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A vigorous academic industry that in the last few years has geared up around the idea of (new) transnationalism has attracted collaborators from both sides of the Atlantic among political scientists, international relations and legal scholars, sociologists, and anthropologists, and has already produced a crop of specialists in "transnational cultural studies" gathered around journals such as Public Culture, Social Text, or Diaspora. In all the studies contemporary mass migrations crossing the globe have been acknowledged as an important or even central diffusing agent of this new transnationalism.

Unavoidably, used by representatives of different scholarly orientations to engage different academic agendas, the concept of transnationalism has been assigned various meanings and applied to various phenomena. (On the conceptual confusion in the new transnationalism literature and attempts to clarify it see, e.g., Verdery 1994; Joppke 1998b; Aleinikoff 1998; also Rex 1995, 1996.) Most common have been two interpretations of the prefix "trans" and its referents that tend to reflect the specific disciplinary concerns of the authors and the differences in the prevailing ideas and practices regarding civic-national membership in North America and Western Europe that have been the focus of most of the new transnationalism studies. (On these differences and the issue of (im)migration see Brubaker 1989; Hammar 1990; Glazer 1996; Bade and Weiner 1997; Joppke 1998a).

In the first interpretation, transnationalism refers to some combination of plural civic-political memberships, economic involvements, social networks, and cultural identities reaching across and linking people and institutions in two or more nation-states in diverse, multilayered patterns. International migrants are the main conveyors of these cross-border connections, and the "new transnational spaces" they create deterriorialize or extrapolate (rather than undermine) the nation-states interlinked by them. This interpretation has been most typically represented in studies of the anthropologists, "transnational culturologists," and sociologists. (Im)migrant-actors in the transnational spaces they describe have usually been located or, more accurately, partially located, considering their cross-border involvements, in North America. (On this approach see, e.g., Basch, Glick Schiller and Blanc 1994; Glick Schiller, Basch and Blanc-Szanton 1996; Glick Schiller 1996; Portes 1997; Jacobson 1996.)

In the second interpretation transnationalism is understood as a shift beyond or, as it were, vertically past (rather than horizontally across) - or "post" - the accustom ed, territorial state/national-level memberships and civic-political claims derived therefrom and state-bound national identities toward more encompassing ones such as universal humanity/human rights, suprastatal membership/entitlements (e.g., in the European Union), or panreligious solidarities (e.g., Muslim in Western Europe). Focused on the "decline of the nation-state" or the loss of its controlling and regulatory capacities or, in more sophisticated analyses, on the dialectics of
weakening and enhancement as the state is strengthened in certain fields (such as immigration control) by the same transnationalization processes that undermine it in other fields (such as the economy and markets), this understanding has been most common among political scientists/political sociologists, lawyers, and international relations specialists. It has been represented primarily in studies focused on Western Europe, especially on the developments related to the emerging European Union. (See, e.g., Feldblum 1998; Soysal 1994; Kastoryano 1994; Miyoshi 1993 for the former approach, and Mann 1993; Joppke 1998a; Rouse 1995; Guiraudon 1997; also Sassen 1998 for the latter). Focused on post-national or "third space" identities of contemporary globetrotters, it has been most typically represented among transnational culture specialists (see, e.g., Kearney 1991, 1995; see also Holston and Appadurai 1996).

I use here the first interpretation of transnationalism for two reasons. Survey and ethnographic studies of cross-statal social and political engagements and identities of the great mass of contemporary immigrants - the ordinary (rather than the professional global elite) sojourners and permanent settlers in the United States and in Western Europe - have documented this form as tangibly informing these people's outlooks and activities whereas the other (postnational option) as an opportunity in-the-making rather than a lived experience. (For evidence of the first form of transnationalism among (im)migrants in the United States see Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Massey et al., 1994; Gutierrez 1997; Guarnizo and Smith 1998; Lie 1995; Levitt 1998; in Western Europe, see Haug 1998; Cesari 1998; Amiraux 1998; Pries 1997; Faist 1997. On the opportunities in-the-making for immigrants' postnational participation in the European Union's institutional structures, see Danese 1998. See also Favell and Lamont in this volume on postnationalism as the (upper)class-specific experience and scholars' "discursive reality".) The first of the two interpretations identified has also informed most of the recent theoretical discussions on the so-called new transnationalism by students of contemporary immigration in the United States - the destination country on which this author's research has concentrated and which provides the illustrations for the claims made in this paper.

I argue that this new transnationalism literature makes several incorrect assumptions about the nature of the last (1880s-1914) great wave of (im)migration to the United States and the historiography it generated and, on this basis, unsupported claims as to the supposedly novel features of its present-day successor and, specifically, the unprecedented transnational character of contemporary (im)migrants' lives. In particular, four such compare-and-contrast claims of the new transnationalists regarding broader-context mechanisms of present-day international migrations, the character of the migration process, and (im)migrants' concerns and activities have been inaccurate.
First, incorrect has been a view that unlike "multiple, circular, and return migrations" of present-day movements, turn-of-the-twentieth-century international travels (to America) were "singular great journeys from one sedentary space to another" (Lie 1995: 304; see also Jones 1992: 219 for a similar statement), and, second and related, that as one-way transplants earlier migrations were "permanent ruptures" with home country affairs, irrevocably dividing past and present lives of the (im)migrants, whereas present-day shuttlers' "networks, activities, patterns of living, and ideologies [...] span their home and the host society" in new transnational spaces (Basch, Glick Schiller and Blanc 1994: 3-4; see also Portes 1997: 812-13 for a similar proposition). Third, unfounded, too, has been a view that the emergence of these new transnational spaces has created a complex "new sphere of politics" - supposedly nonexistent in the past - whereby political leaders in the home countries and (im)migrants in the transplanted communities abroad engage in a "new form of nation-building" as they influence each other and the host-country establishment on a "deterritorialized" plane (Basch, Glick Schiller and Blanc 1994: 46; see also Gutierrez 1997). Fourth and underlying the above, historically inaccurate has also been the new transnationalists' perception that this new transnational quality of (im)migrants' lives and new transnational political spaces have been generated by the accelerated globalization in the late twentieth century, and, in particular, by the constitutive for it "dependent" incorporation of less developed South-East (SE) regions of the world into the capitalist world-system dominated by its North-West (NW) "core" combined with revolutions in transportation and communication technologies, and have been sustained by racist attitudes and discrimination - spared the earlier, white European arrivals - against new SE (im)migrants by members and institutions of the white NW host societies that either block or channel these immigrants' assimilation into the isolated and underprivileged segments of the mainstream society (see Basch, Glick Schiller and Blanc 1994; Glick Schiller 1996; Portes and Zhou 1993; see also Lie 1995; Jones 1992; Guarnizo and Smith 1998).

Although differing in important aspects, contemporary and turn-of-the-twentieth-century (im)migrants' lifeworlds and diaspora politics have shared many of the supposedly novel features of present-day transnationalism some of which have been generated by the same long-dure macroscopic historical forces whereas some others by similar microscopic social mechanisms if embedded in different contexts. Mass transatlantic migrations from Southern and Eastern Europe were the integral part of the dependent incorporation of these regions into the Atlantic capitalist world-system "superpowered" by the most highly developed countries in Western Europe and the United States. "Sclavish," Italian, "Hunkie" (Hungarian) and "Hebrew" (im)migrants in the latter were viewed as racially distinct from and inferior to the Nordic groups and on these grounds were openly discriminated against. Facilitated by the advancement of transportation and communication technologies, the return/circular movement between the sending and receiving countries was very considerable, and the intense economic and social contacts of
(im)migrants with their home villages created complex webs of transatlantic networks of communication and assistance. Immigrants' involvement in home-country politics was significant. Albeit transformed and recomposed in emphasis in relation to American politics, the concern therewith of their American-born offspring was also important as was the transnational engagement of the home countries in the diaspora communities.

Incorrect also have been the new transnationalists' representations of the existing scholarly interpretations of the adaptation patterns of earlier-wave (im)migrants as focused on "the questions of (the latter's) socioeconomic and cultural assimilation," that is, the progressive abandonment of their home societies' ways of life and their replacement with the host, American ones (Lie 1995: 303). In contrast, it has been argued, the new transnationalism perspective offers an interpretation of contemporary (im)migrants' "novel path of adaptation" that is radically "at variance with [that] envisioned by the 'canonical' assimilation theory" (Portes 1997: 813).

Actually, (im)migration historians have long since abandoned the straight-line assimilation model and have developed instead a much more sophisticated concept of ethnicization whereby (im)migrants' lifestyles, identities, and commitments emerge during the interplay between knowledgeable, purposeful, and creative social actors and their multilayered environments: macro- and micro-level, past and present, including translocal ones, such as home-country loyalties and connections, reference frameworks, and traditions (see, e.g., Greene 1975; Sarna 1978; Vecoli 1973; Arhcdeacon 1983; Conzen et al. 1992; Morawska 1998; Hoerder 1996; Gabaccia 1994; see also Yinger 1994; Kazal 1995'). In this approach the specific forms, "contents," and pace of ethnicization-as-mixing-and-recombining of home and host elements at work, in church, politics, social practices, and group boundaries and identities are viewed as inherently contingent on time- and place-specific circumstances and, therefore, never fully determined.

I argue that the concepts of transnationalism as proposed by students of contemporary migration and of ethnicization used by social historians and historical sociologists as the interpretative framework to make sense of the experience of pre-World War II (im)migrants and their children are akin theoretically and can be "translated" into each other to a considerable extent. The representatives of these two approaches can both gain from initiating a conversation. Such a conversation would be especially timely in view of the fact that, unlike immigration sociologists and their studies often engaged as the adversary by the new transnationalists, (im)migration historians and their work have been amazingly absent from the former's field of perception.
(Im)migrants' Transnationalism: 19th/20th and 20th/21st Centuries Compared

I first consider the enduring features in the broader contexts of past and present international population movements and in the (im)migrants' transnational connections and next, from the viewpoint of these historical continuities, the new, contemporary macro- and micro-level developments that make the pressures and opportunities of present-day (im)migrants' transnational lives distinct from those confronted by their turn-of-the-century predecessors. Because they constituted the majority or close to 70 percent of the turn-of-the-twentieth-century (im)migrants to America, South and East Europeans are the focus of this historical comparison. Greatly accelerated during the "long turn of the century" (1870-1914) by the spread of modern transportation (rail and ship) and communication and Western capital investments in the belated industrialization of South and East Europe, the incorporation of those regions into the Atlantic world-system uprooted from their rural lives and set in motion millions of local inhabitants in search of livelihoods toward more highly developed western parts of the Continent and to North America. The total volume of cross-border "comings" and "goings" of South and East Europeans during that period is estimated at a staggering 35 to 45 million. (On turn-of-the-twentieth century globalization process and estimates of international population flows it triggered see Ferenczi and Wilcox 1929; Gould 1979, 1980; Chirot 1989; Nugent 1992; Hoerder and Moch 1996; Berend and Ranki 1982; Bade 1992; Olsson 1996.)(5)

Those who came to the United States - the 1910 American census reported more than seven million (im)migrant residents from Southern and Eastern Europe - settled in tightly knit "foreign colonies" in the rapidly growing industrial cities. Most of them, 90 to 95 percent, went to work as unskilled laborers in American factories, steel mills, coal mines, and in railroad and building construction (East European Jews, two-thirds of whom were employed as skilled manual workers were the exception). (On turn-of-the-twentieth-century immigrants' residential concentration and occupational pursuits see Sheridan 1907; Balch 1910; U.S. Immigration Commission 1911: Immigrants in the Cities and Immigrants in Industries; Hutchinson 1956; Lieberson 1963; Lestschinsky 1955).

Contrary to the view of new transnationalists, their racial identification did not facilitate immigrants' adaptation in America. The contemporary meaning of the concept of "race" differed from the present-day understanding in that it was more inclusive and ambiguous. During the early decades of this century the widely recognized "scholarly" racist theories and on their authority the dominant, native-born American public opinion viewed groups defined today as white as racially differentiated by physical features, skin "hues" and genetically determined mental capacities, and the "Nordic race" as superior to all others.
In this scheme South and East Europeans - immigrants and their American-born children - were perceived as racially (and not just nationally or ethnically) distinct and inferior to the dominant, Anglo-Saxon and other Northwestern European groups. Made of "germ plasm"(sic), "the Slavs are immune to certain kinds of dirt. They can stand what would kill a white man." Italians' "dark complexion... resembles African more than Caucasian hues." Jews or "furtive Yacoobs...snarl in weird yiddish." Examples of such racist pronouncements about those "suspicious aliens of inferior species" by respectable public personae in respectable American institutions such as Congress, Harvard University, the American Census Bureau, the American Federation of Labor, and the like, were numerous. Resulting from these accepted perceptions and amply documented by immigration and ethnic historians was the exclusion of South and East European immigrants and their offspring from closer social relations with the natives and open discrimination against them at work (by 1929, 75 to 80 percent of Slavic- and Italian-Americans were still employed in lower-manual echelons of industrial labor, while East European Jews who by the interwar period had moved into colleges and white-collar jobs were met with restrictive entry quotas and outspoken anti-Semitism on campuses and in offices.) (Quotes after Nugent 1992: 158; Lieberson 1980: 25; DeWind and Kasinitz 1997: 1100; Rieder 1985: 32; Taylor 1971: 239; Wyman 1993: 101; see also Higham 1967, 1975; Hutchinson 1956; Gerber 1987; Moore 1981; Jacobson 1995; Perlmann and Waldinger 1997; on the historical changes in the understandings of "race" see Rex 1998.) As late as 1945, referring to Americans of South and East European backgrounds, Warner and Srole, the leading American sociologists, discussed dim prospects for assimilation among those darker-skin "mixtures of Caucasoid and Mongoloid" blood. As Perlmann and Waldinger have rightly pointed out, it was only in subsequent decades that those "dark Caucasoids" became "white ethnics" (1997: 17-18, see also Novak 1972; on the earlier mainstream integration via "becoming white" of South and East Europeans' predecessors in America, the Irish and the Germans, see Roediger 1991; Ignatiev 1995; Kazal 1998).

Prejudice and social exclusion by members of the dominant groups in America against South and East Europeans at the beginning of the twentieth century had naturally sustained the latter's focus on themselves and their home-country personal connections and public affairs. But several other factors also contributed to the forging and maintenance of these transnational liaisons. The majority of Slavic and Italian migrants intended their transatlantic sojourns to be temporary. A significant proportion, between 30 and 40 percent, actually went back to their home countries or, between 15 and 30 percent according to contemporary studies, made repeated visits. (In comparison, less than 10 percent of East European Jews, the majority of whom left permanently, went back). Because they perceived their sojourns abroad as temporary, as indicated by (im)migrants' letters sent to home villages, diaries they wrote, and the contents of the contemporaneous immigrant press in America throughout the interwar period, most sustained close economic and social contacts with their families and friends in Europe (see Nugent 1992; Wyman...
Across the ocean, migrants had remained part of their home communities even after their sojourns had significantly exceeded their socially expected durations (Merton 1982). "The [village] community [does not] reconcile itself to the idea that the emigrant may never return, may ever cease to be a real member of his original group" observed Thomas and Znaniecki in 1918 (idem, 5: 11). The back-and-forth flow of migrants and densely circulating letters - between 1900 and 1906 alone five million letters from sojourners in America arrived in Russia and Austria-Hungary - created an effective transnational system of communication, social control and household management, travel and employment assistance that extended both forward from the (im)migrants' native places in Europe into the United States and backward from America to their original homes.

Letters and migrants returning from America to the European villages spread information about living and working conditions, wages (four-to-six times higher than at home) and possibilities of savings (up to 75 percent of the average laborer's pay. They also helped to make travel arrangements for those willing to leave (see Taylor 1971; Puskas 1993; Listy Emigrantow 1973; Pamietniki Emigrantow 1977; Cinel 1979; Puskas 1982; Walaszek 1994; Kantor 1990). The transatlantic travel of almost two-thirds of the arrivals in America from South and East Europe had been paid by kin or acquaintances who had gone there earlier. The same people helped them to find lodging in densely populated "foreign colonies" in American cities and work among their own kind in American mills and factories.

From across the ocean, (im)migrants supervised their family affairs and managed their farms. "You went with piglets to Rzeszow and Niebylec," wrote an immigrant in Detroit to his wife in Babica in southeastern Poland, "but you did not sell them, did you? Because I know every movement in the village." And in a follow-up letter, commenting on some unpleasant gossip he had heard about his wife from someone who had just arrived: "Every movement in Babica I know, because I live here among the Babicans, and I hope it is not all true (that) I have been told about you" (Duda-Dziewierz 1938:27). Jozefa Pawiak from Budziwoj wrote to her husband in America: "Now dear husband, I wrote you for advice, what to do with this house which is for sale...Now people give [offer] for it 530 renski. It seems to me too expensive, but if you order, dear husband, I shall buy it for this money, because it would be good for us. But If you don't order, I won't buy" (Thomas and Znaniecki 1918-20, 2: 300). An emigrant in Webster, Massachusetts, wrote to his mother in Golub in Congress Poland: "Tell me how was the weather, the crops, and how big the harvest...buy potatoes and you may buy a pig...But the thing (that) does
not please me too much is that you bought yourself a cow and paid for her 29.5 rubles, which is a lot of money" (Listy Emigrantow 1973: 57).

Such long-distance management required continuous attention and, above all, the financial means to provide the support expected - and demanded - by the migrants' families at home from their American "emissaries." "Homefolk passed judgement on their own in America...by the standard of the remittances: this one sends much and frequently, so he is diligent and thrifty; that one sends but little and irregularly so he is negligent and wasteful" (Molek 1979: 45). The enormous sums of money that flowed into South and East Europe during the peak years of overseas migration provide empirical evidence that those emissaries continued to fulfill their social obligations as managers of the family farms and members of their village communities. Between 1900 and 1906 the total amount of money orders sent from the (im)migrants colonies in America to Russia and Austria-Hungary was a staggering $69,000,000. Local figures are perhaps even more impressive. In 1903 alone, Hungarian emigrants from Veszprem County sent no less than $290,000 to their villages. In 1910 two Slovak villages, Butka and Zdiara in the Zemplin region, each received about $15,000, or about $200 per emigrant household (Balch 1910: 140, 183; Wyman 1993; Puskas 1982: 77; Tajtak 1961: 242; see also Benkart 1975; Hanzlik 1975; Murdzek 1977; Morawska 1987, 1989).

A last and important preexisting feature of transnationalism pertains to the civic-political sphere. Posited by new transnationalists, the supposedly novel "transnational sphere of politics and nation-building" extending, through home-bound involvements of immigrants in the United States and diaspora-centered initiatives of home nation-states, between the sending and the receiving societies, had already existed, even thrived, at the turn of the twentieth century and endured through the the interwar period.

By the late nineteenth century most of the home countries of South and East European (im)migrants were still deeply immersed in building the encompassing national allegiance of their larger populations. Several of them, especially in eastern parts of the Continent, struggled to gain (or regain) state-national sovereignty. The overwhelming majority of turn-of-the-twentieth-century Slavic and Italian arrivals in the United States, more than 90 percent of whom were of rural backgrounds, came to this country with a group identity and a sense of belonging that extended no further than the okolica (local countryside). Paradoxically, it was only after they came to America and began to create organized immigrant networks for assistance and self-expression and establishing group boundaries as they encountered an ethnically pluralistic and often hostile environment, that these (im)migrants developed translocal national identities with - to use a distinction of the Polish sociologist, Stanislaw Ossowski (1967; see also Anderson 1983) - their old-country ideological Vaterlands or the imagined communities of the encompassing Patrias as distinct from the Heimats or the local homelands as Italians, Poles, Ukrainians,
Slovaks, Lithuanians, and so on. (Jews, who brought with them their "mobile" spiritual community of klal-Yisroel that stretched back sixty centuries, were again the exception.) Lithuaninas have referred to the United States as "the second birthplace of the[ir] nationality," and the same may be said of the others as well (quote after Park 1922: 51; see also Conzen et al. 1992, Wyman 1993; Hoerder and Moch 1996; Harzig and Hoerder 1985; Jacobson 1995).

Among the variety of sociocultural agencies created by (im)migrants between the 1880s and the 1910s to assist them as they confronted the new environment the foreign-language press played an important role in defining ethnic group boundaries and fostering solidarity by propagating identification with and commitment to the old-country Vaterland. "[These newspapers]...devote more space to European affairs than to America," noted a contemporary observer. Indeed, taking the Chicago-based Polish daily Zgoda as an example, between 1907 and 1912 the proportion of editorials dealing with the American issues was about 20 percent of the total; most of the remainder focused on the homeland. In addition to current news from the homeland, all these newspapers regularly carried sections devoted to their group national history, reprinted (and advertised) novels and poetry by writer-heralds of nationalism and patriotism in their respective countries. So intense was this preoccupation with the home-country Fatherland that the American (read: German and Irish) church hierarchy and educational institutions, with whom Slavic and Italian immigrants leaders battled over language rights in parish and classroom, were commonly depicted as "extensions" of home-country enemies, such as, in the case of Poles referring to the situation in their then partitioned Vaterland, "Prussian policemen," "Muscovite spies," and so on (after Park 1922: 51-55; see also Wyman 1993; Jacobson 1995; Kantowicz 1975; Nelli 1979; Morawska 1993).

The cultural and political elites of South and East European sender societies were not indifferent to and actually repeatedly intervened in this nation-building process that occurred in (im)migrant communities across the ocean either by trying to mobilize "their" emigrants' national loyalty and to engage them for home-country political purposes or to squash their political activities that were deemed subversive. Thus, for example, several organized groups in Italy, such as the Institute di San Raffaele or the Instituto Coloniale, concerned with "keep[ing] alive in the hearts of Italians [in the United States] ...the sentiment of nationality and affection for the mother country" sought (and obtained) government aid for Italian schools in America and supervised their programs by participating in "bilateral" committees composed of representatives from both sides of the ocean; Poles organized home-based agencies to recruit qualified Polish language and history teachers and contributed educational material toward the same purpose in Polish-American colonies, and Lithuanian nationalists came to the United States to help "awaken a Lithuanian spirit among those who had emigrated" (quotes after Wyman 1993: 94; Rubchak 1992: 120; see also Brozek 1977; Caro 1914; Saloutos 1956; Nelli 1979; Cinel 1991; Gilkey 1950; Kantowicz 1975).
The Hungarian political elite, concerned with the growing national consciousness and separatist aspirations among emigres from non-Hungarian, especially Slovak and Rusyn groups in the multiethnic Hungarian Monarchy, launched a systematic propaganda action in these (im)migrant communities to ensure that their members in America remained "good Hungarian citizens" and did not fall under the influence of "bad-intentioned leaders" who "corrupt [them] from the national point of view." And from the Russian consulates in American cities with large concentrations of Poles and Lithuanians - members of subordinate national minorities in the Russian empire - regular reports were sent to St. Petersburg about the national activities of those (im)migrants with warnings about the importation of these and other (democratic) subversive ideas and practices into their hometowns by immigrant press sent from America and by returning Americanci migrants (quote after Wyman 1993: 95; see also Stolarik 1980; Puskas 1982; Glettler 1980; Brozek 1977; Conzen et al. 1992).

With the encouragement of or in opposition to the "transnational politics" of the home-country elites carried out in the immigrant communities, as national identities of Slovaks, Hungarians, Lithuanians, and Poles in America took firmer roots (im)migrants reciprocally became involved as "core" members or organizational leaders on a regular basis and as "silent" members (Iwanska 1981) when mobilized by an important event or issue in the political affairs of their European Vaterlands. At the beginning of the twentieth century such mobilizing issues were many, especially in the case of the politically discriminated against or nationally "awakening" groups in East Europe, millions of whose members had resided in the United States.

The bloody pogrom of the Kishinyev Jews in Russia brought about massive protest demonstrations by victims' fellow ethnics in American cities who through mediation by East Europeans' German coreligionists, who were longer established in the United States and more influential in the political establishment, successfully lobbied the American government to issue an official protest (Soltes 1924; Morawksa 1993). The imprisonment in Hungary in 1907 of Rev. Andrej Hlinka, leader of the nationalist Slovak People's Party, resulted in a series of "indignation meetings" in the Slovak immigrant communities across America to protest the enforced Magyarization policy of the Hungarian government and a concerted action among members of these communities to buy and mail to Slovakia all possible American Slovak-language newspapers protesting this violence and advising the same at home (Zecker 1998). World War I and, in its wake, the remaking of the political order on the European Continent, in particular the (re)gaining of national sovereignty by Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, and Lithuania, aided a remarkable increase in "transnational mobilization" on behalf of the latter in the East European communities in the United States (see Park 1922; Stolarik 1968; Wyman 1993; Walaszek 1984; Brozek 1977; Vardy 1985; Kantowicz 1975; Recihman 1937).
An upsurge of American nativism hostile to immigrants' "foreignness" and "alien loyalties" combined with a vigorous Americanization campaign launched after the end of the war by U.S. government institutions and the media effectively "demobilized" these home-bound enthusiasms of the immigrants and redirected their attention to domestic, American issues and engagements while the immigration restrictions of the 1920s undercut the previously intense circulation of people and news across the Atlantic. Under the influence of these factors and as their transatlantic sojourn extended in time and the immigrants married, bought homes in the "foreign colonies," learned (some) English and saw their children grow up and themselves age in the new country, they developed local, American attachments and interests and assumed (not unproblematic as we shall see shortly) ethnicized identities as Hungarian-American, Italian-American, Lithuanian-American, Polish-American, and so on. In the 1930s the pluralist spirit of New Deal era politics and the founding of the immigrant-friendly nationwide labor organization, the CIO, facilitated the involvement of foreign-born and, especially, second generation Slavs and Italians in American urban politics and industrial workers' unions. (On the post-World War I rise of American nativism and the Americanization campaign see Higham 1967; Ueda 1997; on the development of ethnicized identities among immigrants and their children, see Vecoli 1973; Nelli 1979, 1984; Conzen et al. 1992; Bukowczyk 1984; Jones and Holli 1977; Gerstle 1989; Morawska 1993; Hoerder 1996; on their involvement in American politics and labor unions in the 1930s, see Bayor 1988; Walaszek 1994; Bodnar 1985; Brody 1980; Fink 1977; Brooks 1971; Galenson 1960; Montgomery 1979; Kolko 1976; Slayton 1986; Allswang 1971; Kantowicz 1975; Nelli 1979; Cohen 1990; Glazer and Moynihan 1970; Von Tassel and Grabowski 1986.)

"Transnational" old-country concerns and attachments of the Hungarian-, Italian-, Polish-, or Lithuanian-Americans did not, however, wane, but reconfigured through the ethnicization process into new compositions as their American experience and opportunities became increasingly important as the reference framework for their activities and plans for the future, and the American loyalties and involvements grew in significance. Letters continued to cross and so did financial assistance from the Amerikanci to their "dependents" in Europe. Material objects were regularly exchanged: "modern" gadgets solicited from the Amerikanci by their old-country family members and friends and articles of sentimental value, tokens of the Heimat requested by immigrants to assuage their nostalgia. The following report, from a study conducted in the mid-1930s on the relations between residents of the Polish village Babica and their compatriots in America, also applies to other parts of East and South Europe: "To the American relatives people wrote asking for money, better fabrics for clothing, ready-made clothing, watches, various small innovations for household use, etc....Z kraju (from the home country), the immigrants asked for local honey, mushrooms from nearby woods, kasha, goose feathers for the pillows, pinewood pipes, embroidered shawls, religious medallions, pictures of patron saints, etc." (Duda-Dziewierz 1938: 50; for similar accounts see Gliwiczowna 1936;
Pamietniki Emigrantow 1977; Puskas 1991; Chalasinski 1934; Molek 1979; Wyman 1993; on the spread of techno-consumer culture in interwar America and on immigrants'/ethnics' eager participation therein, see Fox and Lears 1983; Rozenzweig 1984; Heinze 1990).

Continued, too, throughout the interwar period were transnational contacts between various branches of the American-based associations established in South and East Europe by returned Amerikanci migrants, such as the Polish Mechanics' Association headquartered in Toledo, Ohio, and other lodges of ethnic American labor organizations and mutual help cooperatives, Latvian Mazpulks, a youth group based on the American 4-H movement, Slovak Sokols, Polish National Catholic church affiliates of the dissident religious movement of Polish immigrants in America and the like, and their founding organizations in the United States. (On transnational connections between Itlian and Slavic organizations in America and their European home countries during the interwar period see Koht 1946; Wyman 1993; Cerase 1971; Nelli 1979; Walaszek 1986; Saloutos 1956; Cinel 1991; Golda 1976; Morawska 1993).

By the 1930s less than one-half of South and East European immigrants had become naturalized in the United States (the majority of Jews were naturalized, again the exception). Reports of clashes spilling to the streets and into the city halls of American cities between different (im)migrant groups over home-centered nationalist issues and resentiments were common items in contemporaneous American and foreign-language newspapers (see Wyman 1993; Bayor 1988; Glazer and Moynihan 1970; Diggins 1972; Nelli 1979; Kantowicz 1975; Cohen 1990). Nevertheless, when compared with the earlier period, the immigrant press devoted considerably more attention to the American homeland and the ethnic communities and proportionally less to the immigrants' native countries in Europe. Still, topics related to native countries accounted for a significant 35-40 percent of the editorials (but barely a half of that in the Jewish newspapers). "English pages" became a regular feature in the foreign-language Slavic and Italian press, but old-country national histories were printed there side by side with stories from the American past. The Hungarian Szabadsag, for example, in 1929 published a serial "History of the Magyar Nation" and, on the same page, a detailed account of the Battle of Gettysburg. In 1935 the Slovak Jednota ran the legend of Janosik, a national hero of the Tatra Mountains, next to a history of the American Civil War.9

Post-World World War II "transnational politics" of American ethnic groups of East European origin that (re)mobilized again toward action on behalf of their old Vaterlands that had fallen under Soviet rule is beyond the scope of this discussion. But it deserves noting as an excellent illustration of the advantages of the ethnicization model and, especially, its emphasis on the flexibility in configurations of immigrant/ethnic identities and concerns for the interpretation of transnationalism. In this case, interestingly, immigrant/ethnic transnational politics involved as an
external player-sponsor the host (American) state rather than, as in the earlier period considered here, home-country political elites.

The United States government's foreign policy interests in the context of the prolonged cold war with the Soviet Union and, specifically, its attempts to weaken its enemy on its own territory, made it receptive to or even overtly encouraging of political lobbying by East European ethnic leaders and organizations to pressure communist governments about human rights issues and persecuted groups or individuals, to broadcast uncensored information and anti-Soviet propaganda into Eastern Europe, to solicit material help for dissident groups, and so on. When important developments such as political unrest occurred in these countries - for example, in Hungary in 1956; Czechoslovakia in 1968; Poland in 1980-81 - the "silent" members of the ethnic communities, otherwise focused on their American affairs, joined in transnational politics on behalf of their old homelands. (On postwar "diaspora politics" of East European Americans and its support by the U.S. government see, e.g., Shain 1991, 1994-95; Nash 1989; Rubchak 1992; Safran 1991; Jacobson 1995; Misiunas 1991; also Cohen 1997).

The above illustrations of the multiple transatlantic networks with their old Vaterlands sustained by earlier-wave European immigrants and their American-born children and the involvement of both home and host nation-states in maintaining these liaisons amply document the similarities between the past and present transnationalisms of the (im)migrant/ethnic populations in America. But the present-day situation, shaped by new developments in addition to the enduring circumstances, is not, of course, an exact replica of that from the past. Among those "added components" the following have been the most important.

At the macro-level they include, at the global level, the expanded and increasingly dense interconnectedness of the world-economy dominated by the most highly developed NW core countries/regions and the penetration through the global media of cultural values and orientations of the world's (NW) core into (semi-)peripheral (SE) societies, both greatly facilitated by the "compression of time and space" resulting from the transportation-and-communication revolution. In the receiving, American society the restructuring of the economy has replaced the "lower class" with an "underclass" and has created a growing informal sector largely isolated from mainstream advancement/integration opportunities, on the one hand, and, on the other, the highly skilled professional sector. In the sending societies the educational and occupational differentiation of the general and, of concern here, migrant population supplies (unevenly distributed, depending on national group) the labor force and internationalizes both underclass and upper-level sectors of the American economy.

The politicization of international migration by the receiver states (i.e., controls of the entry, the duration of sojourn, and permissible pursuits of the
migrants) has created there a growing army of marginalized "illegal" migrants. Simultaneously, however, and as a counter-influence on these measures, since the 1960s in the American public discourse a renaissance of the ideology of cultural pluralism has occurred, this time combined with practical implementation in the juridical system and public institutions. At the same time, civic-political movements and organizations of laws and declarations upholding universal human rights, civic entitlements of groups and individuals, social justice, and democratic representation and pluralism have proliferated across the globe and trickled down to the national-level. Finally, most of the present-day societies that send out the largest numbers of international migrants have already completed, or find themselves in an advanced stage of the nation-building process, and their national membership/loyalty laws, political discourse, and cultural representations are considerably less exclusive than were their turn-of-the-twentieth-century nation-building South and East European predecessors. (On these developments see, e.g., Sassen 1991; Castells 1996; Freeman 1998; Koslovsky 1998; Alba and Nee 1997; Cornelius and Hollifield 1994; Hansen 1998; Teitelbaum and Weiner 1995; Aleinikoff 1998; Rumbaut 1994; Esman 1992.)

At the micro-level the new elements include, starting with potential migrants still in their home countries, premigration Westernization or, more precisely, Americanization, that is, familiarity and often identification with Western/American values and lifestyles under the impact of the media and contacts with emigre and returnee family and friends. Next, in comparison with the predominantly (70-75 percent) male turn-of-the-twentieth-century transatlantic migrations of South and East Europeans (Jews, whose emigration was permanent, left in entire families), contemporary travellers contain significantly larger proportions of women, and, as already noted, have been much more diversified in terms of educational attainment and occupational positions. The return and circular movement of present-day migrants a large share of whom originate from regions geographically close to the United States that are made even closer by quick and easy transportation, has been considerably more intense. (Noteworthy as it is, the difference in intensity is, however, in degree rather than in "kind"; similar travels a century ago were common.) A new phenomenon, increasingly common among contemporary (legal) migrants and usually tacitly tolerated by the sender and the receiver nation-states because of the noted (re)orientations in their ideologies and policies regarding national membership, has been the holding of dual (or more) citizehships in the countries of origin and (e)migration. The receiving American society has acquired an important new feature as a popular culture equivalent of the legal-political system reorientation noted earlier, namely, a much more tolerant and cosmopolitan public opinion regarding foreign or "other" things and people, including immigrants and their lifestyles. (On these developments see Rumbaut and Hohm 1997; Rumbaut 1997, 1997a; Levitt 1998; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Boyd 1989; Gabaccia 1994; Portes and Rumbaut 1990; Lieberson and Waters 1988; also Alba and Nee 1997.)
Present-day (im)migrants' transnationalism, shaped by the combination of the enduring and new elements, differs from that of their turn-of-the-twentieth-century predecessors in two major ways. First, it is much more variegated or plural in form and content, because contemporary (im)migrants themselves are much more diverse in their regional origins, racial identifications, gender, and home-country socioeconomic backgrounds and cultural orientations and, in the host society, in their legal status, the sector of the economy they are employed in, and their modes of acculturation to the dominant society. In addition, both the sending and the receiving nation-states are today much more tolerant of such differences than in the past.

Reflecting the diversity among (im)migrant actors and their circumstances, contemporary transnationalisms range from very intense - the situation, most common among short-to-middle-distance indocumentado non-white (or perceived as such) employees of the informal economic sector, whereby (im)migrants' homes, work, incomes, friends, and entertainment actually (and symbolically) "happen" in-between, pendle-like, on two (or more) sides of states' borders, through the gamut of in-between ethnicization configurations with varying home-host compositions and emphases, to the postnational genre increasingly common among the highly skilled professional globetrotter-employees of TNCs, international NGOs, and the like. Unfortunately, there has thus far been little investigation of gender effects on these transnational identities and involvements. Existing studies report contradictory findings: women's national/ethnic identities tend to be more trans; "fluid and permeable," than those of men (Waters 1996), and they are more sharply focused or delineated (Gabaccia 1994); see also Jacobson 1995; Walby 1996). More research is obviously needed on this issue, but it seems most likely that the genderedness of (im)migrants' transnationalism assumes different patterns depending on the impact of other sociodemographic features of the actors and their economic and cultural environments and their interactions.

Second, whereas the earlier-wave immigrants and their children were subject to exclusionary demands from home and host nation-states regarding their national commitments and were unprotected by legal-institutional and civic tolerance for the practice of diversity, legitimate options are available to their contemporary successors in terms of identities and participation, ranging from global to transnational, national, and local and different combinations thereof. Although the idea of a "just pluralism" does not embrace equally all communities, especially those of non-whites (who constitute a large proportion of contemporary [im]migrants) these laws and public discourse create institutional channels and a juridico-political "climate" for groups and individuals either to pursue their grievances or to remain "other" without fear of opprobrium and accusations of state-national disloyalty.

At the beginning of the twentieth century East and South Europeans' transnationalism, that is, interest and involvement in their home countries was confronted with the then pervasive suspicion of foreigners' anti-Americanism and
wide support among the natives for President Woodrow Wilson's renowned "infallible test" for proper hyphenated Americans (who might retain "ancient affections" but their "hearts and thoughts [must be] centered nowhere but in the emotions and the purposes and the policies of the U.S.A." (after Arthur 1991: 144). At the same time the idea of the home-country Patria as promulgated by the cultural elites of the then either stateless or recently politically unified nations of South and East Europe and emulated by immigrant secular and religious leaders, newspapers, and (parochial) school texts in (im)migrant settlements defined the nation as the primordial, encompassing symbolic community and nationalism and national identity as the moral imperative and the exclusive loyalty.

In this situation transnational identities and attachments of pre-World War II immigrants and, especially, their American-born children still viewed by the dominant groups as "suspicious aliens of inferior species," were experienced as contradictory in a painful, "raw on the inside" way - a predicament to cope with and resolve with minimum exposure to the accusation of national betrayal in their own minds and hearts and in the eyes of representatives of the two nation-states of which they felt members. When asked why he did not become an American citizen, a Slovak in prewar Pittsburgh explained that he did not want to "forswear himself." My own historical-ethnographic study of Slavic and Hungarian communities in a Pennsylvania steel town revealed that a sense of discomfort was quite common among immigrants who did obtain American citizenship. Although differently "textured," it also existed among their American-born children for whom their parents' old homelands were experience-distant but America - experience-near (quote from Morawska 1996: 239; for the Pennsylvania milltown study see Morawska 1985).

In comparison with those "closet transnationalists" today (im)migrants' "public transnationalism," including simultaneous involvements in the civic-political affairs of their home and host countries, have become to them a matter-of-fact condition or choice (not without tensions, of course) that they can rightfully claim. Their transnational identities are not experienced, or are experienced considerably less intensely than in the past, as problematic and uncomfortable because of the legitimation of "la droit a la difference" in contemporary American society and the resulting enhanced sense of civic-political entitlement.

On the Benefits of Historical Comparison (In Lieu of Conclusion)

What, then, are the lessons from this historical comparison? What considerations should better inform the debate on contemporary (im)migrants' transnationalism? And what from the latter could enrich the work of immigration historians?
The "new transnationalists" could derive four such epistemic gains from a historical-comparative perspective on present-day immigrants' identities and lifestyles. First and most general would be the recognition that history matters or, put differently, the acknowledgment of the importance of long-term historical processes and circumstances in sustaining people's' - (im)migrants' - attitudinal and behavioral patterns and, at the same time, in transforming them. The long-dure presence of several features of (im)migrants' transnationalism and the global context thereof have been extensively discussed in the previous section. I would recommend in addition a historical, extended-time perspective on the (im)migrants' acculturation to the host/mainstream society. One of the premises of the "new transnationalism" proposition is the failure of assimilation among recent (im)migrants in the United States who, it is argued, are reluctant to learn English and are uninterested in obtaining American citizenship and participating in American politics as concerned American citizens (rather than merely for ethnic or home-national purposes). Ethnicization required several decades for turn-of-the-twentieth-century immigrants to integrate this knowledge, interests, and commitments into their home-country-oriented lifestyles. Although for some present-day (im)migrants home-bound involvements and identities have indeed been more dense and intensive than were those of earlier-wave groups, the duration of their stays (including repeated temporary sojourns) in the United States has not yet been long enough to assess conclusively the scope and "hold" of their assimilation. Existing data show steady increases (differently paced for different groups) in English proficiency, gradual residential dispersion, and naturalization rates among new immigrants from Latin America, the Carribean, and Asia (see, e.g., Rumbaut 1994; Rumbaut and Cornelius 1995; Rumbaut and Hohm 1997; Levitt 1998; also Alba and Nee 1997) which suggests progress toward rather than a retreat from or stalling of ethnicization.

The second contribution of a historical-comparative treatment of (im)migrants' /ethnics' transnationalism is the appreciation of the role of the nation-states on both sides of the migration process in enhancing or suppressing (sometimes at cross-purposes) these transnational identities and involvements toward political, economic, or military purposes, which may or may not coincide with the interests of the manipulated (im)migrant/ethnic groups. In spite of the advancements in long-term globalization of which complex cross-national networks of people, and ideas, and institutions have been a constitutive component, the "formatting" influence upon it by the nation-states has by no means disappeared. As the foregoing discussion has shown, however, this influence - its strength, direction, and effectiveness - has been historically variable or contingent on time- and place-specific circumstances, and therefore it should be assessed on a case/temporal basis rather than generalized in dichotomizing statements about either a declining or "fortress" nation-state. The other side of the impact on (im)migrants'/ethnics' transnational identities and involvements of their home and host nation-states has been the reciprocal engagement: identificational, civic-political, and/or economic, of those (im)migrant/ethnic actors in these nation-states that over shorter or, usually, more
extended times affects the latter's popular culture and national-self perceptions, the occupational distribution, and the domestic and international politics. Like the impact of the state, or, generally, larger structures on (im)migrants, the reverse influences are also historical, that is, they are contingent on changing characteristics of the actors themselves and their environments.

The third benefit from an historical-comparative approach to contemporary (im)migrants/ethnics' transnationalism is methodological. It is predicated on the agreement that the concepts of ethnicization informing historical research on (im)migrant/ethnic lifestyles and activities in the past and that of transnationalism informing studies of present-day (im)migrants'/ethnics' pursuits and adjustments are theoretically akin to each other.

The basic premise of the ethnicization model positing the "imperfect" reciprocity of structures and agency resulting, on the one hand, from the multiplicity and "polysemy" of situations in actors' everyday practices and, on the other, from the transposability of sociocultural resources applied to different situations, especially in a new environment, refocuses the discussion about the origins and persistence of ethnicity from the (primordialist) ancient "being" or the (instrumentalist-constructivist) instant "doing" to the continuous becoming and to the "blending" of different components instead of the final product thereof. The underlying assumptions of the concept of transnationalism, specifically, those of the inherent multiplicity and flexibility of impacts and outcomes and its dynamic, processual treatment of social practices and cultural identities are cognate with the ideas that underlay the idea of ethnicization. Thus, Michael Kearney describes the multifaceted, malleable identities of contemporary (im)migrants as "coalesc[ing] as ethnicity, as an ethnic consciousness, which is the supremely appropriate form for identity to take in the age of transnationalism" (1991: 62). In their recent essay, "Transnationalism: A New Analytic Framework for Understanding Migration," Nina Glick Schiller et al. (1992) invoke Hannerz's concept of "creolization," or mixing, as a useful analytic tool for the understanding of "the dynamic of migration and differentiation...as transmigrants live in several societies simultaneously [and] within their complex web of social relations draw upon and create fluid and multiple identities" (p. 11)

Historically minded students of immigration and ethnicity prefer to look for similarly "flexible and fluxible" yet bounded by time- and place-specific circumstances rather than completely fluid social processes and phenomena, which allows them to search for and identify historical patterns of attitudes and behaviors. In explaining why things happened, social historians and historical sociologists of (im)migration and ethnicity (re)construct how they did by using the configurational method as their primary mode of analysis, that is, by identifying and explaining particular combinations of the macro- and micro-level events/actions/circumstances that contribute to the explanandum. By making their interpretations time- and place-
sensitive or to account for the sequences of unfolding occurrences believed to have generated specific outcomes, they have allowed similar factors to assume different meanings over time and in different settings that contribute to particular outcomes. They have been working for nearly two decades toward perfecting the strategies of configurational analysis so that they can be applied to test general models on historical processes, to analyze causal regularities in time- and place-specific historical instances, or to develop meaningful interpretations of social-historical cases (see Skocpol 1984; Abbott 1992, Griffin 1992, Issac, 1997; Quadagno and Knapp 1992, Aminzade 1992, Ragin 1987). To the extent that they are persuaded by the theoretical affinity between the concepts of transnationalism and ethnicization, the advocates of the former may find this work useful.

For those who might be interested in pursuing the configurational method of analysis, from the literature on transnational involvement of contemporary migrants and from similarly focused studies (or parts thereof) of immigration and ethnic historians I have compiled a list of conditions: global, in (im)migrants' home and host societies, in the immigrants communities, and regarding characteristics of the (im)migrant group itself, that seem to affect one aspect of (im)migrants' transnationalism, namely, their transnational political involvement. If one considers multiple interactions among the contributing factors and reciprocal effects between those conditions and their outcomes complexified even further by the effects of class, racial/ethnic origin, gender, the duration of American sojourn and so on, and "sets in motion" this gyroscopic construction, "polyfractal" would probably be the best term to depict these relationships.
Conditions Affecting Migrants’ Transnational Political Involvement
Past and Present Migrants: Comparative Configurations

I. General Conditions

1. Global
   - degree of the "systemness" of (economic, technological, cultural) globalization;
   - existence of global civic-political organizations for human rights and peace:*)

2. In Home Country
   - position in the global economic system and vis-à-vis the U.S.A.;
   - degree of penetration by global (American) culture (material and symbolic);*)
   - civic-political tradition/culture, esp. the place national interests, identity, and loyalty in the political idiom;*)
   - attitudes/behavior of home government toward (e)migrants (facilitating or preventing contacts and involvement);

3. In Host Country
   - role of home country/region in its geopolitical interests;
   - immigration policies and executive institutions;
   - public discourse (legal, political, educational institutions, popular media) in civic matters: the meaning(s) of nation-state, citizenship, national culture (pluralism/multiculturalism);*)
   - existence of entrenched and widespread institutional racism/nativism;

II. Local Conditions (Receiving Country)
   - labor market conditions and opportunities for upward mobility;
   - degree of ethnic/racial residential segregation/concentration;
   - interethnic/racial (power) relations;
   - civic-political culture and practice;
   - native perceptions of (im)migrants’/specific group’s cultural proximity and degree of social exclusion/inclusion;*)
   - existence of supraethnic organizations/purposes;*)

III. Characteristics of (Im)migrant Group
   - size of the group and proportion relative to native population;
   - socioeconomic composition;
   - mode of incorporation into local economy;
   - political or economic migration (or proportions of in the group);
   - intentions of (im)migrants as to purpose/duration of their stay and contacts/involvement in home country (economic, social, cultural);*)
   - proportions of American-born, recent immigrant, and “floating” group members, and “contents” of their collective identities (the latter *);
   - density/intensity of intra-group formal/informal networks/relations;
   - presence of charismatic leaders;*)
   - access to host country’s government and public opinion;*)
   - mobilizing effects of important events/developments in home country*);

*)Conditions marked by the asterisk have been added to the combined list of factors noted in L. Guarnizo’s and D. Gutierrez’s papers.
Such a "moving-picture" configurational analysis does not generate general conclusions about (all) transmigrants, whether past or present. But it allows one to rearrange, kaleidoscopelike, component elements to explain comparatively, for example, civic-political practices of the majority of recently surveyed Mexicans who reportedly take part in neither (mainstream) American political activities nor in their own ethnic organizations or home-country public affairs and the minority actively involved in home-bound and American ethnic politics (after Jusdanis 1996: 154). Then, should one be interested in a more encompassing project, one could compare, say, more American-bound political involvement of Brazilian immigrants from Governador Valaderes with the "equally distributed" between home and host countries commitments of Gujaratis Indians (see Levitt 1998).

The benefits of the transnationalism-ethnicization encounter are, of course, not one-sided. I readily perceive the following gains for the practitioners of the ethnicization approach who integrate elements of the transnationalism paradigm. Given their recognition of (im)migrants' cross - statal connections and of the "glocal" quality of their lifeworlds, it would make sense to expand the analysis of ethnicization-quas-transnationalization, which has traditionally focused exclusively on (im)migrant/ethnic communities in their host-country environment, to consider as well similar effects in micro- and macro-level economies and social institutions, state- and local-level politics, and cultures of (im)migrants' home countries and to problematize the relationships of these processes. (The differentiating impact of class and gender considered over time would be, of course, of interest.) The transnational perspective directs the attention of students of ethnicization, which has been focused on migrants' bi-national networks, involvements, and identities stretched between home countries and immigrant communities, to the possibility of more, pluri(pan)national/-ethnic connections and commitments as (im)migrants/their offspring in America lived next to, worked with, struggled for "panethnic" labor unions, befriended, or even married members of other (im)migrant groups. (Again, the effects of gender, generation, and the emerging class differences would be of great interest.) It also refocuses the customary interpretation of the involvement of immigrants/ethnics in American politics as reflecting the increment in "host" components in the ethnicization melange by suggesting the consideration of such engagement as, precisely, ethnic-as-transnational. Finally, by positing the possibility of new, postnational involvements and identities - the variety of transnationalism identified but not discussed here as as not (yet?) formed into discernible social patterns among ordinary immigrants, especially in North America, which lacks suprastatal structures comparable to those of the emergent European Union - the ethnicization-quas-transnationalization approach would permit its practitioners to formulate and to test research questions that, if supported by data, might require reworking of the concept of ethnicization as creole combinations of existing, national options including the specification of circumstances in which it does not occur.
Endnotes

1. In the literature not identified itself with the new transnationalism paradigm there exists as well another, third understanding of the concept of transnationalism, and referring to the connections that stretch beyond state borders of one country into another(s) and link members of national/ethnic diasporas outside of their native countries into single symbolic deterritorialized national/ethnic communities based on nearly-exclusive (rather than inclusive and plural as in the first identified here interpretation) identities and commitments, and, in the case of departed members of sovereign nation-states, often also civic membership. Studies informed by this interpretation have been authored by political scientists and international relations specialists as well as political and cultural sociologists, and have dealt with diasporas worldwide (see, e.g., Van der Laan 1975; Singh 1977; Iwanska 1981; Chaliand and Temon 1983; Sheffer 1993; Shain 1991; Hourani and Shehadi 1992; Hovannisian 1992; Pattie 1994; Jacobson 1995; also Cohen 1997 for a review and discussion of diaspora groups and literature, and Clifford 1997 for a critique of the enclosure/non-mixing assumption underlying some of the latter).

2. Other most commonly used conceptualizations of ethnicity as instrumental-situational, negotiated, or constructed, and, for that matter, also the assimilation model if properly "historicized," can be, I believe, encompassed within the ethnicization framework. For a review of different conceptualizations of ethnicity and (im)migrants' adaptation to the host society, see Sollors 1996, and Hutchinson and Smith 1996.

3. But see Sollors 1996; Hutchinson and Smith 1996; also Gans 1997 for overviews of post-assimilationist models developed by the sociologists that have been neglected by new transnationalists and that either emphasize or allow for sociocultural continuities between (im)migrants' home- and host-environments.

4. Although two among (non-Jewish) East European immigrant groups considered here: Hungarians and Lithuanians, are not Slavs, admittedly in a violation of cultural realities but in order to avoid repeated lengthy references to "Slavs, Lithuanians, and Hungarians," I sumbsume here these two groups under the general term "Slavic."

5. Because it escaped, as it were, the forces incorporating Eastern Europe into the Atlantic world system, recorded separately should be 5-to-8-million person emigration during the same era of Russian peasantry to Siberia and Central Asia (see Obolensky-Ossinsky 1929).

6. European and American sources report, respectively, higher and lower figures of such repeated journeys: my own examination of the early twentieth century ethnographic studies in Eastern Europe (reported in Morawska 1985, chap.1) indicates the proportion of repeaters among returned Amerikancv in the villages as ranging between 25% and 40%, whereas the 1908 U.S. Immigration Commission and port records for 1899-1906 reported 12% to 17% (after Wyman 1993: 82-83).

7. A suprisingly high 20-odd per cent of Jews, however, returned to Eastern Europe between 1880 and 1900 (see Sarna 1981).

8. The domination of European affairs in the Slavic and Italian immigrants press after the New York Globe as quoted in Soltes 1924, 175-76. Estimations from Zgoda calculated by E.M. from the content analysis of this newspaper at the Immigration History Research Center at St.Paul University, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
9. The proportion of old country-focused editorials during the interwar period from my content analysis of the foreign-language newspapers held at the Immigration History Research Center, St. Paul University, Minnesota. The same for the Szabadság and leadnota series.

10. Although to a much lesser degree and without the legal-institutional apparatus designed for this very purpose, the entry of (im)migrants into the United States has been actually controlled by the state even before the immigration restriction laws of the 1920s through the federal supervision of the number of foreign ships entering the U.S. ports, and the authority to set the standards of "health" and refuse entry of disembarking (im)migrants who failed the prescribed tests (see Higham 1967, 1975; Ueda 1997; Weil 1997; Kraut 1994).
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