

JANUSZ MUCHA 

THE POLISH PEASANT IN EUROPE AND AMERICA AND THE MISSING ETHNIC LEADERS¹

Abstract

Thomas and Znaniecki became interested in the international migration issues nearly at the same time, at the beginning of the 20th century. Since they met, they concentrated, for about a decade, on the emigration from Polish lands to Western Europe and the US of a particular social class – the peasants. Znaniecki’s interests in ethnic (including national) matters continued after World War I. Thomas moved into other important sociological and psychological territories which strengthened his theoretical prominence. Only to a limited extent, he continued his theoretical concerns with the “immigrant types.” He published his findings under other names. Therefore, this article concentrates on Znaniecki’s contribution.

It seems to be absurd to ask why Thomas and Znaniecki did not research other Polish internationally mobile groups than peasants. However, there seem to be good reasons to ask why the processes of organization of the collectivity of Polish immigrants to America were not theorized deeper in the masterpiece of sociology. In the opinion of the author, if Znaniecki had been more sociologically interested in some topics (like leadership) which later became prominent in his own work, he would look at the social organization more efficiently.

Keywords: migration flows, class structure, peasants, leadership, migrant communities, institutional completeness

Profesor; e-mail: [jmucha@post.pl](mailto:jmuch@post.pl); <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7795-1053>;
www.januszmucha.pl

¹ I have profited from the conversations and correspondence with Grzegorz Babiński, Elżbieta Hałas, Dorota Praszałowicz and Adam Walaszek.

INTRODUCTION

William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki became interested in the migration issues nearly at the same time. In 1908 Thomas, a respected social psychologist received a large grant to study problems of immigration to America. Znaniecki, when he met Thomas in Warsaw in 1913, was Director of the Polish Emigrants Protective Association [Coser 1977: 533, 538]. Since they met, they concentrated, for about a decade, on the emigration from Polish lands (whatever the term meant in the late 19th and early 20th centuries; between 1795 and 1918 Poland was partitioned between Austria, Prussia and Russia) to Western Europe and the US of a particular social class – the peasants. Znaniecki's interests in ethnic (including national) matters continued after World War I. Thomas, because of various reasons, moved into other very important sociological and psychological territories which strengthened his scholarly prominence, and only to a limited extent continued his theoretical concerns with the “immigrant types.” He published his findings under other names than his own [Park, Miller 1921; see: Coser 1977: 522]. Therefore, I will concentrate on Znaniecki in this article.

It seems to be absurd to ask why anybody did not study something different than he or she intended to do; why, for instance, Thomas and Znaniecki did not research other Polish internationally mobile groups than peasants. However, there seem to be good reasons to ask why the cohesiveness of Polish immigrants in America was not theorized deeper in *The Polish Peasant...*, that stands as a masterpiece of sociology. In my opinion, had Znaniecki been more sociologically interested in some topics which later became prominent in his own work, he might have looked at the processes of social organization more closely.

POLISH MIGRANTS IN AMERICA IN THE LATE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURIES

Adam Walaszek reports that about ten million people left Polish territories between 1860 and 1914. Particularly during the 1880s, emigration from Poland was unprecedented [2007: 9, 152]. One can find detailed information on the issue in many authored and collective volumes [see, e.g.: Davies 1982; Pilch, ed. 1984; Walaszek, ed. 2001]. Some scholars underline the class (in a broad sense of the term, embracing collectivities defined by economic resources, income, but also education) character of Polish emigration. Economic emigration within Europe, engaging mostly peasants, started on the mass scale already in the 1840s. Political emigration, with the qualitative and quantitative climax after the November

Uprising against the Russian Empire in 1830–1831,² consisted mostly of representatives of the upper classes, highly educated and known of their brilliant intellectual achievements.

According to Andrzej Pilch, the socio-economic structure of the emigrants to America since the second half of the 19th century was dynamic. Initially, from the Prussian Partition, as well as from the Russian Partition, mostly artisans and factory workers emigrated. Later, the numerically dominant class within the migration flows were the agricultural laborers, but also poor and landless peasants. Only after the revolution of 1905 the emigration from the Russian Partition embraced larger numbers of skilled workers and socialist intelligentsia (however, some Polish socialists had arrived in America two decades earlier). Still, at the turn of the century, among emigrants from the Russian and Austrian Partitions, about 30% were illiterate [1988: 42–43]. According to Krzysztof Groniowski, in the late 19th century, the Polish group (the Polonia) in the US consisted of 90% of uneducated peasants, some craftsmen, a few hundred of clergymen and a small number of lay intelligentsia members.³ Although originating in Texas, Wisconsin, Michigan and Missouri, after 1880 the American Polonia scattered throughout other states. Gradually, the Poles settled in industrial big urban centres. The Polish peasant immigrants to America usually started their job careers from the positions of unskilled workers. Despite some efforts of the Polish socialist activists, Polish workers in their mass did not join the American trade unions [see: 1988]. Adam Walaszek and Grzegorz Babiński are of a different opinion, though: “[Poles worked] outside of their own communities but within factories and other enterprises they made up numerous and coherent occupational groups which already in the 1890s actively participated in the American trade-union movement. The socio-occupational upward mobility of the first generation of the Polish group in the US in the late 19th century was not significant [Babiński 2009: 333–334; see also: Walaszek 1988]. Political activity (in the American and Polish-American socialist parties) of the Polish craftsmen and unskilled workers, mostly in the Midwest, between the last decade of the 19th century and World War I was aptly analysed by Mary Cygan in her unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (1989).

Poles were quite active in their own, ethnically Polish, Roman Catholic parishes which played the religious but also community roles. They established in

² Andrzej Brożek traces the Polish individual economic and political emigration to America even to the 17th century [1985: 10–17], but I will not discuss here the international mobility of that period.

³ Olivier Zunz states [1982: 221] that in Detroit in 1900, 6% of the Polish immigrants were white collars, 32% were skilled workers and 62% – unskilled.

the 19th century two strong fraternal benefit organizations: Polish Roman Catholic Union (PRCU) in 1873 and Polish National Alliance (PNA) in 1880 [Babiński 1988: 180–182].

Andrzej Paczkowski discusses the Polish printed media in the US. After the November Uprising in 1830 and the Spring of Nations in 1848, Polish political refugees attempted to organize themselves and to publish a periodical. Let me offer a few examples. The first short-lived success came in 1842, and a little longer-lived publication effort emerged in 1863. However, there were not enough educated Poles to edit the “Echo z Polski” and to support it. Increasing immigration and the Polish religious organizations helped in this effort in the 1870s. Due to the growth of the American Polonia, but also (perhaps first of all) the general growth of the printed media industry in the US, the total circulation of the Polish press in America reached the level of 50,000 copies in 1892, while, for instance, in the whole Prussian Partition of Poland, leading in education, the circulation of Polish newspapers did not exceed 100,000. Paczkowski quotes a Polish priest who said that the Polish people in America read much more than in the Old Country [1977; see also: Nagiel 1894; Babiński 1988a]. Press means also men of letters – the Polish–American journalists. Observations of sociologists and historians on the Polish media in America seem to be consistent with the opinion of Thomas and Znaniński that “Among those who have left the country the second generation tends to higher wages, better instruction, and usually tries to rise above the ordinary working-class. The new milieu usually gives more opportunity but requires more personal effort in order to rise, and it is therefore here that we find the greatest changes of attitudes” (Thomas and Znaniński 1918: 193; see also: Prasałowicz 1988).

Józef Chałasiński, one of the Polish pre-World War II students of Znaniński, an expert on the US and the American Polonia, was a little more sceptical. In his “Introduction” to the first volume of Polish edition of *The Polish Peasant...* he confirms that the social life in the Polish parishes was blooming under the very strong domination of the clergy. However, he says that various activities of the numerous Polonia organizations did not change the fact that the Polish peasant emigration failed in the creation of its own, organic creative intelligentsia. He even says, quoting a participant of the conference of scholars of Polish origin in 1973, that there is no trust nor collaboration between the Polonia masses on the one hand and the Polonia intelligence on the other. The masses do not trust the highly educated immigrants, there is no effort on the part of the latter to join the general mass current of the Polonia life in America [1976: 10, 16–17].

The first generation of Poles in America did not invest enough in modern schooling of their children, the “Polish–American masses” have not created its own intelligentsia, 75.3% of them were in 1910 unskilled workers in manufacturing and agriculture and only 0.2% were professionals [see: Babiński 2009: 145] but they succeeded in building strong communities. Babiński summarizes this effort up in the following way: “The Poles built, in a massive way, three institutions basic for the duration of the group: Polish–American parishes with the parochial schools, fraternal benefit associations which gradually turned into insurance organizations and the Polish-language press and publishing houses. Poles in the US, already in the late 19th century, built the so-called “institutional completeness” of their own group: nearly all their individual and collective needs could be met within their own group” [2009: 333; for the concept of “institutional completeness” see: Breton 1964].

Thomas and Znaniecki focused on Poles coming from the Russian Partition. Unlike Poles from the Austrian and Prussian Partitions, these emigrants largely departed as single male laborers, which enhanced the movement back and forth [Sinatti 2008: 12]. According to the findings of Dorothee Schneider, by the First World War one-third of Polish immigrants returned to Poland within a few years.⁴ They were a highly transient community at that time. She says that at the turn of the 20th century the “occupational choices most Poles faced in North America were not grand. Lack of formal education beyond the elementary level, lack of English skills and prejudice against Poles meant that most of them were confined to unskilled labour. But there were some choices and there was occupational diversity within Polish America by the post-World War I period. [...] Some were priests, teachers, musicians and professors. My sample is not representative of the Polish community in the United States, but it indicates more breadth than the Poles described in Thomas’ and Znaniecki’s study” [2007: 164].

The conclusion of this historical reminder is that by the early 20th century there was an intellectual and another potential, even if weak, for the reorganization of the American Polonia. Thomas and Znaniecki were aware of it.

⁴ Return migration is not a topic of this article. However, it should be noted that many historians, Polish, American and others, similarly estimate the volume of the return flows. Adam Walaszek is of the opinion that Polish emigrants did not differ from internationally mobile members of other European nationalities in their motivation to go to America. Many of them left their home countries to make money, return and buy land (see 1983: 5–10).

THOMAS AND ZNANIECKI: FROM POLISH PEASANTS TO POLISH-AMERICANS

The original edition of the masterpiece was organized into five volumes. Volume II consists of letters and Volume III is a biographical record of an immigrant. All these personal documents are accompanied by comments from Thomas and Znaniecki. Personal documents are also examples, illustrations and arguments used in other volumes. Theoretically and historically, Volume I is of lasting significance. Here we find the famous Methodological Note as well as the background analysis of the Polish peasant group in Poland with stress on the family organization, class system, symbolic culture including religion.

For this article, the remaining two volumes are particularly important. Volume IV deals with the disorganization and reorganization of the peasant life in Poland in the late 19th century. The notion of social disorganization refers primarily to institutions and only secondarily to individuals. Stressing the fact that a uniform, perfectly organized group is pure fiction, Thomas and Znaniecki present the opinion that the disorganization is a decrease of the influence of existing social rules upon individual members of the group. This decrease may present innumerable degrees. Social disorganization can be found in many circumstances, "always and everywhere."

The stability of group institutions is a dynamic equilibrium of processes of disorganization and reorganization. The reorganization is a production of new schemes of behaviour and new institutions better adapted to the changing demands of the group. This process is also called social reconstruction. It is possible since the previous social disorganization did not influence the individual lives of all group members [Thomas, Znaniecki 1920: 1-7].

In the process of reorganization of the peasants in Poland, four institutions are stressed by the authors: leadership; education; press and their role in the wider community; cooperative associations. I will concentrate on leadership. Thomas and Znaniecki are of the opinion that without the leaders coming from outside any reorganization of the peasant group would be impossible but at the same time the outside leaders (city intellectuals, the nobility, the clergy) were mentally separate from the masses whom they intended to lead and on both sides the deeply rooted in tradition prejudices had to be overcome. The leaders coming from within the peasant class would be most promising but until now their real influence hardly exceeded the limits of one local community [1920: 181-185].

Seen from the socio-psychological point of view, the leadership could be divided into three types: a) by fear or hope; b) by prestige; and c) by practically

demonstrated efficiency. Only the latter one is stable, particularly in periods of rapid social transformations, characterized by the progressing individualization, intellectual development and critical ability of the peasants. It is natural that the leadership by efficiency occurs sooner in economic cooperation than in other spheres of life since in the first field the peasant's judgement is less dependent on tradition and public opinion [1920: 204–208].

In Volume V, the issues of disorganization and organization were taken up in a different context – that of the Polish–American community. The organization is a collective process, but disorganization is an individual issue here. Individual disorganization of immigrant's life has nothing to do with the decay of existing social rules but results from the imperfect coherence of the Polish–American society [1920a: xviii, 165]. Interestingly, analysis of individual disorganization is not balanced by any attempt to present the success stories of the Polonia members, although the authors were aware of them. The chapter on disorganization is depressing but we must bear in mind the fact that the authors relied only on the reports of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Chicago Coroner's Office, Chicago Legal Aid Society and United Charities of Chicago.

Volume V presents not the “Polish peasants,” but a completely new subject of analysis. It is a dynamically growing collectivity of a number of generations, having direct and personal as well as indirect, collective-memory based Polish experiences of the decline of feudalism in its different varieties, slower or faster industrialization, rationalization of economic and societal life, decline of traditional primary group organization, economic emigration to Western Europe, emigration to industrial America with her modern organization of public life, establishing a local as well as “super-territorial,” Polish–American collective life, finally World War I and the emergence of sovereign Poland. Therefore, “old” ways of analysing the migrating peasant masses seemed to be inadequate. Thomas and Znaniecki are not talking about social disorganization now since the organization processes are still in progress; the issue is not a transformation of the old life but the organization of the collective life of a new population, living simultaneously in two overlapping worlds. Slowly but continuously, the Polish–American reality is emerging and becoming increasingly significant in the individual and collective lives.

Thomas and Znaniecki are describing the formation of a new coherent group out of originally incoherent elements. The immigrant groups must resort to reflective social activity, supplement the former spontaneous reproduction of the past social forms by a new social organization. This process of new becoming has already begun thanks to Polish leaders coming from the educated classes.

However, these leaders are still weak, few and preoccupied with Poland rather than America [1920a: ix–xiii]. New Polish–American leadership is still weak.⁵

The authors analyse the Polish–America local community life, with the stress on (multifunctional) mutual insurance institutions, multifunctional parishes and parochial schools, local press [Thomas, Znaniecki 1920a: 35–60]. When analysing the super-territorial Polish–American ethnic population, they refer mostly to the PNA, PRCU and the Alliance of Polish Socialists [Thomas, Znaniecki 1920a: 93–133].

At the end of the chapter devoted to the super-territorial organization, the authors point to the new turning point in the life of the Polish–American population. It is the newly accomplished sovereignty of Poland as a result of the First World War. The main patriotic purpose of Polish associations outside Poland disappeared. Now, again, a new stage of the reorganization of the collective life of Poles rooted in America is necessary. Many new organizational aims clearly and creatively defined, are possible. The authors doubt if the existing social organizations can adequately fulfil this task. They list several organizational reasons for the difficulty of this radical reorientation [Thomas, Znaniecki 1920a: 136–141].

Two things seem to be missing in this analysis. One is a comparison with other immigrant groups coming from nations which recently regained independence. Methodologically, a comparative analysis is important for Thomas and Znaniecki [see: Blumer’s interesting comments in 1939: 13–14], but they never undertook it. The other is the analysis of success stories and therefore of the leadership at the new stage of reconstruction of the Polish–American group. That analysis could refer to the Polish–American leaders, of skills, education and initiative not necessarily from the top of the spectrum, presented in the next section of my article, but adequate to new challenges.

ON THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF LARGE MIGRATION FLOWS

Both globally and regionally (for instance from the points of view of a country of origin and a host society), the migration flows can be considered as social collectivities and we can ask about their social structure. I will pass over the gender, religious and ethnic composition of these flows in this text, concentrating

⁵ Four decades later, when Nathan Glazer and Patrick D. Moynihan studied the accommodation of the African Americans, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish to the New York society, they strongly underlined the positive and real role of the leadership [Glazer, Moynihan 1963].

instead on the “class structure” in a broad sense of the term, obviously simplifying the picture. On the one end of the stratification continuum we have the “masses” of poor, poorly educated (either in the context of the country of origin or the country of destination or in both), hardly accustomed to the cultures of modernity, coming from underdeveloped countries, initially looking for unskilled or semiskilled jobs which emerge due to the consequences of economic growth or to the unwillingness of the host society to perform them. This is the research focus of Thomas and Znaniecki. On the other end of the spectrum, we have a relatively small collectivity of much more affluent, well-educated and skilled migrants, much better understanding requirements of modernity, aiming at much better paying sectors of the economy, only mentioned in the classic *Work*. They are usually called “highly skilled migrants” or HSM. Managers, experts, medical doctors, researchers, scientists, stars of the worlds of arts and entertainment, belong to this class [see, e.g.: Favel, Feldblum, Smith 2006]. The social situations of these two collectivities are very different [see, e.g.: Richmond 1994], they live in “two different worlds” [see: Bauman 1998].

The vertical continuum of the recent migration streams reveals, however, more categories. I will briefly mention only one of them. The “middling migrants” are technicians, nurses, engineers on the internship, young scholars working “from project to project,” some entertainers, university students during the “gap year” [see, e.g.: Rutten, Verstappen 2014].

The question is to what extent this recent stratification model of migration flows could be applied to the social reality of the previous turn of centuries. Another question is if these classes of migrants coming from one national group can be considered one, stratified stream or different migrating groups sharing one nationality.

ON THE DEBATE ON *THE POLISH PEASANT* ...

During the one hundred years after the first volume of *The Polish Peasant...* came out, a vast number of reviews and articles were published on this masterpiece. I will refer to some of them only, those which are, in my opinion, relevant to the topic of this article.

In 1939, Herbert Blumer published a collection of comments presented at a panel discussion that took place in 1938, including his own long article as well as interventions during the symposium (1939⁶). He hardly debates on the issue

⁶ *General Evaluation* (concluding remarks) was reprinted in Blumer [1969: 117–126]. Social Science Research Council published in the 1940s two volumes devoted to the analysis of the

of migration. He appreciates the fact that Thomas and Znaniecki's *Work* is not only a monograph on Polish peasant in Poland and abroad but is instead an intellectual scheme for the analysis of contemporary society in its complexity and transformations, in the "process of becoming." Attitudes (subjective approach) and values (objective approach) are the basic data of social becoming and the individual and social organization are the basic factors of group life. In order to understand them properly, both attitudes and values must be put into a well-defined context. The results of the analysis should be regarded as hypotheses. In Blumer's opinion, Thomas and Znaniecki did not define attitudes and values precisely and in a disjunctive way. The particularly important set of values are social rules. These rules form social institutions. Institutions constitute the social organization of a society. The empirical materials in the form of "human documents" (letters; life histories; newspaper accounts; court records; records of social agencies) used in the *Work* are not very meaningful by themselves, are hardly representative, adequate, reliable and valid; they would not be understood without the authors' broad theoretical background. However, they were the best documents they could have secured.

For the present article, the most important is Blumer's analysis of Thomas and Znaniecki's theory of social disorganization and reorganization (on the Polish territories). The problem of reorganization (reconstruction), says Blumer following the authors, is to create new schemes of behaviour, new, adequate attitudes and institutions. This is the task of leaders. They had to prepare the peasants, by stimulating and forming their proper attitudes, for the acceptance of the newly adequate schemes of behaviour. The attitudes responsible for the former unity of the old primary groups should be used, with the help of leaders, in developing a sense of attachment to a wider, dynamic national community. Reorganization in Poland was necessary due to the demands of modern rational cooperation in the work environment and of individualistic tendencies among the peasants, both being a result of their contact with the outside world – mostly their seasonal emigration to Germany.

In general, Blumer was strongly critical but appreciative of the Thomas and Znaniecki masterpiece. In my opinion, during the debate of 1938 and in the introduction to the 1979 edition of its summary, the general appreciation dominates over still maintained criticism [1979]. American scholars who participated in the 1938 discussion concentrated, like Blumer, on the theoretical and methodological

"personal document" methodology in social sciences: Allport [1942] and Gottschalk, Kluckhohn and Angell [1945].

issues. Thomas' and Znaniecki's Comments published in the 1939 volume deal also with methodology.

In the 1980s, a number of conferences were organized, and several volumes published to commemorate the centenary of Znaniecki's birth [1882]. His (and Thomas') contribution to social theory and methodology as well as to many fields of empirical sociology became re-evaluated [see, e.g.: Dulczewski, ed., 1986; Lindenberg et al., eds.1986]. Interestingly, it seems to me that "migration theory" and "ethnic theory" were rarely touched and debated. I would like to refer here to some exceptions. Gero Lenhardt published a brief article on Znaniecki's (and Thomas') "theoretical perspective of ethnic integration" compared with a relevant chapter of Max Weber's "Economy and Society" [1986]. Lenhardt underlines the fact that *The Polish Peasant...* contains a specific theory of social development: a theory of rationalization. Thomas and Znaniecki see the "substitution of a consciousness technique for a half-conscious routine not only in the sphere of material reality but also in social life" as a major trend in social history. This trend is conceptualized as the transition from primary to secondary groups as dominant forms of social life. The process of rationalization begins, according to the classics, in the village communities in Poland but becomes more radical among Poles in America. Immigrants create new social organizations. This process starts as a disorganization of the Polish village communities, dissolution of the traditional milieu, demoralization. The way the ethnic community is organized does not assist the newcomers in occupational work where the rationalization process had been most advanced.

The "Thomas and Znaniecki Book Award", granted since 1996 by the American Sociological Association's Section of International Migration, helps to keep the debate alive.

Dorothee Schneider dealt with the political integration of the Polish peasants in the inter-war era, years after the publication of the Thomas-Znaniecki Work. Following Eli Zaretsky, who introduced the 1984 edition of *The Polish Peasant...*, she states, rightly in my opinion, that the authors of the masterpiece were not particularly interested in the "history of Polish rural to urban migration or the building of new forms of civic self-organization in industrial America [2007: 159]. Explicit and implicit theorizing on migration contained in *The Polish Peasant...* was aptly and briefly summarized by Giulia Sinatti, in the light of recent developments within the field of contemporary migration studies. She is of the opinion that "some innovations" introduced by transnational approach, multi-sited anthropology and critiques of assimilationism, had been largely anticipated by the Work, one hundred years earlier. Its authors implicitly rejected the assumption that

assimilation is a linear process leading to homogenization of American society, combined the perspective of the country of origin and of the country (countries) of destination, stressed the fact that migrants maintained the social ties with the region of origin, analysed the circulation not only of people but also of economic resources and immaterial objects like ideas, attitudes and imaginations. Sinatti is cognisant the world underwent significant transformations since 1918 and modern theory had to face new phenomena and processes which did not exist one hundred years ago or were not yet clearly visible [2008]. What I find very important in this approach is directing to the Work the questions raised by today's theoretical thought.

In numerous volumes published in Poland and dedicated to Znaniecki's work, the analysis of ethnicity and migration rarely appears. Theoretically speaking, his "humanistic approach" and sociology of culture [see, e.g.: Kwilecki and Czarnocki, eds. 1989; Hałas and Kojder, eds. 2010; Łukasiewicz, ed. 2008], his general social theory and its applications [see, e.g.: Sochacki, ed. 1998; Hałas, ed. 1999] are the dominant topics, even if the authors refer to *The Polish Peasant...*

In the next parts of this article, I will concentrate on Znaniecki's ideas concerning the cultural and – social reorganization during the inter-war period. The concepts of leadership and fellowship will play a particularly significant role.

ON THE ZNANIECKI'S CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP

As we remember, the topic of leadership was already raised in the fourth volume of *The Polish Peasant...* [see also: Pyszczyk 2016]. In the late 1920s, in his two-volume "Sociology of Education" [Znaniecki 1973] published only in Polish, its author was strongly interested in the idea of leadership, very important in the processes of socialization of young people to rapidly changing global situation, to their creative participation in democratic culture. In the 1930s, as a member of a committee at the Teachers College of Columbia University in New York, he wrote four reports on the issue of "education for democracy," endangered at that time in the whole Western World. One of these essays was published only in Poland in Polish [see: 1934], another in English after many decades [see: Znaniecki 1998]. Three different social roles may be distinguished, according to the scholar, when we think of leadership: a) initiating (doing something to others to imitate, impermanent, without a social bond between the initiator and imitator), b) cooperative (continuous and organized by the leader collective activity in order to achieve a common goal which the leader initiates and the followers actively share with him), c) ruling (ruler imposes a common task upon

his subordinates dividing the labour). True leadership is only the second of the above. Organized cooperation can be successful only when it utilizes creative tendencies in collaborating groups and individuals. Imitating the primary group leadership patterns in the larger and very dynamic societies is hardly efficient. New kinds of leaders capable and willing to cooperate under these conditions became necessary [1998: 58, 106, 116].

Znanięcki directed empirical studies in the field of intellectual leadership in Poland. Krzysztof Łukasiewicz briefly discusses the involvement of the scholar and his followers in the survey and biographical research among the cultural elites in Poznań in the 1920s. Unfortunately, this effort did not prove to be successful [2008: 10–14].

While the topic of social disorganization and reorganization returns after the Second World War mostly in his “Cultural Sciences” [Znanięcki 1952], the theme of leadership comes back mainly in “Modern Nationalities” [Znanięcki 1952a]. Creative acts are a foundation of creative reorganization. The organization of national cultures depends on national solidarity resulting not only from “subjective mass psychology” but first from the active cooperation of groups and individuals. Successful cooperation is a result, among other things, of public functions performed by some individuals or groups on behalf of the collectivity [Znanięcki 1952a: 16–19]. These cultural leaders attract circles of voluntary followers and frequently gain the support of socially powerful sponsors. “As the national culture grows, these leaders, their followers, and sponsors who participate in its growth form an increasingly coherent intellectual community activated by the ideal of a culturally united and socially solidary national society, which should include all the people whose folk cultures are presumed to be essentially alike and who are supposed to share the same historical background. The realization of this ideal is expected to overcome the cultural isolation of local and regional communities, political divisions, religious differences, class conflicts” [Znanięcki 1952a: 24–25]. There are, says Znanięcki, various social roles of those intellectual leaders. He sees here the “men of letters” who develop new literary languages from traditional dialects and create distinctive national literature; historians and ethnographers who elaborate a doctrine that, however much the folk cultures differ, they are similar as compared with cultures of other collectivities; national ideologists who are thinking about the future of the collectivity and propagate ideals which the group should realize; artists and musicians who serve as means of social communication and unification; scientists (philosophers) who formulate ethical and political ideals, are inventors but also planners and organizers of the practical applications of inventions, and therefore contribute to

the prestige of the community; economists who analyse the connections between economic development and various aspects of symbolic culture [1952a: 25, 30, 35, 45, 50–54]. Like in the Teachers College reports, the author proposes the establishment of the social centres of the modern cultural leaders functionally like those which had existed in the past.

After the publication of *The Polish Peasant...*, Znaniecki developed his ideas of leadership and reorganization, not only in the school-class context but also in the macro-sociological context of democratic transformation of national societies. The social reorganization was hardly possible, in his opinion, without creative and efficient leaders.

CONCLUSIONS: TOWARD THE REGAINING OF THE ANALYSIS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE POLISH AMERICAN COMMUNITY

Historians and social scientists studying the Polish emigration of the previous turn of the century stress the fact that it was highly unbalanced when analysed from the class point of view, as outlined in the section on the social structure of the migration flows. Class differences lead to psychological antagonisms and sometimes social conflicts in the behavioural sense. One can even ask if we can treat it as one migration flow or various migrating class groups originating in one European nation. Another question is whether this situation was specific solely to the Polish emigration flows.

Still, there were migrating Polish teachers, priests, politicians, business people, writers and journalists, engineers and technicians, nurses and physicians, educated in Europe. Some assimilated soon, but some did not. Most probably, Thomas and Znaniecki did not know more than I had mentioned above in this article about the class stratification of the Polish migration flows. We know much more nowadays. Let me offer some illustrations. Victor R. Green analyses the activities of particular social significance of the (lay and belonging to the clergy) Roman Catholic Polish–American leaders in the 1850s and 1860s [Green 1987: 110–115]. Dorota Prasałowicz [2009] studied the Roman Catholic nuns (sisters) who worked with the Polish immigrants as teachers of religion and English and social workers from the 1870s on. The nuns contributed to the emergence of the vibrant Polish–American local communities. Prasałowicz explicitly criticises Thomas and Znaniecki for neglecting the role of Polish–American leadership. Józef Miąso [1977] studied many decades of the Polish American educational system and proves (in Chapter VIII the cultural and educational programmes outside the school) that from its very beginnings it provided invaluable leadership

qualities. Mary Cygan, in her dissertation on Polish–American socialism (known to Thomas and Znaniecki), gives ample evidence of the active and influential leaders among the craftsmen and unskilled workers in the 1890s and early 1900s [1989]. I have already written about the Polish–American press and journalists. These leading men and women can be considered the “migration agents” – leaders who were setting the stage for the next waves of immigrants – helped them to find jobs, housing, Polish–American education and religious services, to get settled.

In the second generation of Polish–Americans, a relatively small middling group and highly skilled group, already educated in America, emerged. These people stayed in the US. Unlike the story of the peasants who had immigrated earlier, their story is hardly remembered, told and appreciated. They constituted a potential collectivity of leaders oriented not only on Poland but also, or mostly, on the Polish–American reality. It seems to me that the institutional completeness of local ethnic communities, success of the Polish–American media, associations, education, is, at least partly, their achievement. They were the second generation of the migration agents.

Thomas and Znaniecki were interested nearly exclusively in the peasant group but, usually in quite general terms, they were aware of the significance of the HSM. Moreover, in the narrative on social life in Poland, they appreciated the role of leaders. However, they did not study their role in America, did not include this role in the explanation scheme of the organization of the Polish–American communities nor the super-territorial population. When raising the issue of the necessary reorganization of the Polish–American group after 1918, when Poland regained political sovereignty, they did not stress the role of leaders.

Later, during the interwar period, the leadership became a very important issue in Znaniecki’s writings. However, he never returned to the organization of the Polish–American society and the role of leaders in this organization.

23072019

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport Gordon W.** 1942. *The use of personal documents in psychological science*. New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 49.
- Babiński Grzegorz.** 1988. Instytucje i organizacje polonijne. In: *Polonia amerykańska. Przeszłość i współczesność*, H. Kubiak, E. Kusielewicz, T. Gromada (eds.), 177–202. Wrocław et al.: Ossolineum.
- Babiński Grzegorz.** 1988a. Prasa polonijna w Stanach Zjednoczonych Ameryki. In: *Polonia amerykańska. Przeszłość i współczesność*. H. Kubiak, E. Kusielewicz, T. Gromada (eds.), 239–260. Wrocław et al.: Ossolineum.

- Babiński Grzegorz.** 2009. *Polonia w USA na tle przemian amerykańskiej etniczności*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza AFM.
- Bauman Zygmunt.** 1998. *Globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Blumer Herbert.** 1939. Blumer's Analysis. In: *Critiques of research in the social sciences: An appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's "The Polish peasant in Europe and America"*, H. Blumer (ed.), 3–82. New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 44.
- Blumer Herbert.** 1969. *Symbolic interactionism. Perspective and method*. Berkeley et al.: University of California Press.
- Blumer Herbert.** 1979. Introduction to the Transaction Edition. In: *Critiques of research in the social sciences: An appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's "The Polish peasant in Europe and America"*. H. Blumer (ed.), v-xxxviii. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Breton Raymond.** 1964. "Institutional completeness of ethnic communities and the personal relations of immigrants". *American Journal of Sociology* 70, 2: 193–205.
- Brożek Andrzej.** 1985. *Polish Americans*. Warszawa: Interpress.
- Chalasiński Józef.** 1976. Polonia amerykańska. In: *Chłop polski w Europie i Ameryce*. Tom I., William I. Thomas, Florian Znaniecki, 7–29. Warszawa: LSW.
- Coser Lewis A.** 1977. *Masters of sociological thought. Ideas in historical and social context*. San Diego et al.: Harcourt.
- Crawley Heaven, Dimitris Skleparis.** 2017. "Refugees, migrants, neither, both: categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's 'migration crisis'". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X2017.1348224.
- Cygan Mary.** 1989. *Political and cultural leadership in an immigrant community: Polish–American socialism, 1880–1950*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University.
- Davies Norman.** 1982. *God's playground. A History of Poland. Volume II: 1975 to the present*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dulczewski Zygmunt (ed.).** 1986. *A Commemorative book in honor of Florian Znaniecki on the centenary of his birth*. Poznań: UAM.
- Favell, Adrian, Miriam Feldblum, Michael Peter Smith.** 2006. The human face of global mobility: A research agenda. In: *The human face of global mobility*, M.P. Smith, A. Favell (ed.), 1–25. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.
- Glazer Nathan, Daniel P. Moynihan.** 1963. *Beyond the melting pot. The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish in New York City*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and the MIT Press.
- Gottschalk Louis R., Clyde Kluckhohn, Robert Angell.** 1945. *The use of personal documents in history, anthropology, and sociology*. New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 53.
- Greene Victor R.** 1987. *American immigrant leaders 1800–1910. Marginality and identity*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Groniowski Krzysztof.** 1988. Struktura społeczno-zawodowa Polonii amerykańskiej. In: *Polonia amerykańska. Przeszłość i współczesność*. H. Kubiak, E. Kusielewicz, T. Gromada (eds.), 99–121. Wrocław et al.: Ossolineum.
- Hałas Elżbieta.** 2014. „Wychowanie i kultura demokratyczna. Zarys poglądów Floriana Znanieckiego”. *Zoon Politicon* 5: 123–130.
- Hałas Elżbieta (ed.).** 1999. *Teoria socjologiczna Floriana Znanieckiego a wyzwania XXI wieku*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.

- Halas Elżbieta, Andrzej Kojder** (eds.). 2010. *Socjologia humanistyczna Floriana Znanięckiego: przesłanie dla współczesności*. Warszawa: KS PAN i PTS.
- Kwilecki Andrzej, Bohdan Czarnocki** (eds.). 1989. *The humanistic sociology of Florian Znanięcki. Polish period 1920–1939*. Warszawa and Poznań: PWN.
- Lenhardt Gero**. 1986. Theoretical perspectives of ethnic integration. A comparative view on W.I. Thomas, F. Znanięcki: The Polish peasant in Europe and America and M. Weber: Theory of ethnic groups (Chapt. V of economy and society). In: *A commemorative book in honor of Florian Znanięcki on the centenary of his birth*, Z. Dulczewski (ed.), 304–306. Poznań: UAM.
- Lindenberg Siegwart, James S. Coleman, Stefan Nowak** (eds.). 1986. *Approaches to social theory. Based on the W.I. Thomas and Florian Znanięcki memorial conference on social theory*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lukasiewicz Krzysztof**. 2008. Wstęp. W: *Wokół koncepcji kultury Floriana Znanięckiego*, K. Lukasiewicz (ed.), 5–17. Wrocław: Arboretum.
- Lukasiewicz Krzysztof** (ed.). 2008. *Wokół koncepcji kultury Floriana Znanięckiego*. Wrocław: Arboretum.
- Miąso Józef**. 1977. *The history of the education of Polish immigrants in the United States*. New York: The Kosciuszko Foundation and Warszawa: PWN – Polish Scientific Publishers.
- Nagiel Henryk**. 1894. *Dziennikarstwo polskie w Ameryce i jego 30-letnie dzieje*. Chicago: Komitet Centralny Obesłania Wystawy Lwowskiej przez Polonię Amerykańską. Spółka Nakładowa Wydawnictwa Polskiego w Ameryce.
- Paczkowski Andrzej**. 1977. *Prasa polonijna w latach 1870–1939*. Warszawa: Biblioteka Narodowa.
- Park Robert E., Herbert A. Miller**. 1921. *Old world traits transplanted*. New York: Harper.
- Pilch Andrzej**. 1988. Emigracja z ziem polskich do Stanów Zjednoczonych Ameryki od lat pięćdziesiątych XIX wieku do r. 1918. W: *Polonia amerykańska. Przeszłość i współczesność*, H. Kubiak, E. Kusielewicz, T. Gromada (eds.), 37–43. Wrocław et al.: Ossolineum.
- Pilch Andrzej** (ed.). 1984. *Emigracja z ziem polskich w czasach nowożytnych i najnowszych (XVIII–XX w.)*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Praszałowicz Dorota**. 1988. Przemiany oświaty polonijnej w Stanach Zjednoczonych Ameryki. W: *Polonia amerykańska. Przeszłość i współczesność*. H. Kubiak, E. Kusielewicz, T. Gromada (eds.), 203–238. Wrocław et al.: Ossolineum.
- Praszałowicz Dorota**. 2009. „Polish American sisterhoods: The Americanization process.” *US Catholic Historian* 27, 3: 45–57.
- Pyszczyk Grzegorz**. 2016. “Floriana Znanięckiego wizja reorganizacji kulturowej”. *Humaniora. Czasopismo Internetowe* 1(13): 51–67.
- Richmond Anthony H.** 1994. *Global apartheid. Refugees, racism, and the New World Order*. Toronto et al.: Oxford University Press.
- Rutten, Mario, Sanderien Verstappen**. 2014. “Midling migration: Contradictory mobility experiences of Indian youth in London”. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40, 8: 1217–1235.
- Schneider Dorothee**. 2007. “Polish peasant into Americans: U.S. citizenship and Americanization among Polish immigrants in the inter-war era”. *Polish Sociological Review* 2(158): 159–171.
- Sinatti Giulia**. 2008. “The Polish peasant revisited. Thomas and Znanięcki’s classic in the light of contemporary transnational migration theory”. *Sociologica* 2. DOI: 10.2383/27725.

- Sochacki Olgierd** (ed.). 1996. *Socjologia polityczna Floriana Znanieckiego a współczesna polityka*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe.
- Thomas William I., Florian Znaniecki**. 1918. *The Polish peasant in Europe and America. Volume I. Primary group organization*. Boston: Richard G. Badger. The Gorham Press.
- Thomas William I., Florian Znaniecki**. 1920. *The Polish peasant in Europe and America. Volume IV. Disorganization and reorganization in Poland*. Boston: Richard G. Badger. The Gorham Press.
- Thomas William I., Florian Znaniecki**. 1920a. *The Polish peasant in Europe and America. Volume V. Organization and disorganization in America*. Boston: Richard G. Badger. The Gorham Press.
- Walaszek Adam**. 1983. *Reemigracja ze Stanów Zjednoczonych do Polski po I wojnie światowej 1919–1924*. Kraków: PWN (Zeszyty Naukowe UJ).
- Walaszek Adam**. 1988. *Polscy robotnicy, praca i związki zawodowe w Stanach Zjednoczonych Ameryki, 1880–1922*. Wrocław et al.: Ossolineum.
- Walaszek Adam**. 2007. *Migracje Europejczyków 1650–1914*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.
- Walaszek Adam** (ed.). 2001. *Polska diaspora*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Znaniecki Florian**. 1934. „Kierownictwo a zwolennictwo we współpracy twórczej.” *Kultura i Wychowanie* 4: 277–294. English original version published as Leadership and Fellowship in Creative Cooperation, 122–138. In: Znaniecki 1998.
- Znaniecki Florian**. 1952. *Cultural sciences. Their origin and development*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Znaniecki Florian**. 1952a. *Modern nationalities. A sociological study*. Urbana: The University of Illinois.
- Znaniecki Florian**. 1973 [1928]. *Socjologia wychowania. Vol. I Wychowujące społeczeństwo; Vol. II Urabianie osoby wychowanka*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Znaniecki Florian**. 1998 [1933]. *Education and social change*, edited and introduced by Elżbieta Hałas. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Zunz Olivier**. 1982. *The Changing face of inequality. Urbanization, industrial development and immigrants in Detroit, 1880–1920*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

Janusz Mucha

„CHŁOP POLSKI W EUROPIE I AMERYCE” A BRAK KWESTII PRZYWÓDZTWA ETNICZNEGO

Streszczenie

Thomas i Znaniecki zainteresowali się badawczo problematyką migracji międzynarodowych mniej więcej w tym samym czasie, to znaczy na początku XX wieku. Od rozpoczęcia współpracy, skupiali się, przez całą dekadę, na emigracji z ziem polskich do Europy Zachodniej, a później do USA, jednej klasy społecznej – chłopów. Zainteresowania Znanieckiego kwestiami etnicznymi (w tym narodowymi) trwały również i po I wojnie światowej. Thomas skoncentrował się natomiast na innych, ogromnie ważnych z punktu widzenia socjologii i psychologii społecznej zagadnieniach, co przyczyniło się do wzmocnienia jego prestiżu jako teoretyka społecznego, i tylko w ograniczo-

nym zakresie kontynuował swe wcześniejsze teoretyczne zainteresowania „typami imigrantów”. Publikował pod innymi nazwiskami. Stąd niniejszy artykuł skupia się na dorobku Znanieckiego.

Wydaje się absurdem pytanie o to, dlaczego Thomas i Znaniecki nie badali czegoś innego niż to, co interesowało ich przede wszystkim – czemu nie studiowali losów innych niż chłopci polskich grup klasowych, aktywnie uczestniczących w migracjach międzynarodowych. Jednakże istnieją dobre powody aby spytać o to, dlaczego sposób zorganizowania zbiorowości polskich imigrantów do Ameryki nie został głębiej przebadany pod względem teoretycznym w klasycznym Dziele. W opinii autora niniejszego artykułu, gdyby Znaniecki był bardziej socjologicznie zainteresowany niektórymi tematami (jak na przykład przywództwo), które później stały się dla niego bardzo ważne, trafniej przebadalby procesy społecznej organizacji zbiorowości migracyjnych.

Słowa kluczowe: strumień migracji, struktura klasowa, chłopci, przywództwo, społeczności migranckie, kompletność instytucjonalna