education in cahoots with all of these. Hatfield leaves us stuck with the question of how to move from the affirmative securities of local authenticity (South Boston or Chinatown, for example) to existence on a higher plane, envisioned but not experienced.

In specific terms: How, in fact, do we reverse the one-way current of the electronic superculture? How does transcendence emerge, given (for example) the "evil empire" rhetoric of eschatological nationalism and ideology? How do colleges and universities help generate the dialogue necessary to transcendence of local context and self? Will higher education vacate the marketplace of grantsmanship in its affirmation of the marketplace of ideas? The current trend seems in the opposite direction. Will the universities and colleges generate, implement, and promote strategies for multicultural discourse, and what academic or academy-related forms will they take? The habits of mind that the academy seems most anxious to nurture today are in fact those of the "real" (read "marketplace") world of finite satisfactions.

—Neil Nakadate

Critique

To be human is to have an identity. Indeed, it is what ethnicity is about. However, as a theoretical or methodological prescription for ethnic studies, as advocated by Hatfield, identity is inadequate even within the categories he has specified. Hatfield seems to be asking theoretical analysts to do what artists, novelists, and philosophers do best because they explore the existential and phenomenological aspects of ethnic identity in depth and usually with greater authenticity. This does not mean that there is no need for self-discovery and understanding in ethnic studies. There are equally pressing non-identity issues with which ethnic studies must also deal. Ethnic studies should be concerned with economics, for instance, with power or lack thereof. It should also be concerned with the analysis of public policies that impinge on ethnic and minority groups.

Hatfield is correct in pointing out that we do not live in one cultural context in America. As a matter of fact, very few countries in the world

are truly homogenous cultural entities. Nevertheless, this has not prevented dominant ethnic groups from trying to assimilate other groups. In America, such an attempt through Anglo-conformity has been rejected by both ethnic and racial minorities. These groups, in turn, embraced cultural pluralism with some reservation, if not ambivalence. Horace Kellen, for example, espoused cultural pluralism at the turn of the century as a means of preserving Jewish religious and cultural identity in America. He was also hopeful that a "democracy of nationalities" would emerge in America. Unfortunately, that dream has not materialized, yet.

The pluralist thesis has so much appeal to most groups largely because people take the insider's view and, therefore, tend to see pluralism in a positive light. It is partly the reason why white ethnics in the North have used it to keep out blacks from their neighborhoods while denying any racist or discriminatory intent. Blacks and Puerto Ricans in New York City also used pluralist arguments in the 1960s to gain power and control of educational institutions in their communities, but they did not exclude whites from their neighborhoods.

In spite of the fact that pluralism has been used to justify cultural and social apartheid, as Hatfield has pointed out, it still has special significance for ethnic and other minority groups who have often used it to develop and consolidate their communities. Such communities have been invaluable in providing both refuge and a sense of belonging for the alienated individuals. This is how the Black Muslims, for example, have been particularly successful in rehabilitating otherwise incorrigible criminals and drug addicts. Interestingly enough, such communities also serve the more successful members who often become staunch defenders of ethnic community boundaries. However, pluralism has no particular appeal to individuals seeking upward, social mobility. These individuals have often resorted to democratic or individualist principles to break down social barriers.

Ethnic pluralism in America is a social reality that the so-called superculture cannot erase. This is particularly true for racial minorities. On the one hand, ethnic identification for many whites is virtually a matter of choice because of intermarriage between various ethnic groups. A black person, on the other hand, cannot choose to be Irish, for example, even though he or she may actually be part Irish. This same person can, however, choose to be Ibo or Yoruba. That is why Pan-Africanism has particular appeal to Afro-americans. In a pluralistic society, not only is dialogue among groups necessary for social harmony but it must take place in an atmosphere that has tolerance for diversity.

—Jonathan A. Majak