

There are several other problems in Vigil's book. First, his analyses of two issues—the reasons for the Texas Revolution and the nature of marginality—are much too brief and contain some inaccuracies. Second, the limited discussion of the Chicano movement of the '60s and '70s of the Southwest, although reasonably described, is quite disappointing in its brevity and superficiality in light of the author's activist commitment and his focus on "Chicano responses" throughout most of the book. And third, in studying the factors contributing to the rise of Chicano sociocultural and psychobehavioral characteristics, the author accepts some stereotypic traits as actually existing without first questioning their factual bases. However, it is possible that the brief space dedicated to these issues is the product of overzealous editing.

The shortcomings just discussed do not seriously detract from the valuable, challenging, and seminal contribution of the book as a whole. It is a work which ought to be seriously considered for adoption particularly for upper-division sociology and anthropology, Chicano and ethnic studies classes. In fact, the reviewer has already placed an order for the fall semester of 1983!

—Homer D.C. Garcia
The Claremont Colleges
Claremont, California

Charles A. Ward, Philip Shashko, and Donald E. Pienkos, eds. *Studies in Ethnicity: The East European Experience in America*. East European Monographs, No. 73. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980) 256 pp., \$17.50.

Studies in Ethnicity is a collection of papers read at the conference "Aspects of the East European Experience in Europe and America" held at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, May 4-5, 1979. The editors have arranged the papers under three headings: "Ethnicity and Language Maintenance in America," "Ethnic Social Organization: Secular and Religious Dimensions," and "Ethnic Writers in America."

The four essays on language maintenance tend to be rather specialized in focus, detailing the intermixture of English words into the immigrant language, patterns of language change within different generations of the same family, and geographic patterns of ethnic and

linguistic groups in Wisconsin. Separate essays dealing with changes in Croatian, Polish, and Czech language use are primarily of value to the linguist. Barbara Borowiecki's paper on Wisconsin ethnicity contains good charts and maps of ethnic change between 1860 and 1970 and is quite useful to the general ethnic studies aficionado.

The six essays on organizations among several East European and Eastern Orthodox nationalities are more compelling. Frank Renkiewicz's article chronicling the rise of Polish mutual assistance groups, their ultimate Americanization, and important functions as schools for business management and channels to community leadership is a fine piece. So is Karel Bicha's analysis of Czech religion as a divisive force and the consequent lack of a viable community by the 1870s. Lazar Brkich gives intricate detail about the various Serbian fraternal, social, and cultural organizations, as well as their different character before and after World War II. Michael Petrovich provides a good exposition of the problems faced by Eastern Orthodox peoples in adjusting to industrial America and the ethnic decentralization of the church in America. On the other hand, Daniel Buczek's assumption that religion was *the* major formulator of culture for both the Polish peasant and the American Protestant, with a resultant clash between Polish acceptance of hierarchy and the American Protestant's direct lay participation, seems overstated, as is his conclusion that the Polish clergy were unable to plan at politics effectively.

Two of the four essays on the arts, those by Mateja Matejic and Betty Ann Burch, describe well the struggle to assert an individual identity in the face of cultural pain, as that struggle appears in several works of fiction. Josef Skvorecky points out that forcing a writer to emigrate from a repressive regime has the design, if not the effect, of reducing that writer's influence although he or she need not perish. Edward Czerwinski pleads for an expanded recognition of the Polish theater.

As might be expected, conference papers vary in quality and theme. One unfortunate aspect of this collection, however, is the editor's failure to prepare an introductory essay which ties the papers together and illuminates differences as well as similarities in the responses of the several groups. I found it interesting, for example, that evidence from at least two essays suggests that Americanization may have been a qualitatively unique experience for women. Some succinct editorial observations would have alleviated the disjointedness of this work and enabled the really penetrating essays to stand out.

—Lyle Koehler
University of Cincinnati