Inequalities illustrate that violence is not just an American problem.

Highlighting several of these chapters proves representative of the larger theme of stratification and the occurrence of violent behavior. Evan Stark's chapter on race, gender, and woman battering brings together the important theme of domestic violence and minority group representation. The view of domestic violence and black women provides interesting comparisons with white women in similar situations. Stark's theory of gender entrapment connects well with the analysis of the black male as documented in chapters written by Covington and Oliver. These cultural connections are an important element uniting the three well-written chapters.

The McCarthy and Hagan chapter on Native North American street youth is noteworthy. The chapter's focus on the labeling perspective and the empirical research is well framed and would be an important addition to any course dealing with race and ethnic issues.

The Rose and McClain chapter on homicide risk and victimization among blacks and Hispanics is one of the better analyses of two groups trapped in what Moynihan called "an entanglement of pathology." The utilization of Milwaukee as a model city illustrating the quandary faced by these two disadvantaged minority groups recalls some of my observations back in the late 1980s. Other homicide chapters intensify our focus on the impact of stratification and cultural inequity.

The last section of the book synthesizes the material into a meaningful social framework. The lead chapter is written by Farrington, Loeb, and Stouthamer-Loeber. Their analysis of racial differences in violence according to a Pittsburgh youth study, considers risk factors associated with violence from the standpoint of child-rearing, socioeconomic factors such as broken families and bad neighborhoods, and parental factors.

From an overall perspective, Darnell Hawkins provides a strong volume combining the best of the extant research on violent crime incorporating diverse race and ethnic groups. I have taught race, class, and gender courses for many years and cannot recall reading a volume with equal strength. Academics contemplating the preparation of advanced undergraduate courses or graduate level seminars in race and ethnic relations, criminal violence, or social problems issues can confidently include Hawkins' edited volume as an invaluable resource. The chapters will generate diverse dissertation studies leading to further publications in the areas of race, class, and gender as related to violent crime. In addition, class discussions will benefit immeasurably by the information offered in these well written chapters.
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The issue of globalization continues to receive increasing attention in contemporary academic discourse. The reason for this is evident: The process of globalization forces us to reconsider received paradigms in order to situate them in more expansive temporal and geographical scales. Consider the issue of assimilation and immigrant acculturation, a key concern in American sociology since its inception as exemplified by Thomas and Znaniecki's 1918 classic The Polish Peasant. How useful are the traditionally inherited concepts of assimilation and acculturation to understanding the processes through which immigrant populations are both exposed to, and struggle to adapt to the dominant versions of Western culture in the wake of global postmodernity? This is precisely the question that Eric Mark Kramer and the rest of the contributors to The Emerging Monoculture attempt to tackle. The book's central aim is to go beyond "the foundationalist character of traditional sociological theory" (p. 34) in order to offer a more complete and, in the authors' view, less tendentious and biased account of how immigrant populations and resident Northern minorities confront an increasingly hegemonic dominant culture and attempt to maintain a modicum of attachment to and identification with their cultural traditions.
The Emerging Monoculture is structured as a collection of theoretical and empirical chapters that deal with issues related to the reception and effects of Western culture in alien contexts (such as Japanese society) and the problems that confront various immigrant and local minority populations as they attempt to adapt and fit into dominant conceptions of the good or “model” minority. Most contributors to the book are heavily influenced by W. E. Du Bois’ conception of the “double consciousness,” especially when dealing with issues related to how minorities struggle to adapt to dominant ideas related to physical appearance, behaviors, and values. However, the book also leans heavily on more recent poststructuralist theoretical currents, especially the work of Barthes and Bakhtin and recent reinterpretations of the work of Nietzsche and Wittgenstein in the humanities. The villain of the story is the theory of “intercultural adaptation” proposed by William Gudykunst and Young Yun Kim (1997). The Emerging Monoculture itself can easily be interpreted as an extended polemic against these two authors (according to my unofficial count their work is critically addressed in about 42 pages of text by multiple contributors). For Gudykunst and Kim, the process of cultural adaptation for minority groups in global society entails going beyond substantive ethnic identities and renouncing primordial attachments to local cultures. The minority individual, from this point of view, has a chance to go beyond the trappings of local cultural identifications and achieve a sort of universal cultural consciousness that is capable of identifying with all cultures but remains captive to none. Gudykunst and Kim view this as an essentially evolutionary and developmental process, whereby the modern individual is able to grow beyond “lower” stages of cultural and communicative development and achieve the superior communicative capacities characteristic of this intercultural consciousness. For Gudykunst and Kim, the adapted, intercultural cultural minority is a healthier individual, free from parochial compulsions and myopias and ready to navigate the global sphere.

Eric Mark Kramer takes Gudykunst and Kim’s theory of intercultural adaptation to task in two long theoretical chapters that open and close the book. For Kramer, Gudykunst and Kim’s intercultural adaptation theory smacks of the worst sort of right-wing Hegelianism (p. 244) and is riddled through and through with modernist conceptions of subjectivity, interpersonal communication, and culture. Kramer claims that Gudykunst and Kim’s theory is simply “a very old mysticism dressed in pseudo-scientific terminology” (p. 7). Furthermore, it ignores the benefits that come from preserving diverse cultural heritages and pathologizes all personal identifications that do not correspond with their notion of intercultural personhood. This privileges a pseudo-universal ideal of personality and normality behind which stand well-entrenched conceptions that derive from European culture and history. What is worse, Kramer contends that the dream of intercultural adaptation comes very close to a dangerous effacing of all difference, which only serves to sustain global capitalism and its inherent drive to destroy local ways of life:

The new uniformity is robotic and insect-like, and this is the dream of the model minority ideology, with its push to include vaster, less numbers of us as well as become coordinated by the mechanical shock, the value of detached disinterest, abstract credit and corporate culture. . . .” (p. 28)

As a critique of intercultural adaptation theory, The Emerging Monoculture largely succeeds, but this has more to do with the straw-man quality of the intercultural adaptation argument than with the rhetorical strength of the counterarguments proposed. The book suffers from being unable to keep a proper balance between its theoretical aims (largely wedded to a normative style of critique) and its more narrow empirical focus. The range of empirical case studies is excellent. It extends from more or less detailed accounts of the failure of African American and Native American minorities in the United States, and Korean minorities in Japan, to attain “model minority” status, to the ambiguity that comes with having achieved that end in the case of Asian American and East Indian minorities in the United States; however, none of the pieces is able to go beyond their negative evaluation of the existing paradigm in order to offer a more constructive
alternative. Further, the book is interspersed with sections that include little empirical content and read more like political manifestos rather than scholarly contributions. In this respect, *The Emerging Monoculture* could have benefited from tighter editing. This is exemplified by the inclusion of an extended discussion of cultural accounts of disability in Japan, a study that, while interesting, has little relation to the dominant theme of the book.

Nevertheless, the book’s accounts of the struggle in Japanese culture with Western conceptions of modernity, progress, and beauty are captivating, precisely because these pieces are the only ones that are able to integrate the historical material and the textual interpretations with the larger theoretical concerns of the book. The discussion related to the history of Japanese animation and its incorporation of the dominant culture in the form of visual conventions regarding the Caucasian ethnic look of the characters (pp. 228–30) will be of interest to students of race and popular culture. Kramer’s theoretical chapters are excellent and draw on a host of theoretical influences from Heidegger and Nietzsche to Derrida and Du Bois. His readings of Japanese poetry fiction will be of interest to more textually and interpretive oriented sociologists of culture. More grandiose claims, such as the hypothesis that the model minority paradigm is serving as a “neo-colonial system” in order to control East Indians or that Asian Americans are somehow psychologically hurt by their status as a model minority fall flat and are not supported with the relevant empirical evidence, and thus appear as simply rhetorical window dressing. It is in this respect that more mainstream and empirically oriented students of race and ethnic relations will find the book of little value. The bulk of the empirical analysis in the book concerns historical or textual material, with little in the vein of more rigorous sociological research to support it. However, the arguments do possess a large dose of normative *animus*, where the “modernist” approaches to assimilation (primarily represented by Gudykunst and Kim) are treated as ultimate blasphemy. This is probably the book’s most disappointing facet, insofar as the topic of how race and ethnic relations are affected by globalizing processes would be one of the primary motivations to engage with this text. As it stands, *The Emerging Monoculture* feels like a clumsy grope in that direction, but one that ultimately fails to make significant progress along that road.
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Most of the racial and ethnic relations and inequality literature focuses on a single nation, yet exposure to similar issues in another society reveals implicit assumptions and raises questions about broad generalizations that are actually country specific. In this light, Andrew Pilkington’s *Racial Disadvantage and Ethnic Diversity in Britain* offers a solid introduction to race and ethnicity issues in contemporary multicultural Britain where race riots have been in the headlines.

Pilkington notes that race and ethnicity had been a marginal area in British sociology and only recently moved to the discipline’s center. The move coincided with a shift in the study of race and ethnicity from a white-black dualism model in which whites occupied an advantaged structural position, to a model examining a diverse collection of nonwhite groups and the disadvantages each has relative to both whites and to other nonwhite groups. The shift was stimulated by research in Britain and replaced thinking initially borrowed from U.S. studies.

There are significant differences between Britain and the United States. The 6.7 percent of Britain’s population that is nonwhite is made up of several groups; all are under 1.6 percent of the national population. Most are post-World War II immigrants from former colonies in South Asia and the Caribbean or are offspring of those immigrants. In Britain the term “Black” often refers to people origi-