

Wisconsin is described at length and is accompanied by a map of Norwegian population in the state in 1890. The effect of swamps, disease, and modern transportation on the movement West and North is traced. Ten pages of photographs show farms, Sunday School gatherings and individuals.

Some of the difficulties the immigrants faced are explored, among them the need to learn English to be employed, often solved through the tradition of working first as hired labor in an American farm to learn both the language and the agricultural methods of the new land; adjusting to the climate; and understanding the customs of clothing, handicraft, and food. Institutions such as churches, schools, and newspapers in the lives of Norwegian Americans in the last century and a half are discussed. Despite the wishes of religious leaders, parents sent their children to public schools so they could become fluent in English. The typical architectural style of the Norwegian dwellings is discussed and illustrated. The demise of traditional architecture in the face of advanced construction methods such as balloon framing is chronicled.

Occasionally interesting juxtapositions of fact are mentioned: "while the total number of Norwegian immigrants is small when compared to the total European immigration to the United States, no other country except Ireland contributed so great a percentage of its population to the United States." Occasionally strong opinions are stated: "Norwegians are one of the most ethnocentric immigrant groups in America, mainly because the church and the ethnic press effectively struggled to preserve Norwegian heritage."

No documentation is offered for either type of claim. There are, in fact, neither footnotes nor a bibliography to help researchers along. However, as a source of basic background information, the pamphlet is useful.

—Marilyn Meisenheimer
University of Wisconsin, LaCrosse

John E. Farley. *Majority-Minority Relations*. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1982) ix, 452 pp., \$19.95.

John E. Farley, who is on the faculty of Southern Illinois University (Edwardsville), says that he has written this book because he is concerned about the deteriorating status of minorities and intergroup relations in the United States. His main objective is to increase

awareness of these issues among college students in race relations classes by not only describing but also analyzing and attempting to explain the problems which our society faces.

The book is generally more successful in this endeavor than most race and ethnic relations texts (RET's) on the market today because of the unusually wide range of topics covered. Whereas the book conforms to the norm by concentrating on racial and ethnic problems of the United States, it also discusses problems facing other nations. The nature of oppression is reasonably examined, but it is in the analysis of minority group responses to oppression that the book excels over other textbooks. Negative reactions are studied, but so too are positive responses like civil rights activities and other efforts toward self-determination which are typically ignored. Moreover, the book does not make the same serious mistake which most RET's commit of focusing only on the problems of blacks while ignoring those of Chicanos, Native-Americans, and other minority groups.

Majority-Minority Relations is well-researched and organized. Landmark race-relations studies *as well as* the most up-to-date investigations are examined. Rather than hopping from subject-to-subject without any direction as is so often the case with RET's, the book deals with topics in chronological order: the causes of oppression are first examined, followed by the effects of oppression and then the future of intergroup relations. This makes for better organization and understanding of how topics are interrelated. There is also thematic continuity. The author utilizes two major sociological perspectives, the "structural-functional" and "conflict" theories, to study the reasons underlying racial and ethnic problems throughout the book. Despite the sociological focus, the book is more interdisciplinary than most RET's because it covers economic, broad public policy, and non-sociological topics.

There are three significant drawbacks to this book. The most serious is the author's naive acceptance of minority stereotypes which have been proposed by culture-of-poverty theorists and other social scientists. Like so many "liberal" writers of RET's, Farley prefers to explain the supposedly wide array of inferior minority group characteristics as adaptive responses to race-class oppression. It is truly unfortunate that he fails to question the predispositions, research methods, and conclusions of racist social scientists. Second, when solutions are dealt with, "assimilation" and "pluralism" are discussed as philosophical goals which, if attained, might improve the lot of minorities. Yet, concrete institutional methods like school desegregation and bilingual-bicultural education which have been designed to promote each respective philosophical objective have been ignored. Third, in a similar vein, it is unfortunate that the book fails to supply practical suggestions on how students can help bring about social change, and it gives no

encouragement to become active in general. This is problematic because increasing awareness of problems without simultaneously furnishing practical methods for achieving solutions can lead to frustration and anger, especially for minority college students.

Nevertheless, *Majority-Minority Relations* ranks as a generally excellent text which ought to be considered for adoption for introductory-level race and ethnic relations courses in sociology. "Activist" instructors using this book, however, should address the shortcomings of this book in order to promote truly non-stereotypic attitudes, pragmatic political knowledge, and political motivation in all students.

—Homer D.C. Garcia
The Claremont Colleges

John E. Fleming, Gerald R. Gill, and David H. Swinton. *The Case for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education*. (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1978) xxiv, 416 pp., \$8.95.

The case for affirmative action has become a major problematic concern within the last several years. Beginning with the notorious Bakke vs. the Regents of the University of California, 1978, and cresting with the recent ultraconservative stance taken by at least the most vocal members of the Civil Rights Commission, affirmative action may very well be the tidal wave that washed against the minds of those who are actively involved in obliterating racism, as well as those who remain unmindful of the beast. *The Case For Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education* deserves to once again be taken down from our shelves, dusted, and ruminated intellectually.

The study is well-researched and documented and brings together an exemplary group of scholars dedicated to the pursuit of equality and justice. The three authors, John E. Fleming, Gerald R. Gill, and David H. Swinton, served as Fellows at the Institute for the Study of Social Policy (ISEP). Several precursory works have richly contributed to this study including John E. Fleming's *The Lengthening Shadow of Slavery: A Historical Justification for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education*, and two papers prepared by one of the most eminent scholars on affirmative action, Kenneth A. Tollett. Included in the study are tables which contain pertinent statistical data for the many inferential analyses made with respect to the progress (or lack of progress) of