

The Use of Archives in the Study of Immigration and Ethnicity

RICHARD N. JULIANI

IN RECENT YEARS there has been a widely proclaimed resurgence of interest in ethnicity in the United States. On one level, a small but articulate group of writers has maintained that Americans are experiencing a very significant renewal of identification with and interest in their past, and may be on the verge of forging an important new force in American politics and culture. Michael Novak, perhaps one of the most influential spokesmen for the new ethnicity, has compassionately referred to the descendants of the so-called new immigration as the *PIGS*:

... those Poles, Italians, Greeks, and Slavs, non-English-speaking immigrants, numbered so heavily among the workingmen of this nation. Not particularly liberal, nor radical, born into a history not white Anglo-Saxon and not Jewish—born outside what in America is considered the intellectual mainstream. And thus privy to neither power nor status nor intellectual voice.¹

At the same time, the new ethnicity has generated its own critics who contend that this movement is neither realistic nor productive; instead they argue that the philosophy and politics of the new ethnicity is a dangerous and divisive trend in inter-group relations.² While this controversy rages, however, a second trend on another level can be noted which is less debatable, but still important.³ There has been a strong renewal of scholarly interest in immigration and ethnicity among intellectuals, researchers, and teachers. For instance, according to a study to be published soon by the Balch Institute in Philadelphia, of all the doctoral dissertations written on immigration and related topics since the first one in 1892, more than half of them have appeared in the twelve-year period between 1961 and 1972.⁴ Similarly, according to a recent U.S. Office of Education survey, during the 1972-73 academic year 135 colleges and universities offered 315 courses in the area of white ethnic studies (in addition to courses dealing with Blacks, American Indians, Chicanos, and Puerto Ricans).⁵ Yet another indication of the renewed interest in ethnicity is evident in the fact that 1,026 proposals for funding in fiscal year 1974 were submitted in

The author is assistant professor of sociology at Temple University, in Philadelphia.

¹ Michael Novak, *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1971).

² Harold R. Isaacs, "The New Pluralists," *Commentary* 53 (March 1972): 75-79; Gunnar Myrdal, "The Case Against Romantic Ethnicity," *The Center Magazine* 7 (July 1974): 26-30.

³ Contrast, for example, the interpretation offered by Andrew M. Greeley in his *Why Can't They Be Like Us?* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1971) with that of Vladimir C. Nahirny and Joshua A. Fishman, "American Immigrant Groups: Ethnic Identification and the Problem of Generation," *Sociological Review* 13 (November 1965): 311-26; and Thomas F. Magner, "The Rise and Fall of the Ethnics," *Journal of General Education* 25 (1973): 253-64.

⁴ A. William Hoglund, *Immigrants and Their Children in the United States: A Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations, 1892-1972* (Philadelphia: Balch Institute, forthcoming).

⁵ Gene I. Maeroff, "White Ethnic Groups in Nation Are Encouraging Heritage Programs in Trend Toward Self-Awareness," *New York Times*, 28 January 1974, p. 11.

a period of less than five weeks to the U.S. Office of Education, under the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program.⁶

Within the scholarly community, one of the most exciting developments bearing on the study of immigration and ethnicity has been the work of a new generation of historical researchers who have shifted to an entirely new scale of procedures, greatly expanded their sense of substance, and set new intellectual goals as well. First, by adopting the techniques of social scientists, the "Clio-metricians" have introduced the mechanical processing of quantitative data to historians and have achieved an enormous increase in the amount of information under examination.⁷ The significance of this prodigious quantum leap in methodology has justly warranted, in itself, the label of *new history*. In addition, this work reveals a developing definition of the subject matter. Traditionally, academic historians in too many cases had a narrow preoccupation with political and military events and personalities as the substance of their studies. The new historians, to the contrary, display a welcome tendency to explore all the social institutions of a civilization. They also show a great willingness to examine the relationships and interactions among social institutions. And, most desirably, they have turned to the social experiences of the ordinary members of society. Finally, the new historians reflect also a series of new aspirations. In the past, historians might have been distinguished from social scientists on the grounds that the former were primarily interested in the idiographic description of unique events, while the latter pursued the nomothetic analysis of recurrent activities in order to determine the laws of social behavior. In short, while historians might have *described* the American Revolution, social scientists attempted to *explain* the phenomenon of revolutions.⁸ Occasionally, an institutional historian such as Alexis de Tocqueville might seem to invalidate such distinctions; nevertheless this separation between the disciplines was generally sound. As the new historians accepted the challenge of new procedures and new substance, they also assumed different analytical goals—adding the explanation of general events to the description of specific events. Among other consequences, these innovations within the craft of historical scholarship have greatly blurred the conventional boundaries between history and sociology. In fact, some sociologists are tempted to characterize the new historians gratuitously as historical sociologists. These changes have also created greater affinities between social scientists and historians and make possible a tremendously fruitful new collaboration between the disciplines. At the root of this convergence is the movement of history as a discipline nearer and nearer to scientific procedure.

However, in the same way that the extended application of the scientific model from the study of the physical world to the study of social behavior was from its beginning and remains today a problem, the development of the new history faces similar difficulties. The basic underlying issue is the question: can we actually *test* historical hypotheses? Can we construct causal models, delineate specific hypotheses, gather systematic data, and make decisions which represent critical tests of

⁶ P.L. 92-318, Title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, *Congressional Record*, 93d Congress, 2d session, 18 July 1974, p. 107.

⁷ Perhaps the best representative of this approach is Stephan Thernstrom. See his various works, including *Poverty and Progress: Social Mobility in a Nineteenth-Century City* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964) and, co-edited with Richard Sennett, *Nineteenth-Century Cities: Essays in the New Urban History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969). Similarly, of considerable depth is the work at the Philadelphia Social History Project, under the direction of Theodore Hershberg, which is just beginning to reach the publication stage.

⁸ Nicholas S. Timasheff, *Sociological Theory: Its Nature and Growth*, 3d ed. (New York: Random House, 1967), pp. 6-7.

the validity of these ideas? In brief, can we have a science of history? Some historians might argue that it is not the function of their discipline to test hypotheses. Other historians might accept the task of hypothesis-testing but ignore, in fact, the more stringent canons of science and operate with a looser set of standards. Yet historians increasingly use a vocabulary of concepts which indicate their intentions to create explanations. Further complicating this issue is the fact that areas such as ethnic studies draw social scientists and historians together. We use each other's questions, ideas, data, and insights. Unfortunately, we also often enter into pejorative accusation across disciplinary lines, frequently based upon distorted impressions of one another. At a conference on immigration and industrialization in 1973, one historian eagerly assaulted what she termed the sociological interpretation of the family. She equated the interpretation with the "Chicago School" in the past and Parsonsian theory at present in a rather one-sided exercise, without any indication of knowledge of alternative ideas on the family within the discipline of sociology which, ironically, conformed rather precisely to her own view. At the same meeting other papers on the impact of industrialization on stratification presented concepts and arguments similarly labeled sociological as strawmen to attack in order to advance the revisions of the authors.

If we can put aside this unfortunate and counterproductive debate, we can return to the more important issue: what can be expected from the interaction of sociology and history as disciplines? What can be gained from the intersection of sociological procedures and data with historical questions? And, we might add, what role can be played, if any, by archivists? Collaborating historians and social scientists face two general problems in the analysis and interpretation of data. In regard to either of these issues, we shall see that archival collections could provide one very important source of opportunities and solutions.

The first problem refers to the limitations of quantitative data precisely in terms of their functions as quantitative data. The use of quantitative data is a means of greater precision in measurement; hence, such use is probably the most direct instrument to the attainment of scientific knowledge. The basic method of science for the establishment of validity is comparison. Therefore, in order to have quantitative data which meet scientific standards of validity, it is necessary to make critical comparisons, and the primary function of quantitative data is to facilitate such comparisons. From a scientific point of view, one of the greatest disappointments in the attempt to use archival materials is the discovery of a wealth of material related to some particular institution or aspect of group life, but no analogous material to make possible a comparative model of inquiry which would permit the actual testing of hypotheses. The implication of this problem for archivists should be obvious; if the new history is to mature into a rigorous scientific enterprise, comparative data must be accumulated. Otherwise, we cannot study history with anything approaching the certainty promised by science.

The second problem is in the inherent limitations of quantitative data as a particular data type in contrast to other types which are customarily termed qualitative data. Some argue that in attempting to explore any issue, including immigration and ethnicity, it is possible to tie knowledge to specific operations and to merge truth totally with methodology. This argument rests upon neopositivist philosophy which holds that if we cannot *measure* some thing, then it does not exist. The new history in its enthusiastic adoption of sociological techniques may, unintentionally and implicitly, absorb this philosophical outlook. The new historians have incorporated the widespread use of ecological data to answer historical questions. Ironically, Edward P. Hutchinson, one of the most perceptive and influential

users of such data in the study of immigration and ethnic groups, has warned that aggregate data can often conceal and average out more than they reveal, that they tantalize and frustrate, and that they often lead the researcher into wanting to get in back of them through smaller and more localized studies.⁹ Or, as John W. Blassingame has put it so well in a review of *Time on the Cross*, that most profound and significant example of the new history:

What Fogel and Engerman forgot was that numbers do not provide their own interpretative framework. It makes no sense at all, for instance, to make assumptions about the intentions of planters based solely on numbers when slaveholders explicitly discuss these matters in thousands of documents. Failure to read any of this material led the authors down many false trails.¹⁰

The argument here is not that historians should not utilize quantitative data; in fact, its use has obviously opened some tremendously exciting possibilities for historical analysis. Rather the argument is that historians should not become so infatuated by quantitative data that they begin to restrict themselves to it. Some contemporary historians have explicitly recognized this important point and have already issued similar warnings.¹¹ However, it remains to be seen whether these warnings will be heeded and the problem avoided.

The revival of interest in immigration and ethnicity, particularly among the new historians, contains hints of the tendency toward self-restriction. We might again see a recurrence of what happened in the early days of sociology. Envyng the great success of the physical disciplines in the early nineteenth century, the first sociologists were convinced that the natural scientists were getting very close to absolute truth. Consequently, sociology adopted positivism, believing that use of the methods of natural scientists could solve the intellectual problems in explaining social behavior. It took nearly a century more for Weber, Cooley, and Mead to demonstrate that human behavior was different enough from the physical world to require additional procedures. Today it appears that many social historians are looking at neopositivistic sociologists and assuming that their methodology can produce impressive truths. Historians ought not to abandon their traditional humanistic perception of the importance of subjective meanings in the analysis of human action; otherwise, history as a discipline may lose its own unique wisdom and its charm.

Again, the implications of this second problem for archivists should be obvious. Research based upon archival materials represents one very important answer to the problem since such collections have traditionally been the repositories for the intimate letters, diaries, and other personal documents which provide the subjective filters through which the interpretation of more objective quantitative data can be made. For no matter how large our accumulation of quantitative data is and how fine our analysis of it, as long as we assume that subjective meanings and personal values have some influence upon human conduct, then qualitative data remain indispensable.

⁹ Edward P. Hutchinson, in concluding remarks delivered at a conference on immigration and industrialization in America, jointly sponsored by the Balch Institute and the Eleutherian Mills Foundation, in Wilmington, Delaware (November 1973).

¹⁰ John W. Blassingame, "The Mathematics of Slavery," a review of *Time on the Cross*, *Atlantic* 234 (August 1974): 78-82.

¹¹ Stephan Thernstrom, "Reflections on the New Urban History," *Daedalus* 100 (Spring 1971): 359-76; H. J. Hanham, "Clio's Weapons," *ibid.*: 509-19; and Richard Rinitz, "A Note on the Impact of Quantification on the Methodology of Non-Quantitative History," *Pennsylvania History* 39 (July 1972): 362-66.

Research on migration, in particular, has been criticized in the past for a tendency to rely upon relatively detached and aloof sources of data such as government censuses and statistical reports on large populations.¹² An important function of qualitative data is to allow research to penetrate into the more subjective and cultural layers of human experience. Qualitative techniques also enable us to bridge the gap between the larger, more impersonal aspects of immigration and ethnic life such as can be discovered from demographic, ecological, and economic data and the social, psychological, and cultural dimensions which are found in subjective interpretation and the personal experience of specific individuals.

How might these remarks be converted into some useful prescriptions for archivists?¹³ First, it is necessary for archivists to acquaint themselves with the topics and issues of ethnic history; unless actively engaged in research in this area it is unlikely that archivists will be able to identify and conceptualize research problems. However, some previous writers on immigration and ethnicity have already attempted to list and sort out the problems. Their efforts provide a useful inventory of research topics and issues which can guide archivists in their pursuit of relevant materials. Maldwyn Allen Jones and Philip Taylor conclude their fine general histories on immigration to the United States with bibliographic essays identifying some major issues and providing orientation on these subjects.¹⁴ In addition, Richard Kolm, in the *International Migration Review*, has performed a similar function in a more contemporary framework in his discussion of research needs in the study of ethnicity and ethnic groups.¹⁵ However, these recommendations are only shortcuts, not substitutes; the archivist who wishes to collect the appropriate materials should still immerse himself entirely within the literature of immigration and ethnicity. Without his own immersion into these problems, no one can satisfactorily tell him what he should collect or what he can collect.

Without contradicting this last point, it is possible to offer some concrete suggestions based upon my own experiences and preferences in regard to the study of immigration and ethnicity. Also, these suggestions might be attached to some problems in the actual collecting of these materials. To begin with, there remain several enormous gaps in assembled and available materials. In fact, the activities of the new historians are, in part, a commendable response to this situation. In a rather critical attack upon current writers on ethnicity, Gunnar Myrdal has recently noted:

What is most disturbing to a scientist is that until now they have made so few important new contributions to the study of those cultural traits to which they attach such significance. They usually do not say with any precision what these traits are, nor do they give us a scientific analysis of the origin of still prevailing traits, how they were brought over, how they developed through mixture and change, becoming in the end what we now find in the present generation of ethnics. Nor do they tell us how these traits are alike or different in the several groups of ethnics and within the several social and economic strata. Too often the scientist

¹² J. J. Mangalam and Harry K. Schwarzweller, "General Theory in the Study of Migration: Current Needs and Difficulties," *International Migration Review* 3 (Fall 1968): 3-14.

¹³ At this point, I feel somewhat like the man who dies and discovers that his admission to heaven will depend upon his ability to impress an audience of previously saved souls with the story of his most important earthly accomplishment. Having lived through the Johnstown flood of 1889, he decides to use his story of this adventure to save his soul. As he approaches the podium, a well-intentioned angel tells him, "I think you ought to know something: Noah is in the audience today."

¹⁴ Maldwyn Allen Jones, *American Immigration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960); Philip Taylor, *The Distant Magnet: European Immigration to the U.S.A.* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1971).

¹⁵ Richard Kolm, "Ethnicity and Ethnic Groups: Research Needs," *International Migration Review* 8 (Spring 1974): 59-67.

reading "ethnic" literature is left with only some highly generalized and unverified assertions about these cultural traits.¹⁶

But even the heavy efforts of sociologists and traditional historians, concerned since the turn of the century with ethnicity, or the new historians of today, miss the point of Myrdal's criticism. For no amount of research measuring the *role* of ethnicity and relating it to forms and degrees of participation in American institutions such as voting, residence, work, and mobility, which is what most previous research has done, is the same as describing and measuring the *content* of ethnicity and its transformation, which is what Myrdal is referring to. The basic problem here is: what kinds of sources, appropriate to archival collections, can be recommended to advance the study of the *content* of ethnic communities and cultures in North America? There are, of course, many answers to this question. It is beyond the scope of this paper to offer an exhaustive or even comprehensive discussion of the wide range of such solutions. Instead it may be instructive to focus upon a few sources which have produced fruitful results in previous research and to examine their limitations as well.

The first source is the oral history technique. It is somewhat odd that the oral history technique has been primarily associated with the study of the lives of the most important *individuals* in our history. Although the immigrants and ethnics within our society perhaps led unspectacular lives as individuals, their collective impact on our history certainly makes them heroic and significant participants in the formation of modern society. Moreover, certain features of their own cultural backgrounds make them capable candidates for enterprising users of oral history techniques. In a great many instances, the immigrants to this continent during the past came out of folk cultures in which most of their heritage was transmitted and maintained through the generations as part of an oral tradition. Furthermore immigration, resettlement, and the struggle for survival and success in a new country was the most important single adventure in the lives of many foreign-born persons. Many immigrants regard their private efforts as having been a considerable contribution to their adopted society, a contribution for which they have received little reward or appreciation. But the researcher who expresses interest in these individuals actually offers them recognition for their personal accomplishments and provides a basis for rapport which, if the researcher can solve the various procedural problems of in-depth interviewing, may generate endless hours of invaluable first-hand information from these respondents.

In recent decades the nature of immigration to North America has changed greatly both in terms of sources and individual character, from earlier historical periods.¹⁷ For example, the men and women who came from Europe to the United States during the roughly one hundred years of the Great Migration prior to the passage of the restrictive quota acts are an "endangered species." Within a relatively short period of time none of them will be left to reconstruct for us in their own words this highly significant phase of our social history. To put it bluntly, we have much more to ask of them before they die; and we must act quickly. There is no technical solution for the obvious fact that an interviewing technique, such as that of oral history, is a useful tool only as long as the participants in the particular period of interest remain alive.

¹⁶ Myrdal, "The Case Against Romantic Ethnicity," p. 28.

¹⁷ Edward P. Hutchinson, ed., "The New Immigration," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 363 (September 1966).

A second source takes us into the institutions of the immigrant neighborhood. Unfortunately, the immigrant community itself was not generally organized into formal institutions that left a system of social bookkeeping. Organized religion, however, was one of the major exceptions and perhaps the only institution outside of the family which maintained any continuous influence or authority over immigrants in their transition from Europe to North America. Much of the material, collected as parish records, remains in existence today. Although the primary intention of the clergy in keeping them was administrative, these records can serve also as a valuable source of socio-historical information on immigrant communities. It is instructive to see what British and French scholars working in the field of historical demography have done for local communities through the extrapolation of social and cultural facts from data provided by parish records.¹⁸

Parish records, however, also have their limitations. In particular the problem of access is rather peculiar to this source of data. While most clergymen would probably not allow laymen, under any circumstances, to examine current parish records, which are understandably confidential, religious bodies do not appear to have any general or uniform policies in regard to historical records. While some pastors might grant researchers liberal access to historical records, other pastors might impose restrictions or conditions on their use, and still others might not allow any examination of them. In general, the accessibility of historical parish records may depend upon the specific agreement and relationship established between the researcher and the pastor. Solving this problem belongs more to the realm of art than to science insofar as it depends more upon the personal powers of persuasion of a researcher than on technical ability.

Another source of data is the records of voluntary associations founded among immigrant populations. While less formally organized than the churches, the mutual aid societies were not only numerous, particularly in urban areas, but were also extremely important as mechanisms of social survival and adjustment. Since even a small village might be the source of several different fraternal or religious societies in an American city, the proliferation of mutual aid groups sometimes reached formidable numbers. Informants have claimed that Philadelphia once had over four hundred various societies of Italian immigrants during the early years of this century.¹⁹ In Chicago and New York about half of their even larger Italian-born populations are reported to have been members of at least one society.²⁰ For New York, with its teeming Italian population, one can only guess how many immigrant societies existed. In many cases these organizations were probably key instruments in the resettlement and adaptation of immigrants. In addition, mutual aid societies were often interestingly connected to other enterprises, such as funeral parlors. It is not unusual to discover that a mutual aid society treasurer who dispensed death benefits also happened to be a funeral director who was conveniently ready to make the necessary burial arrangements. Such facts begin to reveal some of the internal institutional connections in an immigrant community.

The primary difficulty in attempting to obtain records of such organizations is that they were frequently conducted on such an informal basis that the only records

¹⁸ E. A. Wrigley, ed., *An Introduction to English Historical Demography from the 16th to the 19th Century* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966).

¹⁹ Richard N. Juliani, "The Social Organization of Immigration: The Italians in Philadelphia" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1971), p. 173.

²⁰ Humbert S. Nelli, *The Italians in Chicago: 1880-1930* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 173.

ever kept were contained in a single notebook carried by one officer. Consequently, despite the number and importance of such organizations, records of their existence may come more from the memories and oral tradition of former members than from written material, a serious limitation to the transformation of such information into systematic and reliable data.

Another obvious source of information on the immigrant experience in America is the records of various economic institutions. The personnel records of large industrial and commercial firms that employed foreign-born workers are often still available, and may frequently provide considerable social data about immigrants. Also, certain types of business enterprises, such as banks, travel agencies, and employment bureaus, provided important services within the immigrant community. One such Philadelphia firm is frequently cited by older Italian-born immigrants as having been especially important in facilitating immigration and resettlement in the area. Not long ago a body of materials, collected originally by the Works Projects Administration just before the beginning of World War II, was rediscovered in the Pennsylvania State Archives. These records included information on the literacy, regional origins, and destination of over 38,000 Italians who passed through Philadelphia. In an interview given to a WPA investigator in 1940, the son of the firm's founder admitted that his father acted as hiring agent for a major railroad company and was routinely permitted to board incoming ships even before immigration officials. In a recent conversation, however, a younger sister, still operating the firm as a real estate agency, denied the existence of the original records or of any role of her father with the railroads. This incident reveals the delicate nature of these matters, perhaps because of the exploitative and legally questionable character of the services. The reluctance of some persons to renew the past will impede our efforts to gain access to such data.

Many historical studies attempt to do more than gather personal and subjective information *about* deceased individuals; they gather it *from* them as well. This raises a question that sounds facetious: how do we interview the dead? It is quite possible through content analysis to gather, classify, and interpret data not originally created for research purposes and through this indirect technique to achieve fragments of a functional substitute for the interview. Although content analysis is widely associated with the study of mass media today, a sociologist can easily recall another more pertinent illustration for us. Perhaps the first great classic of modern empirical sociology in America was *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, by W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki.²¹ The largest single source of data for this important work was a body of 764 letters between immigrants and their European relatives. This source began with Thomas's accidental discovery of a smaller set of such letters amid a pile of trash on a Chicago sidewalk.²² Eventually these letters provided what alternative research strategies could not have produced: an enormously graphic description and profound insight into the transformation of the personalities and community life of Polish immigrants to Chicago. There probably remain hidden away in long-forgotten trunks and chests all over the world similar personal documents. Such materials represent a nearly priceless treasure of information for researchers into ethnic life.

²¹ W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918–20).

²² Randall Collins and Michael Makowsky, *The Discovery of Society* (New York: Random House, 1972), pp. 159–60.

As with the sources previously discussed, however, there are great difficulties in the use of personal documents. First, ethnic groups varied in literacy, with some groups probably leaving very few such written records. In addition, it may well be that the most interesting and useful letters for research on immigration and ethnicity in North America were those letters sent back to Europe. But the most formidable problem related to this source is the simple question of how long the letters were retained before being destroyed. The letters of earlier periods of immigration history may all be just about gone. Finally, a special problem results from the fact that many people who have participated only as bit-players in the great drama of human history frequently do not appreciate the importance of what they might be able to tell us or what their personal artifacts—letters, diaries, legal documents, photographs, newspapers—might reveal to us. Consequently, if there are personal documents of value for historical research on immigration and ethnicity lying stashed away in forgotten corners it is likely that these materials will remain indefinitely right where they are, unless we all begin to do a better job of communicating some sense of their importance to the general public.

This paper has argued that recent tendencies in the study of immigration, assimilation, and ethnic groups have important implications for archivists and archives-based research. In particular, the rise of the new history and the renewed interest of sociologists in these areas appear, at first glance, to render archival materials and approaches less useful and perhaps even obsolete. Archivists, if they so perceive the situation, may feel an increasing sense of despair about their future roles. To the contrary, the quantitative orientation itself of current researchers contains inherent limitations that can be countered in the complementary use of conventional archival materials and methods. However, in locating the more promising sources for study, the solution may require greater imagination than has been applied. In this paper, I have attempted to describe some appropriate sources and their obstacles and pitfalls. The archivist's recognition and sensitivity to the problems should be greater than that of most persons doing the actual research. Still, an expansion of communication and cooperation between us the researchers and you the collectors is obviously necessary if we are to remove further these obstacles which continue to impede the growth of our knowledge and understanding of immigration and of the role of immigration in shaping the individual character, cultural heritage, and social institutions of modern society.