

ography. Conversi's particular focus is on the leading intellectuals and intelligentsia who selected the "core-values" of the Basque and Catalan nationalist movements.

Conversi explains the violent nature of Basque nationalism as due in part to endemic political and cultural fragmentation. In Basque country, where the Basque language was quickly disappearing and there was little tradition of "high culture," there was continual difficulty reaching a consensus on "core-values." Conversi contrasts this to a more unified, inclusive Catalan nationalism with an established "high culture" and a consistent focus on a widely spoken language. Key to his analysis is the large impact of immigration on the two regions and their nationalisms. Due to these differences and others he discusses in the book, the impact of the Civil War and Franco's intolerant and violent anti-regionalist policies escalated violence in the Basque case but not among Catalan nationalists.

To an anthropologist, Daniele Conversi's attention to the use of culture, ethnicity, and symbols as tools for manipulation and mobilization is appealing. His work opens a space to consider the intentional as well as historically determined use of "cultural" and "ethnic" elements by interested parties, and his analysis of the intended and unintended results of such choices is interesting. This type of analysis brings up traditionally anthropological questions concerning definitions of "culture," that innocent looking word that often hides internal difference and power relations beneath a veneer of sameness and supposedly shared identity. This approach also provides material for those interested in how ethnic groups acquire their defining characteristics—through both bottom-up and top-down processes. Conversi's attention to the role of elites, of the state, and of culture in determining the outcomes of Basque and Catalan nationalisms is appreciated, but his evident confusion of "culture" with "high culture" throughout the book ultimately leaves his arguments unconvincing.

Laura Bathurst
University of California, Berkeley

Daniel Friedman and Sharon Grimberg. *Miss India Georgia*. Urban Life Productions. 22-D Hollywood Avenue, Hohokus, NJ 07423. VHS video, 56 minutes. 1997. Rental (may be applied to purchase price): \$50.00; Purchase Price: College or University classroom use: \$250.00; Public Library, Secondary School, or nonprofit community organization: \$95.00; Personal Use Only: \$39.95; Shipping and Handling: \$6.00. Phone: (800) 343-5540; Fax: (201) 652-1973.

Miss India Georgia is an intelligent and insightful video documentary that tells the story of four Indian American teenagers, who in

the process of preparing for Atlanta's annual South Asian beauty pageant reflect on the trials and tribulations of their bi-cultural lives. It is a timeless tale told over and over as each new wave of immigrants has come ashore and their children have had to resolve the incongruities of their multiple ethnicities. *Miss India Georgia* captures with special poignancy the complexity of emotions that transpires and the interactions which the young women have with their parents, grandparents, friends, boyfriends, as they articulate their frustrations, impatience, and all kinds of mixed feelings at being caught at a confluence of such distinct cultures. The documentary is particularly deft at capturing the often subtle, often direct ways in which the young women navigate their social terrain, set apart by culture conflict and a hierarchy of marginalities brought on by their 'brownness' in an otherwise culturally and racially homogeneous social sphere. The conflict is not about core societal values such as material success, which both the young women and their parents eagerly embrace, but those values which are popularly labeled old fashioned and traditional. The parents in the documentary, like most Asian Indian parents, embody a cultural heritage deeply rooted in tradition, convention and religion. Children are socialized to unquestioningly respect the authority of the parents. Cultural fidelity and continuity are disproportionately associated with upholding virtues associated with traditional Indian womanhood or femininity. This explains the parents' impermeability when it comes to relinquishing their hold on their daughters, especially when it comes to interacting with their young men-friends. But, in the social context of their adopted land, their objections to dating breeds rebellion and tremendous unhappiness among their progeny. *Miss India Georgia* does a remarkable job at portraying these disagreements judiciously. The documentary successfully shows how futile it is to generalize about Asian Indians and their assimilation experiences when it presents the unique ways in which each young woman resolves her particular experience of "twoness" and the additional marginalities that she perceives.

In several ways, however, the documentary does represent the Asian Indian community in a rather monolithic form. All four of the young women in the documentary come from very affluent, professional families, when in fact a large segment of Asian Indians, especially those who have recently immigrated, are neither affluent nor well educated and therefore experience their adopted country quite differently. Moreover, not all young women in the Asian Indian diaspora have adopted the traditional American notions of femininity so uncritically. As a matter of fact, many young women have tried to resolve their marginalities by seeking out community with those who have challenged traditional ideas of femininity, both Indian and American.

In other ways, however, *Miss India Georgia* quite effectively fulfills the objective it sets out for itself: to provide a narrative of the struggles

of four young women as they try to establish their identity as second generation Indian Americans. Therefore, it is an important addition to works relating to the American ethnic experience.

Kasturi DasGupta
Georgian Court College

Nathan Glazer. *We Are All Multiculturalists Now.* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997). 192 pp., \$19.95 cloth.

Some of the readers familiar with Nathan Glazer's writings may be surprised or intrigued, as the case may be, by his latest book, *We Are All Multiculturalists Now*. That title seems quite an extraordinary declaration from a man who became known in the 1980s for his neoconservatism as well as for his persistent criticism of certain liberal social policies such as affirmative action. Has he finally seen the light? Not exactly. The book is by no means an apologia nor is it a ringing endorsement of multiculturalism either. Indeed, the reader is held in some suspense till the last chapter to find out what Glazer really means by "we are all multiculturalists now." Nevertheless, his main purpose in the book, he says, is to examine the phenomenon of multiculturalism—"that new dispensation" as he calls it. And he does it with relative even-handedness.

To being with he declares that, as far as cultural wars in education are concerned, the multiculturalists have won. They have won in the sense that the old assimilationist orientation (dispensation?) in the curriculum toward the "melting-pot" ideal has been abandoned. That is his assessment, but one that is not shared by many critics of multiculturalism some of whom ascribe to it all that has gone wrong with education in public schools in particular and the society in general. Glazer identifies what he considers "the four big questions" that critics have about multiculturalism and he analyzes these questions in some depth. These questions, he says, represent critics' fears.

One of the fears is that multiculturalism will lead to national disunity. The distinguished historian, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., is one of the leading proponents of this view. He presents his case against multiculturalism in his controversial book, *The Disuniting of America* (1990). Schlesinger, Jr. is particularly harsh on Afrocentrism. Like most critics, he regards Afrocentrism as an offshoot of multiculturalism with a separatist agenda. He claims that Afrocentrist scholars are doing a disservice to African American history—a history that, he believes, is a part of the Western democratic tradition even though it had been shamefully neglected. While Glazer is also critical of Afrocentrism because he considers it extreme, nevertheless, he believes that the mainstream African