

could be accounted for. My hypothesis is that nativistic movements are phenomena relevant for this enquiry.

Generally nativistic movements are consequences of stress of culture. Nativistic movements have existed at all times, but they have increased in frequency and importance particularly since World War I, and they have reached a peak in the last decade. They have attracted political attention as they have been suspected of being interconnected with the wave of nationalism which has arisen in many politically dependant nations in the world. Although the immediate causes of nativistic movements are presumably highly variable, most of them have as a common denominator a situation of contrast between the cultures in contact (CLEMHOUT).

Does the study of such movements allow the detection of value patterns and the nature of these values. Is it possible to forecast the direction of development or change? Is there a reasonable probability that these movements will take the direction of value pattern leading toward an "entrepreneur spirit"? If so, can we forecast (in view of the present value pattern) the direction that such pattern should take to reach the value pattern required for an "entrepreneurial spirit"?

The contact between two cultures entails sociological and psychological disturbances. As has been shown by MANONNI, TEMPELS and SPENCER it is something beyond material, technological problems and adaptation. It is the whole personality structure which is involved in its three components of needs, values, and world view (although these authors do not quite speak in these terms). Interesting aspects are the kind, the order, the intensity, and the direction of changes in the personality structural components. The principal leaders of the nativistic controversy, WALLACE and VOGET, consider these movements dynamic, but they have not told us why this is so nor how this energy is generated.

In a stable society the needs of individuals are consistent with each other, and so are the values. The society provides means of satisfying the need-dispositions (combinations of need[s] and value[s]) it has inculcated. As long as it does so, the individual is content with the social order and its values and continues to live by them (HAGEN 1959). In the following development, we are using MURRAY's definition of need, KLUCKHOHN's definition of value and PARSONS' definition of need-disposition. In every single act performed by an individual enters at the same time needs and values, *i. e.*, there is no act where there is no combination of needs and values, and this combination is called need-disposition. The central aspect of the orientation of an actor is his set of need-dispositions toward the fulfillment of role expectations and achieving one's status (PARSONS, p. 32). "By status, we refer not merely to social class, but to one's position as determined by all of one's relationships to the social system around one and to the invisible world in which one believes. Role and status are correlated. Defining either defines the other" (HAGEN 1959).

The stability of society is disturbed by stress of culture. How does stress of culture generate nativistic movements? Does it influence role and status and modify them? We answer yes to this question.