupled with a determination to preserve the knowledge of Slovenian language and Slovenian nationality, may be a reflection of this underlying moral philosophy. And this philosophy, first developed as a defense against Germanization, Italianization, or Hungarianization in native Slovenia, is many centuries old. It at the same time forms and expresses attitudes of a number of ethnics toward adjustment and assimilation in the New World.

Closing remarks on our examination of concepts. The purpose of our examination of concepts was not a complete critical review of the prevailing concepts in sociological (and related) literature on adjustment and assimilation. We tried, rather, to develop a complementary conceptual

analysis—that of "filling the gaps" where it seemed to us that an additional perspective or a different emphasis was needed. Perhaps this approach will at some later date be elaborated into a theory of adjustment and assimilation from a slightly novel point of view. This presentation, at its best, is merely a search for new perspectives.

Our concepts will not be fully "utilized" in the rest of the dissertation. Such full utilization will require development of additional techniques and of extensive research which may need several years of work.
CHAPTER II

REFUGEE CORRESPONDENCE

The Period 1945-1955 as it Appears from Letters Which Were Received by a Slovenian Refugee

In this chapter we shall present a sample of letters which were received by a Slovenian refugee whom we shall call Yanes (Janez is Slovenian for John). Yanes was chosen because of his popularity with refugees from all social classes. It is also felt that refugees expressed their views to him freely, since friendship was the only motive for writing. The letters therefore fairly well reflect the views of refugees from many "walks of life." Other collections in the files of the Slovenian Research Center in America which are at our disposal are somewhat more limited to a narrower group, for instance, written primarily by intellectuals or primarily by manual workers.

The letters which Yanes received are contained in three files. In the first file are those which describe a refugee's life and aspirations in the refugee camp. The second file contains letters from the old country, and the third file letters from fellow-refugees written after their arrival in their respective new countries.
Time and space limitations make it impossible for us to present in this study more than one collection and even the correspondence received by Yanes (containing over 900 letters) can obviously not be reproduced in full. After having read all letters, it seems, however, that the predominant ideas are fairly similar; it is our hope that the reader's insight will be both enriched and balanced with the help of this collection.

In 1945, Yanes was twenty years old--a popular sociable Slovenian refugee student. All letters were received during the period 1945-55. They will therefore shed some light on views and attitudes of a sample of refugees during that period and should be considered complementary information to the main body of our research which is based on questionnaires that were completed in 1961. In questionnaires, obviously, refugees look at their past experiences only in retrospect; their past may therefore be viewed through the matrix of their present attitudes. To this extent, letters written in the past may serve as a corrector.

We shall keep our comments to a minimum and let the letters tell the story. Only the main body of each letter is presented. Opening and closing sentences, etc., are omitted. When known, writer's occupation and approximate age are indicated. Letters written by fellow refugees while in camps will be presented first.
1. Life, attitudes, and aspirations of refugees while in camps. Letter from a young former Slovenian Chetnik:

Visiting your camp I have received a very good impression. I have seen how good and hospitable your boys are. By comparison, things looked very dark at C-camp [a Slovenian group with the British RAF unit in Southern Italy]. Although compared with men in C-camp we live in a very great misery, I would never exchange places with them.

In spite of poverty, group cohesion and a "higher moral level" were more appreciated by the above writer.

A former student of engineering comments on the value of employment which only very few refugees could obtain:

My salary is too small to deserve mentioning, yet I prefer hard work to the killing monotony of camp idleness.

From a young factory worker on the same topic:

You don't know how happy I am to have found a job in the hospital. My salary is, of course, so small that I spend it in no time. Then, during my free time, I walk around aimlessly, much like a blind man.

This refugee later obtained a better job in a different camp whence he writes:

Were it not for Eddie, I would live a completely solitary life, although, as you well know, I am never able to escape these crowds and have a little peace and privacy. So, however, Eddie and I make just enough money to go to the movies from time to time; that's how we spend 'the big money' we make during the day. We saw a number of beautiful films. At times, I am really enchanted and I forget everything. . .

The life of the unemployed majority (in our estimate over 80 per cent of refugees in Italian camps) was somewhat
closer to that of a former professional actor who describes it in the following words:

We all vibrate like a cord . . . as long as it holds. Of course, we do not want to break, yet we live in constant fear of breaking . . ., breaking like a cord which will never give a tune again.

In another letter he describes one of his roommates:

Before Easter [1948] he looked so terrible; his face was almost dark with blood, and he spoke something in a confusion of languages no one could understand. Now, he is a little better. All day long, he sits on his bed, staring aimlessly and never uttering a word. At times we manage to take him to the yard for a minute . . . . And there are others, Yanes, starting to behave in a similar manner. If we are not soon taken out of this camp, there will be a catastrophe.

The same actor "philosophizes" in his next letter:

A few days ago I read in a Viennese paper that there is no humiliation which could not be turned to further one's personal edification and maturation. But I ask you, Yanes, do not ripe apples fall from the trees and turn rotten on the ground if no one conserves them?

His next letter describes a welcome change:

Now, imagine, an opera singer joined us in our misery. A Georgian, he sings in a dramatic tenor German, Italian, French and Slavic pieces. What a change! We established a choir and now we are busy with rehearsals for a concert.

Yet, the new enthusiasm is short-lived. Few could listen and fewer could sing for long in his camp [somewhat below the average in Italy]. Next letter:

This Devil's Comedy makes me every day richer with sad experiences. Our story sounds very much like the story of that donkey which, we all know, dropped dead just after the gypsy taught him how to live without food. Such experiences may increase knowledge, but they break the strength of
any young man. . . Young people turn old in a matter of months, lose their ideals or, at best, they become cowards with a new philosophy of life: "Those who do evil, live better. I do not care any longer.
. . ." I try to say to myself: "Only once do you live; live at least then as well and as decently as you can!" You see, I am still the same old fool.

A letter from a 25 year-old tuberculosis patient, one of the many who later died from TB while in camps:

Our hospital is a modern building and looks very well. Yet, since there are also non-TB wards here, we are never allowed to go out of our ward. We live as in a jail from which there is only one escape. You know what I mean.

Some groups preserved and increased solidarity; others disintegrated. One group of refugees at T-camp built stone monuments for all eight Slovenian refugees who died in that camp, even though money was scarce even for buying supplementary bread. The following letter describes the last funeral:

All of us actively participated in this smallest funeral procession at T-camp. K., E., H., and myself carried the coffin; a beautiful wreath adorned with our Slovenian flag was carried by Z. and K.; and the last two members left, N. and V., carried a second wreath. So he lies there, poor M.! May he rest in peace!

A former graduate student of economics who was transferred to S-camp writes Yanes:

I am still the same Frank (Franci), of course, with one important difference: I have forgotten how to laugh. I resented to have turned so serious. Yet, is it strange to be serious after what we have suffered?
Encouragement and good advice is freely given:

Keep up, Yanes! Be as successful as ever! Show them, after you emigrate, what our people can do and become! Show them that we can be great in our culture and honesty!

From a former musician in the Y-court orchestra:

Go ahead, Yanes, and our entire nation will one day be proud of you! I could write much about what we whisper, yet I know you would not like this sort of talk. Be sure at least that I wish you all happiness and the highest success from the bottom of my heart. . . . And remember: one day we shall return to our Slovenia.

It seems that some popular refugees were at times idealized and others projected their own high hopes into the future of such symbols:

March on, our boy! All of us who know you will always support you. One day we shall work miracles in our fatherland.

Since refugees wanted originally to return home, they often had to idealize their new countries to make the thought of emigration bearable. Writes a former merchant who knew nothing of Canada (and later emigrated to Australia where he became mentally sick):

Closest to my heart is Canada. There, it seems to me, I would go as to my second home.

Some try to fight against illusions:

I do not know when the day of leaving our camp and starting new suffering will come; yet, I try to wait in cold blood. I fight against all illusions and I am ready for the worst.

And in another letter:

I will have to take any job and have no opportunity to study. The only thing that remains to me is to
accept life as it is—the few years that are still left. [He was about 25 years old when writing this letter!] Perhaps I will one day be happy enough to marry and establish a home. What more can I hope for after having lost so many years in camps?

Sometimes the news from the prospective new country helped to combat idealizations:

Your sponsor says that you will work in the foundry only five days a week. For the remainder, you will work on his farm and help him fix up his house. You don't have to know much carpentry, Yanes. There is also a college in the vicinity and you could take night courses.

And elsewhere:

I am sorry I had to give you such businesslike conditions. Yet, such is the life in America. There is no refugee spirit around here. This country, like most other countries, accepts no refugees; it accepts only workers.

And advice in the next letter:

You will have an opportunity to learn plenty. Yet, be careful never to sink in the cold waters of materialism and mechanized life! Go through the world with open eyes and never cease asking yourself: "Is this good or bad? Right or wrong?" Also ask yourself: "Would this work if transplanted to my country?" Think much! Your environment will probably not be inducive to thinking,—weigh your findings, write down your conclusions!

A barber, age about 27, writes before embarking:

Hard are these days, Yanes, and sadness is in my heart. All my thoughts of today are nothing but torture. Where do I go? Why? Is that why I waited, suffered, persevered for five years in camps in a foreign land? Is that why I was making plans, longing for my home, deceiving, indeed, with my letters my loved ones who waited for me to return and bring them freedom? Had I to take all this only to go farther away from my home, to go someplace where I never desired to go? To go there only to lose there my strength, the last that is good in
me, all that I treasure in my soul? To lose there perhaps even my faith in God and my love for our Slovenian nation? ... No, this must never happen, never! ... Enough of my oratory. So, I wish, Yanes, that we may meet once again at our festivals in Slovenia, appear there together with our drills on the horizontal bar, and, what is more important, work again, each to the best of his ability, for our ideals.

An architect expresses similar feelings:

Rendering each other a helpful hand, we must now go through the world, waiting patiently for the happy moment when, our stations of the cross being behind us, we shall return and give all our strength to our native country. The tiny group of our refugees must now produce new giants who will bring happier times than we ourselves had to our posterity.

A farmer writes:

I will never forget the moment when our train started to move and you waved to us for the last time. At once, our entire camp life lay before me, as on a screen. All friends, all hardships, all joys. I felt as if leaving my native home, my own family, Most of us felt this way. The home we built up from nothing in camps, was now breaking to pieces. Oh, God, may this our greatest sacrifice, our emigration, not be in vain for our beloved country!

The same farmer describes, a few weeks later, how he felt when the ship started to sail:

Here we were saying good-bye for the last time to Europe; Europe, in material ruins and ideological strife, how she filled us with sympathy! Then, in my soul I saw far behind the fading horizon also my suffering country. I heard how she exhorted us to create, while abroad, a reservoir of cultural strength for rebirth, rebirth that after so many sacrifices must follow! This gave me a feeling that I was not really leaving for good, that our departure was merely an extraordinary move made by the Almighty on the chessboard of our life.

And a letter from a dentist:

You cannot imagine how impatiently I wait to cross the ocean. I made up my mind and now I would like
to go immediately. I think I will have no quiet
time until the time when I see our ship sail.

2. Letters from Slovenia

From a friend of Yanes who chose repatriation rather
than emigration:

A few days after we parted, I reached my home. You
can never imagine how I felt when again in my native
land! How I felt when shaking hands with my child-
hood friends! I visited them one after another and
also some of those who were together with us in
Italian camps and are now at home. . . . I received
a good job in our county office. We often gather in
the shadow of our hills and enjoy ourselves singing
our beautiful songs. . . . Otherwise, everything is
almost as it used to be; cherished customs of our
people do not change.

Another refugee who returned:

Only one thing I beg you: do not consider me wicked,
because I returned! Such judgment on your part would
hurt me greatly. Though four years have elapsed
since we parted, I never had such a good friend again.
. . . Soon after I came home, I visited your mother.
She complained you don't seem quite to believe her
that she is in good health. Indeed, Yanes, she looks
fine. Everything is fine, they only miss you. . . .
I finished technical school in the meanwhile and am
now a metallurgical technician in the foundry of C.,
less than twenty miles from your home. Often, we
organize excursions. We all miss you, Yanes.

A short letter from a former fellow-member in a youth
drill organization:

I wish, Yanes, only that you may always remain
faithful to your ideals and may God bless you and
keep you always in the best of spiritual and bodily
health!

A former high school mate who fought with communist
partisans writes after twelve years of separation:

How many times I think of the happy years we spent
together at the classical high school in M. ! Last
time, I met several of our classmates in Ljubljana [Lyooblyana]. You don't know how strange one feels meeting them after so many years. Before they were children, now they are mature and experienced men.

... M. finished agronomy; T. (adolescens) completed slavistics and is now professor; Z. finished geodesy and is very prominent in his field; S. studies medicine; G. practices medicine in M.; P. took over his father's farm; C. studies philosophy in Rome; M. teaches at high school in B.; our second "little girl" Z. practices medicine there and is married to a doctor; S. is a detective; K. is an active officer; S. studies in London; J. was killed on the front; V., mobilized by partizans, was killed in guerilla fighting.

In another letter the same classmate, now a paymaster in a foundry, describes a scene as follows:

One of my best friends suffered from cancer. Two weeks before his death we were in his room—his parents, brothers, sisters, and myself. Then one of his sisters read your letter to him. He listened, then he started to cry: "Send to this your friend a little of our Carinthia, so he will not long for his country so hopelessly! I do not know him, yet he sure must be a good boy to be capable of such love for his country..." This scene of a young boy on his deathbed, who in no danger or hardship of guerilla fighting ever cried a single tear but was now crying for someone whom he never saw was so moving that all of us soon cried with him.

A young priest, temporarily vice-rector of an Italian college, a recognized linguist, poet, painter, and sculptor, writes from Rome:

How incomprehensible are the ways of God! Eight years ago we were present together, at the risk of our lives, at the underground meeting at S. Now, at midnight again, I am listening to the waterfalls at St. Peter's forum. Listening and thinking of you, and of all Slovenian youth. Long will I sit here and look at the stars tonight. Will they give me an answer?
A young high school student writes from Slovenia:

You went so far away from home. Time stormed ahead and you have perhaps already forgotten little Yanko, only twelve years old when you last saw him. For my part, I very often think of you and, while sorry for you, I admire you. You must have seen plenty! You have torn the shining mask from the hypocritical face of the world. You admired the glow of human creativeness. Yet, certainly, you were not happy. Away from the homeland and never hearing a Slovenian word—how could one ever be happy?

A former friend, now a seminarian, contemplates:

Is it not true that once so joyful Yanes has now become serious? Your many experiences guide you to the goal of becoming worthy to sacrifice yourself completely for others; this is the program of your life. And in this precisely is all beauty, in this all greatness of man: that he does not build everything around his little ego, but sacrifices himself completely for others. To obtain this goal you will have to struggle, to fight hard against all obstacles but in your way.

A girl business administration student:

Many times I have heard how the world has corrupted immigrants. Is this true? My mother often told me about my uncle. He went to America when he was only twenty years old. He was then well-bred, but he soon forgot all instructions of his aged mother. I simply cannot understand this. Is it really so easy to forget one's home, one's mother, one's native land? From your letters I see all but this. And this is why I hold you in esteem.

A young mechanic, tired of communism, writes rhetorically:

Fight ye against the wolf pretending to be a lamb; covered with flattery, yet filled with falsity! We brethren of the right hearts, together we shall stand and what is sacred to us all together we shall save!
A former fellow sabotage-group member writes Yanes from Slovenia:

We must now devote ourselves to the great task of creating a better future, if not for ourselves, at least for our posterity!

A seminarian advises:

Your duty is to learn all you can so that you may once render yourself useful to your suffering nation and our entire race. In this, you are not alone, even if foreigners don't understand you; your mother is with you and your friends, I among them.

An old peasant woman who knew the father of Yanes (now dead) writes:

You are now in a land of plenty, yet I know that you suffer and long for our hometown about which even songs say to be as beautiful as a paradise. Time will come when all wounds will heal and you will then return to your loved ones. We who are old will not be there to shake your hand, but I know you will visit us at the Hill of Trinity where there is also the grave of your father.

3. Letters from refugees in their new countries. A young housewife writes from Australia:

We have no old friends here; our only ties with old friends are letters which we exchange with each other. Here we do not look for new acquaintances any longer, since in all we have made so far, we have been disappointed. . . . How much happier you are in America; there are many Slovenes and you have strong organizations of your own.

A letter from a foundry worker in Montana:

I had a very nice Easter. Yenko's family visited me. Their son is a doctor and they bought a car already. Then we all took a long ride out in the country. We really had much fun. Besides, I visit almost every evening the [Slovenian] family G. I live only a few steps away. I work in the foundry here and I make good money. The only trouble is
they take so much away for income tax, because I am single. So I started to think about marriage.

A refugee priest describes a former young economist, a very good sportsman, a dance teacher at T-camp, who could not adjust in Argentina:

Perhaps you know already the story about R. In ill health and sensitive, working together with rather rude workers, he at times heard them say: "Te mato—I will kill you!" which for them was just another phrase. These words hurt R. immensely and sounded always in his ears, until he perhaps started to take them seriously. Obviously, he could not tolerate this crude environment any longer. One day, on his way to work, he cut his veins. Lying at the edge of the road, he was found there by J. [another refugee], surrounded by a crowd of onlookers. They took him to a mental hospital where, though capable of thinking clearly, he now suffers.

From another refugee from Argentina:

Although I have everything I need, not once was I happy in this country.

A former high school teacher, now a hospital maid, writes from an American city:

Although in a way it is nice here, many times I cannot help crying: "Oh, our beloved beautiful home, oh, our sweet Slovenian language! How it hurts to see my children cannot learn in our Slovenian language! I always hope and pray that God may lead us back where we belong, to our Slovenia.

From a refugee priest from California (while Yanes was still in camp):

You can hardly conceive, Yanes, how terrible is the life in a foreign land where you don't have one single soul that could understand you. A young person who is still in good health and strong can perhaps take it. A person, however, who had to go through such life experiences as you is too weak and too tired for new struggles. If alone and surrounded by a materialistic world, you will find it too hard to realize
your ideals. When you don't succeed, you may be too disappointed and you may lose your zeal for work.

In 1950 when there were in Australia relatively few Slovenes, some found good friends among other Slavs:

During my one-week vacation I went to the city of St. George to visit my Polish friends there. For my feast day they organized a party and we all had a very good time.

From a mining engineer in an American city:

Today our daughter is only eleven days old and she smiles already. You don't know what fun we all have with her! Yes, so it is when you are a father. I tell you, Yanes, if you only knew everything I know today, you would at once leave your studies, come here, and establish a family. And this I wish you from the bottom of my heart.

In another letter:

Of nothing do you think but your studies and politics! Why don't you change, you will never be sorry! Come to our city! Here you will marry, build a house next to mine (right now a lot is still free) and I will at least have a good neighbor.

A young accountant observes from Argentina:

Lower class persons always put material things first, and ideal second, if at all. Where and when the question of one's love for one's native country is raised, they rationalize it away with economic realism.

From a high school student in Minnesota:

I have been so desperately busy: graduation, work at the farm, our Slovenian student paper. . . . Yet, I am happy to be busy; otherwise I feel lonely and don't know where to turn, since I have no Slovenian friends here. With American boys, however, it is hard to associate; we have no interests in common.
A Slovenian merchant writes from Australia:

Every nation accepts immigrants with one goal in mind: to assimilate them the soonest possible. Yet, a man of character will remain what he was born or else he has no character. He should respect the country which accepted him—not as a human being indeed but as a part of the needed labor force—and he should work hard and honestly. Yet, is it not for ever true that we are sons of Slovenian mothers and of one mother common to us all, our Slovenia?

A Slovenian refugee priest from Illinois:

Almost everybody here goes through fires of all sorts of suspicions. They are not able to understand idealism, altruism, premarital chastity. These are two entirely different worlds. The best thing is to suffer patiently and do what one believes is best. No one can swim for the rest of his life against the stream and there is nothing we could change.

From Buenos Aires:

There are every day fewer idealists among us; everybody rushes headlong into this crude materialism and no one does anything to save us from death. [Materialism is thought of as spiritual death.]

A former auditor from Cleveland:

Doctor R. had a very good lecture on the theme "Slovenia and Europe." Do you know how many attended? One dozen, exactly one dozen! The dollar now is their god!

Another letter from a metal shop worker, Cleveland:

We must really thank God for having crossed the ocean. Now it is up to us to help ourselves and each other to get ahead, and this will be every day easier. . . . How much did you sacrifice for many a refugee, often also for myself, and I did nothing in return as yet. So, Yanes, if you come to Cleveland, with us you have free room and board whenever you want and as long as you wish to stay. We must help each other or life will never be better.

Help in practice:

A. told me they took cast off your wrist and you will still be unable to work for a while. So I
thought you could probably use some extra money. Here I enclose $15, all I have at home right now. When I go to the bank on Friday, I will call on you and bring you some more. Forgive me because I did not visit you during the last week. After the shift, I always worked with the parents of my girl helping them to fix their house.

Next letter from Argentina:

We established a company here: J., V., and myself. We are building houses. We made one for the parents of J.'s wife first and we now have free room and board there. Everybody comes to help in the evening and a house is built in no time. When he builds, everybody helps him. In Lanus they built an entire settlement "Villa Eslovena" that way.

A girl who was expelled by Nazis to Serbia when only seven years old and fled communists in 1945 when eleven, writes from Argentina:

With greatest joy we have received your books and we all thank you for them. I greatly enjoyed reading everyone of them. Whenever I read Slovenian books I recall our Slovenia and all our sufferings since 1941. Then I say, what a miracle that we are still alive and in good health!

A former industrialist writes from Canada:

By now I am saved from my one-year long contract. The first thing I did was to move to Toronto. The only job I could this far find here is washing dishes, but yesterday I attended for the first time the singing rehearsals of a Slovenian choir and I felt happy for the first time.

A former army officer who graduated in pharmacy while a refugee in Italy writes from California:

Mr. B. and I have finally reached San Francisco. Yet, it seems to us we should have stayed in Europe. We could find no work this far. Very probably we shall clean toilets.
Five weeks later:

I have just found work in a chemical laboratory here where I work three days a week. For the time being it is O.K. But I will have to go to school again, since they don't recognize my diplomas. And before I can go to school I must learn more English and save money. I often feel sorry I did not go to England where they offered me a job as a chemist.

A year and a half later:

I just finished my first six units in America. I sure was very busy with work and study. But I must take 18 more units to get my license. So, you see, while at home I could already retire here I am still going to school. I am very disappointed with American students; they are egocentric and vulgar to the extreme and so very vain.

From a young student of engineering in New Jersey:

Last semester I worked ten hours a day and six days a week, since they were in need of my work and I was in need of their money. From factory I had to rush straight to school three times a week. When I came home I truly could not start studying until everybody in the building was in bed; noise always disturbed me. However, I am not losing my zeal. On the contrary, my studies are a true consolation and a source of satisfaction to me. I am not discouraged by the fact that I will have to live like this for four more years to get a poor Bachelor in Engineering degree.

A similar letter from Argentina:

I have started to study all anew. During the day I work as a bricklayer and in the evening I go to school. Twice a week four hours and once two hours. Three times weekly I have singing rehearsals since we are soon going to give a concert. Even on Sundays there is much to do; I just don't know where to start. I will have to give up something. Not my girl and not the school! So it will have to be singing, right after the concert.

From a student of aviation engineering in West Germany:

I could not play violin with my stiff fingers right now, but I have sold it anyhow. Nevertheless, I
must confide to you that I am very proud of these my hands now; no one who thinks manual work is the only true work could ever say again that we students are good for nothing.

A Slovenian refugee student writes from Madrid:

We live here in the Santiago College which was established especially for refugee students. Every nationality group lives together. At the moment, there are twelve Slovenian students left. We get everything we need at the refugee campus free while no tuition is charged to refugees by the university. They also give us small regular amounts of pocket money for our personal needs. Natives are very hospitable; they would never offend or hurt a foreigner. We do everything we can to make them better acquainted with our history, literature, customs, and, above all, with our songs. Many times we sing on radio. Many of our articles appear in the Spanish press. Next week we are going to Granada skiing. We sure shall get to know Spain very well.

A student from New York about an old immigrant:

Yes, he talked to me all the time about his son. For fifteen years he attends school already, imagine! He is now at a very high school, very, very high, indeed, the highest school that there is which one can enter only after twelve full years of study! I asked him whether he was at a university and he looked at me so unbelievably, then he remarked approvingly that I have learned plenty already.

The same student about a happier experience:

A singer from Brooklyn was announced here on the program, then in the last minute she informed them that she could not come. Then someone got the idea to invite me to play two or three pieces on the piano instead. Well, I played three pieces. You cannot imagine how enthusiastic they were! Articles followed in the local paper and I was presented with a piano, used indeed, but still good. I am so happy since now I can play at home once in a while and, besides, since that day they have accepted me in the community.
About a large family in Cleveland:

They are very industrious. All of them work. They bought a new house for $17,000 here and they have another one in Minnesota.

From a Slovenian school teacher in Cleveland:

In an old paper, I have found a fragment from Duma which the Slovenian poet Zužepič dedicated to Slovenian immigrants. This fragment was translated into English by Ivan Zorman, an older Slovenian immigrant here. Of course, it is much weaker in English than in the original, but I thought you would probably like it. Here it is:

Their backs and shoulders are as strong as cliffs;
their necks (a load, 0 tyrant you can place thereon)
will carry all and will not bend.
Their hearts love peace and they are stout;
their pride is without words:
as if they were not born of mothers
but from the mountain crags had issued forth.
Into the world they go, and foreign countries boast
of their hands' work and skill.
There— in America, there— in Westphalia
they're lost to us, beyond the reach of sight.

Where art thou, native land? Here in these fields
beneath Triglav? Among the Karavanke?
'Midst furnaces and in the mines
beyond the Ocean—thou who hast no bounds?
There was a time I wished that thou wouldst broaden forth,
expand and broaden o'er the world,
and lo! 'tis plain that boundless thou hast grown:
like seeds thou scatterest into distance all thy breed.

Wilt thou, like swallows, tempt them home again?
Wilt thou, like doves, unite them 'neath thy roof?
Or will they, once beguiled by might and glory
of foreign lands, no more return to thee?

Where are thou, native land? Here in these fields
beneath Triglav? Among the Karavanke?
'Midst furnaces and in the mines
beyond the Ocean—thou who hast no bounds?

I apprehend and feel thee. Ah, the poet's dream
for many a year has hovered over thee,
watching, listening, weeping, hoping
thy secret to disclose.
The oyster, deep within the sea, its pain intense into a gem has gathered.
Oh poet's heart, what's gathering in thee?
Oh poet's heart--it is thy pain.

It describes our situation well, does it not, Yanes?
We really don't know where is our native land.
Scattered all over the world but only in small fragments. Immigrants--at home everywhere and nowhere.
We have been under pressure as if the Ocean pressed on us. But when this "oyster" is opened, what do we find, Yanes? It's merely--pain.

* * *

It should be remembered that the letters here presented were written during the years immediately after the war or during the first years after refugees settled in their new countries. The letters therefore refer to a period of greater homesickness than it would be true of refugees at the present time. In the meanwhile, a considerable transformation of feelings and attitudes probably took place, since refugees have by now established themselves in their new countries to a much greater extent; they have probably reached the average economic level of natives or even surpassed it; and the New World is more and more becoming also their new home as it will be revealed by chapters that follow.
CHAPTER III

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SLOVENIAN
REFUGEES IN AMERICA

1. Cultural Background

The Slovenes are the smallest westernmost Slavic people. Because of their small numbers and century-long subjugation to larger states, they have been little known outside of Europe, with the exception of, perhaps, a very narrow circle of specialists.

In "far-away" America, not only the Slovenes but Slavs in general seem to have been relatively "unknown" and subject to misconceptions and misrepresentations. In 1906, the United States Immigration Commissioner included among the Slavs also Roumanians, Lithuanians, and Hebrews.¹ Slavs often became a common denominator for less known and, at times, supposedly less assimilable peoples.

Less known peoples are ready subject for spectacular generalizations. L. G. Brown, for instance, quotes Sicilian peasants who say they "cannot learn because they are

contadini and their heads are too thick to learn letters." Then he generalizes: "This is the general attitude among the first generations from Southern and Eastern Europe." In truth, the attitudes of Sicilian peasants are not even representative of Italians let alone of all Southern and Eastern Europe. Pupin who originates from Serbia tells us how his peasant mother exhorted him to learn, saying to him that "knowledge is the light which illumines our path."  

A certain Vrčarić found himself widely quoted after he confessed to W. I. Thomas that among the South Slavs "every married man strikes his wife black and blue at least once a month, or spreads a box on the ear over her whole face, or else people are likely to say that he is afraid of his wife."  Pupin, however, although from a South Slavic home, gives an opposite picture. His father who was a peasant community leader was often willing "to abide by the decision" of Pupin's mother. This writer is familiar with South Slavic communities in Cleveland, Chicago, Toronto,


5Pupin, op. cit., p. 13 ff.
Montreal, etc., as well as with those in the old country; yet he cannot remember ever seeing a single woman "black and blue" from blows by her husband. It is highly probable that the practice is not more widespread than among other peoples, if at all.

Slav immigrants have been described as having "dull minds" and little interest in education and, of course, small reputation for capacity. Yet the Polish ethnic organizations alone support at least five colleges in America, in addition to over 550 elementary schools and 70 high schools. Fraternal organizations have special fees for education which are generally approved and paid by members. Slavic names are also found on "purely" American faculties and in the student bodies, even if we disregard such noted immigrant inventors as Pupin and Tesla or such world-renowned artists as sculptor Ivan Meštrović.

South Slavic "proverbs" have been widely quoted such as, "One man is worth more than ten women." No specific national origin of "proverbs" is indicated; a boasting joke

---


by an individual or the "honest" conviction of a mountain village would hardly become a common proverb of all South Slavs, especially since languages differ. Among the Slovenes perhaps the most widely spread proverb, used often as a compliment to housewives, is "Zena tri vogle podpira," which means, "A woman supports three corners of a home." Only one of the four "corners" is supported by the man. This is a compliment that refers primarily to the moral and educational importance of a woman as the most important person in the home. Mother's Days have long been celebrated throughout Slovenia with many performances, children's concerts and general festivals given in their honor; no Father's Day is celebrated. Slovenia, of course, is again not representative of other South Slavic peoples. But this precisely proves the point how unjustified are some of the mentioned generalizations.

H. G. Duncan reports that 86 per cent of Slovenes are illiterate and that the Slovenes have no literary language of their own. A "theory" is then developed to "explain" why are the Slovenes the least literate of the South Slavs. Unfortunately, however, the author who used somewhat old statistics confused literacy with illiteracy and thus presented the entire picture "upside down."

What are the facts in this regard? The oldest preserved records in Slovenian language were written around the year 1000 A.D., though they were probably composed even earlier. They are known as *Brižinski apomeniki* or, in German, as *Freising Manuscripts*. The first Slovenian books were printed by Primož Trubar in 1551. The Ljubljana (Lyooblyana) College which had the right to confer doctor's degrees was established (although later suppressed) in 1595. The first Slovenian publishing house in Ljubljana was founded by Janez Mandelc in 1575; an *Academia operosorum*, the first Slovenian Academy of Arts and Sciences, was set up in Ljubljana in 1693; *Academia philharmonicorum* was founded in 1701. The first Slovenian play was performed in Ljubljana in 1789; the first opera was sung in 1652.

De Bray, who also studied the Slovenian literature, gives us a somewhat different picture than Duncan about the actual literacy level in Slovenia. Says he: "Literacy in Slovenia reaches almost a hundred per cent of the population; and the general level of urban, rural, and domestic culture is high even by West European standards. Thanks to this

---


happy position the Slovenes have always enjoyed respect as a nation."\textsuperscript{12}

Although Slovenia lies in the Alps and closely resembles Switzerland, it has been, because of recent political ties with other South Slavs, often considered to be geographically, historically, and culturally a Balkan country. This misconception has been corrected by R. L. Wolff who points out: "Slovenia has a distinctly central European air. This is Alpine, not Balkan country."\textsuperscript{13}

Far from being 86 per cent illiterate and without a literary language, "the Slovenes used to share with the Scandinavians the reputation of being the best-read people in the world--the number of books read per head of the population was four times the British figure."\textsuperscript{14} "The publication of books in Slovenia is proportionately the highest in the world."\textsuperscript{15}

Politically, "it was manifestly impossible for a small people to gain and hold its freedom when surrounded


\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 187.
by acquisitive great powers, but the Slovenes determined to secure the greatest possible degree of home rule, and concentrated on cultural rather than political liberty."\textsuperscript{16}

The last available census shows 1,415,432 Slovenes living in Slovenia, the northernmost republic of Yugoslavia. Considerable Slovenian minorities remained under Austrian and Italian rule.\textsuperscript{17}

Slovenia is a predominantly industrial and tourist country; only 33 per cent of the population are employed in agriculture and this percentage is rapidly declining.\textsuperscript{18}

Roucek estimates that there are up to 400,000 Slovenes in America\textsuperscript{19} (with some 10,000 post-World War II refugees). While the large majority of immigrants from Slovenia arrived after 1880, a handful of Slovenes served in George Washington's Revolutionary Army. Around 1715, some twelve hundred Slovenian and Croatian settlers undertook cultivation of the silkworm in Georgia. The first nationally known immigrant from Slovenia is the missionary bishop Frederick Baraga, a Slovenian noble and scholar who sold his goods and spent the proceeds for the benefit of American Indians among

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 199.


\textsuperscript{19}Brown and Roucek, op. cit., p. 172.
whom he settled in 1831. He wrote a number of religious and ethnological books in several languages and also developed a Chippewa dictionary. Baraga and four of his Slovenian followers (Ignatius Mrak, Ivan Vertin, Jacob Trobec, and Ivan Stariha) became American Catholic bishops.

More recently, perhaps the best known immigrant from Slovenia is Louis Adamic, author of several books and a leading defender of pluralism in ethnic and racial relations. John Jager, the Slovenian-born "builder of Minneapolis," was one of America's foremost architects; he built in Slovenia, Austria, and even in China and came to America as a full-fledged architect. Francis Jager contributed to the development of bee culture. Matt Cvetič was popularized by the movies and the radio for his courage as "Communist for F.B.I." Mihael Lah is among the leading cartoon animators while Frank Lausche became known in politics. Anthony Schubel and Mary Udovich sang in the best European and American operas.20 Many additional names of Slovenes in industry, churches, art, agriculture, science, army, business, and politics should be added, but the subject will be more fully treated in a later study.

Generally, Slovenian ethnics in America seem to have retained their tradition of hard work, honesty (crime and

20 Cf. William Furlan, In Charity Unfeigned (St. Claud, 1952). See also Louis Adamic, A Nation of Nations (New York-London, Harper and Brothers, 1945), Ch. IX.
delinquency are almost nonexistent), and intensive cultural life. In Cleveland, the Slovenes, although not one of the largest ethnic groups, rank third among 50 ethnic groups in the (absolute) number of ethnic cultural institutions and activities. Several operas and operettas (mentioned because of the amount of cooperative effort and skill they require) are given each year in Slovenian in Cleveland and Chicago and occasionally also in other smaller Slovenian ethnic communities. Compositions by Slovenian ethnic composers (Zorman, Spengov, Renner, Milač) are included in some of these programs.

2. Characteristics of the Population Studied

In April and May, 1961, a 14-page questionnaire was mailed to 500 Slovenian refugees in the United States and Canada. Some questionnaires apparently failed to reach the addressees because of the change of address, etc. By the middle of August, 1961, 151 questionnaires were returned. Twenty-eight of them were completed by immigrants who came to America before the Second World War and were discarded. Eight questionnaires were too incomplete or


completed in an ambiguous manner and were, for this reason, not included in the present study. One hundred and fifteen questionnaires completed by Slovenian post-World War II refugees (to whom we shall from now on refer as respondents) provide the data on which the remainder of this dissertation is based.

Refugees of higher educational levels are over-represented among respondents. First of all, they were over-represented on the lists of addresses from which addresses were chosen at random. Second, since the questionnaire was somewhat long (partly for experimental reasons for the planning of future research, partly for the great value which each completed questionnaire possesses singly) it is probable that persons with higher education were better equipped with the necessary understanding and knowledge and therefore relatively more willing and capable as respondents.

The findings will be presented as much as possible in tabular form.

1. Age and sex. Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents is presented in Table 1.
Table 1. Frequency (f) and Percentage (%) by Age and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male f</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female f</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Total f</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85.26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although men are much more numerous among Slovenian refugees than women, it is possible that in our sample females are somewhat underrepresented.

2. Amount of Formal Education is shown in Table 2.
Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Highest Year of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|           | 98   | 85.26| 17   | 14.79| 115  |

Data from Table 2 are condensed by four-year intervals in Table 3.
Table 3. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Education Presented in Four-Year Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 27*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85.26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Knowledge of languages. Knowledge of languages reflects either additional study or culture contacts with persons who speak a different language. As such, it is an important characteristic of refugees.

Refugees were asked how many languages they can speak a little, how many fluently. Among languages spoken fluently, their Slovenian mother tongue was included. No language that was spoken fluently was, however, included among those spoken "a little." Where a refugee listed a language in both places, it was cancelled from the latter category. Ten refugees listed only languages which they speak fluently; in their case no language is listed as "spoken a little."

*Intervals over 20 years condensed.
For reading knowledge of languages, refugees were asked to write out those languages in which they ever read books, papers, or reviews. Slovenian is counted. For "writing" languages, those were to be enumerated in which the refugee can write letters to friends without the use of dictionary. Slovenian is included. Since the refugee can "get along" in those languages which he can speak fluently or at least a little, this last category is the sum (computed simply for each respondent) of the number of languages spoken fluently and those spoken a little.

Despite the fact that closely similar languages (Serbian and Croat or Czech and Slovak) were counted as one, respondents show a remarkable language proficiency. Most less educated Slovenes, while in Slovenia, could get along in two or three languages. Those Slovenes who completed high school (gymnasium) in their "old country" studied at least four obligatory languages. To the knowledge of previous languages English must be added and at times the language of the country were refugees spent several years in camps. Slovenes, as a small nation usually dependent on more powerful nations, have always highly valued knowledge of foreign languages (see Table 4).

If we should subdivide our data by educational intervals, and ask how many respondents get along in five or more languages, the answer would be for those under 8 years of education 37.50 per cent; for those having 9 to 12 years of
school 50 per cent; 13 to 16 years 68 per cent; 17 to 20 years 93.20 per cent; and for those with 20 or more years of formal education the answer is 100 per cent.

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Number of Languages Known

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Languages</th>
<th>Speaks Little f</th>
<th>Speaks fluently f</th>
<th>Reads f</th>
<th>Writes f</th>
<th>Gets along in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 8.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33 28.71</td>
<td>6 5.22</td>
<td>1 0.87</td>
<td>13 11.31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33 28.71</td>
<td>21 18.27</td>
<td>11 9.57</td>
<td>23 20.01</td>
<td>1 0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17 14.79</td>
<td>19 16.53</td>
<td>15 13.05</td>
<td>21 18.27</td>
<td>10 8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 13.92</td>
<td>26 22.62</td>
<td>23 20.01</td>
<td>24 20.83</td>
<td>18 15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 1.74</td>
<td>21 18.27</td>
<td>22 19.14</td>
<td>19 16.53</td>
<td>22 19.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 1.74</td>
<td>12 10.44</td>
<td>14 12.18</td>
<td>11 9.57</td>
<td>22 19.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 0.87</td>
<td>8 6.96</td>
<td>10 8.70</td>
<td>4 3.48</td>
<td>14 12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 1.74</td>
<td>9 7.83</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>9 7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>5 4.35</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>9 7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>1 0.87</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>5 4.35</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>10 8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Marital status. One category needs explanation. Wherever marital status is listed as "separated" this means involuntary separation. For instance, the refugee is here, while his wife is still in Slovenia. There is only one divorce (the only divorced Slovenian refugee known to this writer), and it was between a Slovenian refugee and a Dane.
Table 5. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the group of the spouse whom the respondent married. Older respondents married other Slovenes in Slovenia. While abroad, Slovenian refugees married Slovenian refugees, then Slovenian "old" immigrants (which in this case means those that came to America before the Second World War); members of other ethnic groups in America followed. The category "other" includes spouses of some European nationality, Spanish, German, Italian, or French.

Only about 13 per cent of respondents married outside of their nationality group. The further away from the Slovenian national group, the smaller degree of intermarriage.
Table 6. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Nationality or Ethnic Group of the Spouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of Spouse</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian married in Slovenia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian refugee</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian—&quot;old&quot; immigrant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Year of Arrival in America is shown in Table 7. The largest number of respondents came to America or Canada in 1949. By the end of 1952, slightly over 73 per cent, or almost three-fourths of respondents, arrived in their new countries. When completing the questionnaires, a large majority of refugees had been in the New World eight years or longer.

*Two separated respondents are included.
Table 7. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Year of Arrival in America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Arrival</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

ADJUSTMENT

1. Economic Adjustment

1. Occupations. Occupations in which respondents were employed in 1961 have been classified as manual, semi-professional and professional. Placement in one category or another may occasionally be arbitrary. Since, however, all occupations will be listed, readers may be able to readjust the classifications according to their preference or need.

Table 8. Frequency and Percentage (of All Respondents) Distribution in Manual Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factory work</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 9. Frequency and Percentage Distribution in Semi-Professional Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draftsmen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Agents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Technicians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade School teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.92</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Frequency and Percentage Distribution in Professions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College professors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate broker and attorney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitor's clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Main Occupational Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-professional</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Vertical occupational mobility. Occupational categories were compared at three reference points: occupation (if any) before the war in Slovenia; first occupation in America and occupation in America in 1961. Students who are still studying and those who had completed their studies in America and received an employment on a level corresponding to their educational qualifications were included among the upward mobile.

Table 12. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Vertical Occupational Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always manual</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always professional</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always semi-professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up mobile</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down mobile</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up and down</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only 44.37 per cent of respondents remained always in the same broad occupational category; the remainder, however, was mobile. There was also a great deal of horizontal mobility which was apparently even more common than vertical mobility.

3. Respondents' evaluation of occupational treatment. The respondents were asked to check how they were treated in occupations during their first year in the New World and in 1961 in comparison with natives of about the same ability. Their evaluations appear in Tables 13 and 14.

Table 13. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Evaluation of Occupational Treatment During the First Year in the New World

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of treatment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much better than natives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly better</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse than natives</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had no chance at all</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Evaluation of Occupational Treatment in 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of treatment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much better than natives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly better</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse than natives</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had no chance at all</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Economic security and standard of living. Respondents were asked to "write out" where they felt economically more secure— in Slovenia before the war or in the New World. Their answers appear in Table 15.

Table 15. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Evaluation of Economic Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Security</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater in New World</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater in Slovenia</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know, depends</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer (and too young)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Evaluation of Standard of Living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard of Living</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher in New World</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher in Slovenia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know, depends</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Acquisition of property. Of the items listed, houses, furniture, books, typewriters, and radios (although radios to a lesser extent) were frequently owned in Slovenia. The ownership of other items (cars, televisions, washing machines) was almost nonexistent before the war although, during the last two years (1960-61), Slovenian cities began to report parking problems.¹

Table 17. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Home Ownership in Slovenia and America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned home in Slovenia</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own home in America</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Various Items Owned in 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car: yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television: yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio: yes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>89.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriter: yes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing machine: yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 books or more: yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 49 books: yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Personality and Social Adjustment**

In the remainder of this chapter, various areas of opinions, "judgments," and attitudes that are relevant for personality adjustment and for social adjustment will be explored. Selection of such areas is arbitrary and does, therefore, never lend itself perfectly to generalizations about a respondent's or a group's total adjustment. Should other areas be chosen, or the number of areas increased or decreased, the generalizations would probably change while adjustment certainly would not. For this reason we prefer to view each area separately.

We shall begin with predispositions toward Americans and America (which should mean Canadians and Canada for respondents from Canada). If, for instance, someone says his attitudes were too negative before his arrival this also means that he has developed more positive attitudes toward natives or his new country; if too idealized, this also means, "I am disappointed at the present."

Not everybody, of course, thinks of exactly the same thing when the same term is used. "America" may be viewed geographically and physically by some (skyscrapers, slums, parks and fields; washing machines and cars). To others it may appear primarily as a constellation of social, moral, and political values. It seems likely, however, that whatever one sees under the term "America" is subjectively most
important to him and therefore most indicative of his attitudes.

Table 19. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Attitudes Toward Americans before Arrival in America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes toward Americans</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly idealized</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little too favorable</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little too negative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much too negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer (and too young)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Attitudes Toward America before Arrival in America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes toward America</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly idealized</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little too favorable</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little too negative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much too negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer (and too young)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, the degree of agreement with the statement, "In America it is a handicap to be of Slovenian parentage," was measured. The degree of agreement would tend to reveal
whether or not respondents think that Americans are prejudiced, or resort to discriminations, merely because the refugees are of Slovenian origin. "Failures" are perhaps less likely to be among the respondents; to the extent that they are, they may, however, be inclined to blame American "prejudiced" attitudes toward their minority group.

Table 21. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Degrees of Agreement with Statement, "In America it is a handicap to be of Slovenian parentage"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several years of camp life, frequent unfamiliarity with the language and customs of the new country, conflicts in social and moral evaluations, the lack of any economic

---

and financial resources, etc., make the study of relative social ease in America of special interest.

Table 22. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Degrees of Social Ease during First Month in America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At ease</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more with Slovenes than Americans</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little more with Slovenes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same with either group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much more with Americans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Degrees of Social Ease in 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At ease</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more with Slovenes than Americans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little more with Slovenes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same with either group</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little more with Americans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much more with Americans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next, respondents were asked to check whether they became more or less nervous, social (sociable), and happy while in America. Answers appear in tables 24, 25, and 26.

**Table 24. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Changes in "Nervous ness" While in America**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nervous</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained about the same</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat less</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 25. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Changes in General Sociability While in America**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained about the same</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat less</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Changes in Happiness While in America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained about the same</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat less</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At last, respondents were asked to evaluate their adjustment to the American way of life. The range of answers was from very good to very poor. All answers are, of course, always "as perceived" or "conceived" by respondents; they mirror their subjective attitudes. But it is through such attitudes that refugees experience their own selves and their external environment.
Table 27. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Evaluation of Adjustment to American Way of Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So ... so</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the 1960 census data on general distribution of property in the United States are, at the time of this writing, not yet available for comparison, it seems safe to say that economic adjustment of respondents has been very high. Personality and social adjustment shows progress in some areas and deterioration in other fields. A substantial number of respondents think they have "remained the same" (as before coming to America); many report some improvement and many some deterioration. While over 80 per cent of respondents felt more at ease with their Slovenian compatriots than with Americans during their first month in America, most respondents felt equally at ease in American company in 1961. Forty-five per cent have become more "nervous" while in America and about one-third "remained the same." Almost one-third of respondents think they are happier in America.
than (they had been) in Europe and only one-fourth believe they are less happy in the New World. Everything considered, about two-thirds of respondents think that their "over-all" adjustment to the American way of life has been good or very good.
CHAPTER V

ASSIMILATION

Our concept of assimilation has been thoroughly developed in Chapter I. In the light of our analysis, various areas which will be here presented are not per se indicative of assimilation. They may be viewed as prerequisites or tools of assimilation in American society; these prerequisites may or may not lead to the development of reciprocal identifications. Yet, since as prerequisites they are, in American culture, practically indispensable for the development of reciprocal identifications, the progress in the acquisition of such prerequisites may be considered as a basis on which identifications may gradually develop.

As we shall see at the end of this chapter, many respondents already identify themselves in some respects (e.g., culture) and to some extent with Americans. Since the identification is not yet habitual and unreserved (and may not measure up to American expectations) and since we are unfamiliar with the extent to which Americans think of refugees as of their full-fledged fellow-Americans, the chapter should not lead to over-generalization on assimilation of respondents. Our findings should rather be viewed
"area-wise" in the realization that only a limited view of only certain aspects of assimilation has been obtained.

1. **Language.** The extent of knowledge of English on arrival in America will be presented in Table 28 and the extent of knowledge in 1961 in Table 29.

**Table 28.** Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Knowledge of English on arrival in America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just workable</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient (or none)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 29.** Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Knowledge of English in 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite good</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just workable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 30 and 31 show in what proportion English and Slovenian were spoken during the first year in America and in 1961.

**Table 30.** Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Proportion of English and Slovenian Spoken During the First Year After Arrival in America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English mostly, some Slovenian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian mostly, some English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian only</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 31.** Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Proportion of English and Slovenian Spoken in 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English mostly, some Slovenian</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian mostly, some English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The language which one speaks "only" or "mostly" is not necessarily the language of his choice. Someone who lives far away from his Slovenian fellow-immigrants speaks "English only," even though he may wish to speak Slovenian. Thus we have with regard to the English language at least three important variables which need not coincide: knowledge of English; English actually spoken; and English by preference. Those who consider English itself as a reliable indicator of Americanization seem to neglect, in addition to the crucial importance of reciprocal identifications, also that they would get three different degrees of assimilation depending on which of the three variables they chose.

Our next question was, What language (or what combination of languages) would a refugee speak if this depended merely on his free choice and would in no way affect his life chances. Answers appear in Table 32.

Comparing the data of Table 31 (actual frequencies) with those of Table 32 (preferred frequencies) we notice a tendency toward more equal use of both languages; no one wants to speak "English only" and only a little over 5 percent "English mostly" (although over 40 per cent have to do so); over one-fourth of all respondents wish to speak Slovenian mostly or Slovenian only, although less than one-eighth actually can do so. Research which considers the English language as the most important and reliable indicator
of assimilation in America will have to count with such variations.

Table 32. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Preferred Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Preferred</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English mostly, some Slovenian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian mostly, some English</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Association. With whom did Slovenian refugees associate during their first year in America? Table 33 answers this question.

Table 33. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Association During First Year in America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association With</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovences only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovences mostly</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty - fifty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans mostly</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans only</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary - isolated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Association in 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association with</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenes only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenes mostly</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty - fifty</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans mostly</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary - isolated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as in the case of language, actual and preferred (or desired) frequencies are juxtaposed. Note that the discrepancy between actual and preferred frequencies also indicates a certain maladjustment since, in social relations, one cannot act according to his preference. Not only is in this way the indiscriminate use of indicators of assimilation corrected; an additional perspective is also obtained for research on adjustment.

For discrepancies between actual and preferred (desired) frequencies of association compare Table 34 with Table 35.
Table 35. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Preferred Association in 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Preferred With</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenes only</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenes mostly</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty - fifty</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans mostly</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary - isolated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Affections. Do the refugees have a greater affection for their old country or for the new one? Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of their agreement with the statement, "My love for Slovenia is greater than (my love) for America." See Table 36.

Table 36. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Degrees of Agreement with Statement, "My Love for Slovenia is Greater than (My Love) for America"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does greater love of Slovenia preclude love of America? Do the respondents think they love America just as much as native Americans do? Answers are given in Table 37.

**Table 37. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Degrees of Agreement with Statement, "I love American just as much as native Americans do"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although about two-thirds of respondents are convinced they love Slovenia more than America, slightly over a half also believe that their love for America equals that of native Americans.

Refugees, unlike economic immigrants, left for political, ideological or "survival" reasons. If there was freedom again in Slovenia, what would Slovenian refugees do? Where would they prefer to live? See Table 38.

Although one may emotionally prefer life in his native country, after having settled in America, achieved a higher material standard of life, and after having, in many
### Table 38. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Degrees of Agreement with Statement, "I would rather live in a free Slovenia than in America"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cases, children "brought up" in an American environment, how many refugees plan actually to return should Slovenia be free again?

### Table 39. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Intention to Return to Live in Slovenia if the Latter is Liberated and Democratic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would Return</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certainly</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost certainly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the "undecided" elaborated: "It depends when liberation would take place. Now or in thirty years?" "I may want to go, but if my children wanted to stay here, I could not live so far away from them." "If I would still find everything the way I left, I would go; but suppose my house is in ruins? Should I go to live there?" "The pension policy would decide. I could not go if I was not eligible for a pension." "I just don't know. I am attracted to both countries. Some things I like better here, others at home. Would have a hard time to decide," etc.

4. Political loyalties. An overwhelming majority adopted American or Canadian citizenship as soon as possible. A small number of refugees have not been in the New World five years yet, but they, too, plan to apply for citizenship when eligible.

Table 40. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Number of Years in America before Adoption of American Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years in America</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

115

*Children of citizens from Slovenia.
**Soldiers in Korea.
Only 3 of 115 respondents had no intention, in 1961, of becoming American citizens. All three have not been in America five years yet.

Would refugees be loyal to America in a crisis such as a new war? See Table 41.

Table 41. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Degrees of Agreement with Statement, "If there was a war, I would do my best to help America win"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one disagrees. Says he, "Why should I? Americans sold Slovenia at Yalta to communists. They never tried out anything like we did. Let them go through the same hell I did, themselves, then they'll understand better." Among undecided, two pointed out that it would depend against whom was America fighting; one remarked he was too tired of wars and "had too much of it"; he would try to pull out of it as much as he could.

How do the respondents judge American political maturity?
Table 42. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Degrees of Agreement with Statement, "Americans are politically more mature than Slovenes"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Nationality and culture. The respondents were asked to check what was their nationality and their culture. Results appears in Tables 43 and 44.

Table 43. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Stated Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>94.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Slovenian, partly American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note here that, while the majority of respondents consider themselves American by citizenship, all but six think that their nationality can be nothing but Slovenian. Recall our discussion in Chapter I under the subtitle "Adjustment, Assimilation, and Ethics."
Table 44. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Slovenian, partly American</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (European, Cosmopolitan, etc.)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have here three variables which have frequently been considered as main indicators of assimilation. By citizenship Slovenian refugees are overwhelmingly "Americanized," by culture only partly, and by nationality not at all. How dangerous would it have been to generalize from either variable alone!

6. Americanization. At last, respondents marked to what degree they considered themselves Americanized. This, as a generalized identification, is, in our opinion, the only true indicator. It is circumscribed, however, since this identification is apparently not yet habitual, since it is not unreserved (i.e., other aspects come to the foreground which seem to "counter" Americanization, e.g., nationality). It is, of course, also only one of the two needed reciprocal identifications. The extent to which the
refugee is habitually and unreservedly thought of as an American should also be known. At the moment, there are, apparently, still considerable "reservations" since the assimilation process had lasted hardly a decade.

Table 45. Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Degrees of Self-Appraised Americanization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Americanization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Americanized</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More American than Slovenian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About fifty - fifty</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Slovenian than American</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely Slovenian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than 9 per cent of the respondents think of themselves as completely Slovenian, i.e., they alone fail to identify, at least when confronted with the question, with Americans. Almost one-third developed half-way identifications, and about one-twelfth stronger identifications with Americans than with the Slovenes. Forty per cent of respondents think of themselves as partly Americanized, although their identifications with the Slovenes are still stronger.
CHAPTER VI

OBSERVATIONS

At the end of a dissertation, the question, "What more do we know now?" may well be asked. The writer would, of course, prefer that this question be answered by those who may read the dissertation (and he would expect a continuum from "nothing" to "something"). But he is also pressed to express his own concluding observations on some of the main points of this study.

Our first rule was not to accept any concept or definition "on authority" of a scientist or of a "school." A deep sense of indebtedness and a feeling of "intellectual piety" do not justify uncritical adoption of whatever is not scientifically tenable. Our debt to men who with great labor and perseverance sought for the truth is best paid by our own search for the truth. Adopting this rule, we found, for instance, that many concepts of adjustment and assimilation were untenable. We tried to "fill in the gaps," wherever we have discovered them and to develop new concepts, especially a new concept of assimilation.

A relatively large part of the study was devoted to conceptual analysis, since concepts are of crucial importance
for both ethnic theory and research. When, for instance, ethical and sociological adjustments are confused and when Americanization is conceived of merely as a process of democratization, such vagueness and ambiguity of concepts will necessarily be reflected in ethnic theory and research. The "assimilability myth," the popular version of which was first attacked by Professor Berry, illustrates, whenever incorporated into scientific texts without criticism and challenge, one of the consequences for ethnic theory. Oversimplifications in scoring and multiplying supposed indicators of assimilation reflect the consequences of conceptual ambiguities in actual ethnic research. When such findings are further incorporated into ethnic theory, we are obviously moving in a vicious circle and ambiguities are bound to continue.

Let us take, for instance, the most "reliable" and perhaps the most universally "measured" indicator of Americanization (as a specific instance of assimilation)—the English language. By some investigators, knowledge of English was considered a reliable and valid measure of assimilation; by others, the relative amount or proportion of English spoken. It seems that little critical thought was given to the question which alternative would better indicate the degree of assimilation. And, were there no additional alternatives?
To establish the extent of differences among alternatives, we asked respondents, first, how well they knew English (English known); second, how much English did they speak in comparison with Slovenian (English spoken); and, third, how much English would they speak if the choice of languages was entirely free and would in no way affect their life chances (English preferred). We obtained astonishing differences: English known: 94 per cent of respondents; English spoken (more often than Slovenian): 40.89 per cent; English preferred (over Slovenian): 5.22 per cent. It becomes obvious that a researcher could, even with English alone, find in one case the same group of respondents as being among the most highly assimilated ethnic groups and in another case the same group could be proven as almost unassimilable—depending merely on which alternative was chosen as indicator! (And it seems to us that alternatives were seldom critically examined or seriously challenged.)

To illustrate the oversimplification of a considerable part of ethnic research, let us see how our respondents could be shown as a highly assimilable group, or as an almost unassimilable group, depending only on an almost imperceivable variation in indicators. If we took the following indicators: knowledge of the English language, naturalization, economic adjustment, political loyalty, and affection for America (as compared with that of natives), respondents would
seem to be among the most assimilable groups in America. And our indicators, if compared with much previous research, could hardly be challenged.

If, however, we chose the following indicators, preference for English or ethnic language, self-appraisal on nationality, participation in American social life, preference for life in a free America or in a free Slovenia, and relative increase or decrease in "nervousness" while in America, we would find the same ethnic group to be among the "definitely unassimilable" ethnic groups. Language alone would receive in the first case a value of 94 (or a corresponding score) and in the second case a value of 5.22! And we would have been studying, just as in the first case, important aspects of assimilation.

It seems that the discovery how findings could be quantified often became so intoxicating (or at least so convenient) that too little attention was paid to the fact what a tremendous difference it makes what is quantified. The variations found in our study should perhaps serve as a warning against uncritical acceptance of various "total assimilation scores" of the past ethnic research and against oversimplified "total assimilation research" in the future.

Various areas, processes, or subprocesses can and should be studied. But their relevance is limited; it cannot be generalized to "total assimilation" merely because
this is statistically feasible. Of course we wish to know what proportion of immigrants, for instance, knows English. This is important per se as well as for various other areas, e.g., employment, association with Americans, etc. But a high proportion of English knowledge does not per se justify a high assimilation score nor does it so in combination with citizenship and economic adjustment. Over a third of Slovenian refugee respondents had at least workable knowledge of English on their arrival in America; but they also knew several other languages. Obviously, one would not consider them at the same time also Germanized, Italianized, Americanized—and Slovenian, since the knowledge of their mother tongue persisted. Knowledge of a language may, but need not be a tool to be used for the purpose of assimilation. What can be said of English as the most widespread indicator of Americanization can obviously be said even with greater justification about other indicators, such as citizenship, economic adjustment, degrees of association with natives, etc.

It is hoped that our study has demonstrated that the widespread ethnic research by means of indicators, scores, and total scores of assimilation needs a serious reconsideration. On language alone we can get such greatly differing values as 94, 41, or 5. And apparently no serious question was raised as to the use of one alternative or another.
It has also been demonstrated in the course of this study that the final test of assimilation is the development of habitual, unreserved reciprocal identifications between minority and majority group members (immigrants and natives, Negroes and whites, Indians and "immigrants," etc.). Reciprocity of identifications is, of course, to be understood in the sense specified, i.e., it is usually in the direction of incorporation into the dominant group. All other areas or aspects of assimilation which were usually considered as quantifiable indicators of assimilation are relevant for assimilation only to the extent to which they help to develop reciprocal identifications. Knowledge of English, naturalization, association with Americans, etc., may, but need not do so. While their absence is a definite sign of the lack of assimilation in America (because of the dominant expectations on which reciprocity of identifications is based), their presence does not indicate whether or not parallel reciprocal identifications are being (or have been) developed. One may first identify with Americans and then become a citizen. One may first become a citizen and then identify more closely with Americans. One may become a citizen, without identifying with Americans before or after, except perhaps in a very narrow field, such as a common anti-communist orientation, etc.

Because of such multiple possibilities it is, unfortunately, yet impossible to know with any satisfactory
degree of reliability to what extent is progress in various areas actually paralleled with a conscious or unconscious development of reciprocal identifications. While we know that immigrants in America would generally not be thought of as full-fledged fellow-Americans unless they knew English and became American citizens, we also know that many immigrants who know English and are citizens are not habitually and unreservedly thought of as Americans, nor do they themselves think of themselves as being American. As it was shown by our research, over 90 per cent of our respondents know English and are American citizens, but over 90 per cent also consider themselves Slovenian by nationality and prefer to speak more in Slovenian than in English. Yet, the largest single group (51.33 per cent) wish to speak as much English as Slovenian, but only 5.22 per cent wish to speak more English than Slovenian. Even for this last percentage we cannot be certain, however, whether it expresses stronger identifications with the dominant group. In a different context, one respondent states that "he wanted to speak as much English as possible until he mastered the language." After that, he would speak English only when necessary. Another respondent, however, remarked: "No one wants to associate with a group as long as he does not know their language. He feels completely out of place. He will avoid American company until he learns English." Thus, one respondent would join Americans to learn English and their
customs which are necessary tools in America, but he would later diminish these contacts. Another will avoid American company until he had learned the language in some other way (at school, from other ethnics, in church, by radio, etc.). In either case, reciprocal identifications could develop only out of a common immigrant-native matrix of favorable attitudes.

Since reciprocity of favorable attitudes is crucial, we have, *eo ipso*, demonstrated the oversimplification of "differential assimilability" of ethnic groups. We further showed that, depending on changing attitudes, Germans should have been, by traditional criteria, among the least assimilable groups only a century ago (when they tried to get the German language accepted as an official American language on equal "footing" with English), while, more recently, they have been considered to be among the most assimilable ethnic groups in America (although the crucial test of identification with America came to the foreground in such periods of crisis as the two World Wars). Our comparative data also suggested that Russian immigrants, while for instance relatively unassimilable in America are, by the same criteria, more assimilable than Germans in Brazil, and remarkably adaptable in France. Since assimilation has been shown to consist of habitual unreserved reciprocity of identifications, we concluded that one cannot properly and
correctly speak of assimilability of any ethnic group in vacuo without taking into an equal consideration the dominant "partner" in the assimilation process. It is therefore a misleading oversimplification to speak, for instance, of Russian assimilability. One can only speak of Russian-American, Russian-Brazilian, or Russian-French assimilability; similarly, of German-American or of German-Brazilian assimilability, or whoever the "partners' in the assimilation process may be. (A similar reciprocity also prevails in adjustment processes.)

From our data, it would appear that Slovenian-American assimilability is incomparably higher than Slovenian-German or even Slovenian-Croatian assimilability (in spite of a considerable cultural kinship in the latter cases). Indeed, by the traditional method of "indicators" the Slovenian refugee respondents could be shown to be one of the most highly assimilable ethnic groups in America (should we use such standard indicators as knowledge of English, American citizenship, economic adjustment, political loyalty, and affection for America as compared with that of the natives).

However, if we consider identifications of respondents with Americans we see that they are not yet habitual and unreserved. One feels American by citizenship, Slovenian by nationality; both America and Slovenia attract the respondents (and both also repulse in certain respects);
hence there is a considerable indecision whether or not one would return to Slovenia should she become free and democratic again. For about one-third of respondents the "pull" of Slovenia is still stronger than that of America; yet, in over one-fifth of the cases America prevails, while the remainder, or the largest single group, remains undecided. By culture, over a half of respondents consider themselves to be Slovenian; less than 2 per cent to be entirely American, while various "mixed" components are acknowledged by the remainder. Only about 12 per cent think they are, in general, more American than Slovenian (but this identification, apparently, is not entirely unreserved); nearly one-third think they are about half-way Americanized, while 40 per cent feel they are more Slovenian than American. Note, however, that less than 9 per cent think of themselves as completely Slovenian; more than 90 per cent obviously realize that they have become Americanized to some extent, although the majority of respondents feel they are still more Slovenian than American.

These variations suggest that identifications of respondents with Americans are still "forming," developing; they are not yet firm, universal, and unreserved. In some areas the Slovenian "pull" is stronger; in others, American influence increasingly prevails. All this shows that we have here Americanization in process. Identifications
of respondents with America will apparently gradually become more habitual, widespread, and unreserved.

The extent to which identifications of Slovenes with Americans should take place is, of course, determined by Americans among whom the refugees live and work. (Before a satisfactory evaluation of assimilation could be made a parallel research among these Americans should be developed.)

On the basis of the limited data here examined (to a great extent for the purpose of conceptual clarification), one could say merely that considerable progress has been made during the refugees' first decade in America; many of the most necessary prerequisites or tools of adjustment and assimilation have been acquired and some limited identifications with Americans developed and are recognized by more than 90 per cent of respondents. Apparently, additional decades will be needed before these identifications will become entirely unreserved, habitual, and reciprocal.
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