



Ethnicity

Author(s): J. Milton Yinger

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 11 (1985), pp. 151-180

Published by: [Annual Reviews](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2083290>

Accessed: 04/07/2012 20:25

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Annual Reviews is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Annual Review of Sociology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ETHNICITY

J. Milton Yinger

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio 44074

Abstract

The near universality of multiethnicity in contemporary states, the persistence—culturally and structurally—of the ethnic factor, contradicting modernization and Marxist theories, and the strong public interest in ethnic phenomena have stimulated a great deal of research in sociology and other social sciences. This review examines the wide diversity of definitions and interpretations in that research. The demography of ethnic groups, the sources of ethnic survival and revival (primordial attachments, political and economic interests, and estrangement from the larger society), and the major themes in the literature on ethnicity are examined. Three themes are emphasized: 1) the relationship of ethnicity to social stratification and discrimination—in particular with reference to internal colonialism, split labor markets, and resource mobilization; 2) ethnicity as culture, illustrated by reference to studies of family and religion; and 3) the connections between ethnicity and politics in developing states, in developed states, and in the armed forces and police of many societies.

INTRODUCTION

Changes in relationships among major subdivisions of a society are often reflected in the development of an active sociological specialty designed to analyze those changes. Currently important work goes on, for example, in the study of male-female relationships and sex roles, of life course and age, of the simultaneous appearance of “new religions” and old fundamentalism, and—more perennially—of class conflict and social stratification. None of these topics is new, of course, but in recent years they have carried unusual salience.

To this list of significant topics of new or resurgent interest we must now certainly add ethnicity. The flood of material from research centers, new

journals, book series, government agencies, and individual scholars is overwhelming; it has been called an academic ethnicity industry (Basham & DeGroot 1977:423). Undoubtedly this flood expresses not only the readily apparent importance of the ethnic factor in most of the societies of the world, but also the varying and often conflicting interests and commitments of the writers.

Although the proportion of contemporary work on ethnicity may be higher in sociology, major research is also being carried out in anthropology, political science, history, economics, and social psychology. In this review I shall pay little attention to disciplinary origins. Since the topics addressed and even the methodologies overlap extensively, it seems more appropriate to focus on the problems being investigated than on the professional identities of authors.¹

Varying Perspectives on Ethnicity

It is not as easy to disregard the differences in assumptions, premises, and ideologies of those studying ethnicity as it is to disregard their disciplines. Although I shall not undertake an essay in the sociology of knowledge, we need at least to be aware of the range of values here. In his preface to a collection of papers taken from the journal *Ethnicity*, published by the Center for the Study of American Pluralism, McCready (1983:xvii) observes that differentiation is a good in its own right. Novak (1972:60) is concerned that America without strong ethnic identities will become a tasteless homogenized soup.

I believe it is fair to say that a large majority of the students of ethnicity applaud its current resurgence and/or its continuing strength. Ethnic attachments are variously seen as ways to preserve a precious cultural heritage; to soften class lines; to protect or to win economic and political advantages for disadvantaged groups; to furnish a more intimate and flavorful connection with large, impersonal societies; and to retard the shift of overwhelming power to the state.

It would sometimes appear, however, that in social science as in the physical world, for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. The strong emphasis in the last 20 years on the importance of (and value of) ethnicity has been countered—although by a relatively small number of persons—on both evidential and ideological grounds. It is the “Lebanization of Americans,” as a recent headline put it. Or in the words of Czeslaw Milosz (in DeVos & Romanucci-Ross 1975:352): “Perhaps those sardines fighting each other in the mouth of a whale are not untypical of the relations between humans when they search for self-assertion through ethnic values magnified into absolutes.”

¹Representative recent theoretical and historical works from a variety of perspectives include Archdeacon 1983; Banton 1983; Cohen 1978; Dinnerstein, Nichols & Reimers 1979; Francis 1976; Glazer 1983; Hall 1979; Heisler 1977; Keyes 1981; Lieberman 1980; Mason 1982; Pettigrew 1978; Rex 1981; Simpson & Yinger 1985; A. Smith 1981; Thernstrom 1980; Williams 1978; Wilson 1980; Wolf 1982; Young 1976.

A tendency to exaggerate the salience of ethnic identities and to overlook the strong pressures toward assimilation—most of this with reference to the United States—has been discussed in several recent works (eg, G. J. Patterson 1979; Stein & Hill 1977; O. Patterson 1977; Gans 1979; Alba 1981; Steinberg 1981). It has been observed that “Anthropologists who have studied truly plural societies would probably feel, for example, that attendance at Polish picnics, membership in a Polish-American voluntary association, and a reluctance to endure Polish jokes does not equate with strong ethnic identity when the individual probably speaks little if any Polish and shows scant evidence of adherence to Polish cultural traditions” (Basham & DeGroot 1977:423).

Sociologically, a more powerful argument is the contention that the current stress on ethnicity is divisive and inegalitarian in its effects (Morgan 1981). Current attention to ethnicity, Steinberg argues (1981), tends to blind us to the structures of discrimination. It leads to cultural rather than to “opportunity” explanations of inequality (see also Lieberman 1980).

Indeed, black intellectuals and leaders have had good reason to balk at the pluralist doctrine. As a group, blacks have always experienced the bitter side of pluralism, and ideological justifications for maintaining ethnic boundaries carried insidious overtones of racial segregation. . . . Just as ethnic groups have class reasons for tearing down ethnic barriers ahead of them, they also have class reasons for raising ethnic barriers behind them. Thus, it is not uncommon for ethnic groups to invoke democratic principles to combat the ethnic exclusivity of more privileged groups, but to turn around and cite pluralistic principles in defense of their own discriminatory practices (Steinberg 1981:255, 258).

To this argument Juliani replies (1982:370): “. . . the rejection of certain aspects of assimilation may mean for many Americans, for the first time in their history as members of this society, finally understanding themselves and coming to peace with their cultural origins. Such awareness may also enable them to understand others better, across ethnic and racial boundaries, and may promote social justice far better than assimilation ever did.”

Orlando Patterson argues that emphasis on ethnicity is inherently conservative, even though its proponents may believe it to be liberal. At its worst, he says, it is “vulgar chauvinistic polemics,” and even at its best it is “a sophisticated attack on modern industrial civilization” (1977:152). In their emphasis on ethnicity, black Americans “. . . have found their own weapon used against them. Once lower-middle-class whites realized that it was now fair play to return to the old technique, the field was wide open for the revival of ethnic politics on a statewide scale” (Patterson 1977:158).

As these citations illustrate, what was formerly a rather sharp line between race relations and ethnic-group relations in a gradual transition has been nearly erased, with the recognition that genetic variation is important in human interaction only because it is often correlated with cultural, historical, and status differences.

Although some of these authors, particularly Steinberg, have sought to analyze the sources and consequences of both pluralism and assimilation (see also Yinger 1981), in the main their goal has been to remedy what they see as neglect of the facts of assimilation and of the results of ethnic separatism.

Since a recent chapter in the *Annual Review of Sociology* deals mainly with assimilation (Hirschman 1983), I refer to the concept only briefly. Despite its ambiguity and the controversies surrounding it, assimilation continues to be an important concept for students of ethnicity, particularly those dealing with the United States and Britain, where many group boundaries have historically been more permeable than in most other societies. In this discussion I shall use assimilation as a descriptive and analytic, not an evaluative, term. It is a variable, not an attribute. Assimilation is a multidimensional process, the various aspects of which, although highly interactive, can vary independently at different rates and in different sequences.

Assimilation is a process of boundary reduction that can occur when members of two or more societies, of ethnic groups, or of smaller social groups meet. When the process is carried to completion, "an assimilated ethnic population is defined operationally as a group of persons with similar foreign origins, knowledge of which in no way gives a better prediction or estimation of their relevant social characteristics than does knowledge of the behavior of the total population of the community or nation involved" (Lieberson 1963:10).

Some fear that emphasis on assimilation is factually wrong (Young 1976; Glazer & Moynihan 1975), others that it reinforces oppressive systems (Blauner 1972). Still others fear that failure to recognize cases when some assimilation does occur under various conditions leads to poor social analysis and promotes inequities (Pettigrew 1969; Kuper 1977).

In his well-known discussions of types of assimilation Gordon (1964:71; 1978:169) outlines seven variables. Three of these—absence of prejudice, absence of discrimination, and absence of value and power conflict—can better be seen, in my judgment, as causes and then as consequences of the extent of assimilation, rather than as types of assimilation. The other four, with some modification, can be seen as the separate but interdependent subprocesses of which assimilation is constituted. They are: integration, acculturation, identification, and amalgamation—the structural, cultural, psychological, and biological aspects of assimilation.

These four subprocesses are not usually discussed separately or distinguished in a sharply analytic way, mainly perhaps because they are empirically almost always mixed (see Yinger & Simpson 1978). Special attention may be given to one or another, however, and it will be useful to refer to each one.

"A group is integrated to the degree that its members are distributed across the full range of associations, institutions, and regions of a society in a pattern similar to that of the population as a whole" (Yinger 1985). It is conceivable,

but not likely, that an ethnic group could be highly integrated and yet minimally acculturated and amalgamated, with little shift of identification to the larger society. Studies of integration mainly focus on political, occupational, educational, and marital data, often seen against a background of the regional and metropolitan demographic situation (see Murguia 1975; Woodrum 1981; Garcia 1981; Astin 1982; Shavit 1984; Burke 1981; Ogbu 1978; Stryker 1981; Alexander et al 1978; see also references below dealing with politics, stratification, and intermarriage).

Acculturation refers to the degree that values, norms, and usages of a group correspond with those of the society at large. As a process it is almost always two-way, even though smaller, less compact, resource-poor groups are more likely to be affected by it than to affect it strongly (see Padilla 1980; Hurh et al 1979). Dominant ethnic groups, however, are likely to overlook the extent to which they have been culturally influenced by those whom they dominate. They are also likely to exaggerate the persistence of cultural elements among the deprived, as in the conception of a presumed culture of poverty (see O. Lewis 1959, 1966; and for a few recent critiques, M. Lewis 1978; Waxman 1977; Abell & Lyon 1979; Hill & Ponza 1983).

Identification is perhaps the least well conceptualized and measured of the four processes of assimilation, although recent research is beginning to fill the gap (Alba & Chamlin 1983; Melville 1983; DeVos 1978; Horowitz 1975). Most Americans know the ethnic origins of their grandparents, but evidence of the salience of this knowledge and of its behavioral outcomes is scarce. One topic that is closely related to identification has been carefully studied. The work of Clark & Clark on self-esteem among black children (1947), although widely accepted for many years, has recently been seriously challenged, primarily for failing to distinguish clearly between group identification and self-esteem. Nonwhite children may have high self-esteem and still identify with whites, not because they "view white as intrinsically better than brown, black, or red" but because "they understand that certain societal avenues are better open to those who *are* white" (Beuf 1977:102; see Rosenberg & Simmons 1972; Rosenberg 1979; Louden 1981; Della Fave 1980; Taylor & Walsh 1979; Gecas 1982; Porter & Washington 1979).

Despite the valuable research by Rosenberg and others, perhaps the last word has not yet been written on this subject. Were the Clarks wrong because their methodology was inadequate; or were the times different; or has ideology shifted so that evidence of "the mark of oppression" is less likely to be emphasized than the creative responses of the oppressed [note the similar shift in studies of slavery (compare Elkins 1959 with Gutman 1976, for example)]; or is the evidence now available to us much richer? Some worry with Adam (1978) that these recent studies may tend to obscure the great harm done by oppression.

The amalgamation of an ethnic group, seen as a variable, is the degree to which the genetic make up of its members is similar to that of the society as a whole. A more sociologically relevant definition would be: "Groups are amalgamated when no *socially visible* genetic differences separate their members" (Yinger 1985). Genetic lines in the United States population, for example, are significantly blurred (80% of black Americans have European ancestors; 50% or more of Mexican Americans have both Indian and European ancestors; perhaps 20% of "white" Americans have African or Native American ancestors (Stuckert 1976:137). The socially visible genetic differences, however, are not as rapidly reduced in a race conscious society.

The Larger Theoretical Setting

A number of theoretical developments, although not directly concerned with ethnicity, are relevant to its study, to which in some instances they have been applied. I will mention only four such developments, to suggest the importance of the larger circle of theoretical work for the sociology of ethnicity.

The comparative sizes and ratios of groups and the experience of "solo" situations have been shown, in many studies, to have important consequences for individuals and groups (see Blau 1977; Kanter 1977; Spangler, Gordon & Pipkin 1978; Frisbie & Neidert 1977). Sizes and ratios of ethnic groups are clearly important for every aspect of their situation in a society. Token or solo experience is a common event, particularly for minority ethnic group members, under many conditions.

The study of status-organizing processes is revealing significant aspects of interpersonal relations. These are processes "in which evaluations of and beliefs about the characteristics of actors become the basis of observable inequalities in face-to-face interaction" (Berger, Rosenholtz & Zelditch 1980:479). Thus defined, their importance for the study of contacts across ethnic group lines, as for other kinds of contact, is apparent (see also Cohen & Roper 1972; Cohen 1982; Dovidio & Gaertner 1981; Humphreys & Berger 1981).

One of the postulates of network analysis, as developed by Laumann (1973:5), states that "Similarities in status, attitudes, beliefs, and behavior facilitate the formation of intimate (or consensual) relationships among incumbents of social positions." In his study, Laumann shows how the bonds of pluralism are strengthened in urban social networks in a way suggested by the postulate.

As a final illustration of theoretical work not specifically concerned with ethnicity, but important for it, I would call attention to studies of the ways in which individual actions can lead to an outcome that no one, or only a minority wished. Interpretations of outcomes may be faulty, as is well shown by Schelling in *Micromotives and Macrobehavior* (1978), if the process of interaction among individual actions, based on a range of motives or levels of

intensity, is disregarded. If 20% of X's do not want non-X children in their school and pull their children out when non-X's become 20%, the percentage of non-X's goes up, motivating some of those who were content with the earlier percentage but opposed to the new distribution to withdraw, motivating those who were content . . . *ad segregatum*. This is not, of course, an inevitable process. The new percentages may prove, on experience, to be acceptable. Nevertheless, the process by which individual actions can lead to results that none or only a few desired or anticipated is not uncommon in human experience. The study of this process is a valuable lead for theories of ethnicity.

THE DEFINITION AND MEASUREMENT OF ETHNICITY

Durkheim encouraged sociologists to "treat social facts as things." This advice is difficult to follow, not only because his own usage was rather ambiguous, but also because the boundaries of the things of interest to sociologists are often drawn in different ways by different observers. Theoretical perspectives, ideologies, and the data being examined—all affect the process of definition. Thus "ethnic groups" range, in various usages, from small, relatively isolated, nearly primordial "kin and culture" groups within which much of life proceeds, all the way to large categories of people defined as alike on the basis of one or two shared characteristics (e.g. Hispanics or Asian Americans). It seems unlikely that the term will be pared down to some small part of this range. We do not yet have even a clear typology marking different points, in terms of salience and identification, along the range (see T. Smith 1980, 1982). It is essential therefore, that students of ethnicity be alert to differences in usage. Current ethnic movements in developed societies are different in many ways from what can be called primary ethnic groups (Stein & Hill 1977).

Ethnicity, nationality, and country of origin are often used as synonyms. In commenting on the coding of answers to the question, "From what countries or part of the world did your ancestors come", NORC, in its *Cumulative Codebook, 1972–1982* combined those who named only one country (54%) with those who named two or more but selected one as the country they felt closer to (24%), identifying both as "the ethnicity of the respondent" (p. 43). This is valuable information for many purposes. It is of questionable value, however, if one is concerned with ethnicity more narrowly defined in reference, for example, to persons whose ancestors came from Mexico, the Philippines, Poland, Puerto Rico, Yugoslavia, or many other countries. If language is used as an important sorting criterion, "an immigrant from Argentina and one from Uruguay may clearly seem to be Hispanic, but what if the first is of Italian birth or descent and the second a German?" (Davis, Haub & Willette 1983:4).²

²For valuable works on language and ethnicity, see Fishman 1984, 1966; Fishman et al 1968; Heath 1983; Lieberman & Hansen 1974.

Geertz emphasizes the primordial tie, the “longing not to belong to any other group,” as the critical defining characteristic of ethnicity (1963:109)—a criterion not easily applied to most persons in modern societies. This is a more stringent definition than Weber’s reference to ethnic groups as “groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent,” although Weber adds that “this belief must be important for the propagation of group formation” (Weber 1968:389). Using NORC data, Greeley (1974) wisely divides state-origin groups by religion, into what he calls religio-ethnic groups, in order to study ethnicity in the United States; but the data do not permit him to study the effect of “the longing not to belong to any other group”—a definition that he applauds.

Most empirical work is based on the single fact of an ethnic (or state-origin) label, with little attention to the salience of the label, to the strength of identification with the ethnic group compared with other identities, or to distinction between country of origin and ethnicity. The United States Census in 1980 sought to use the concept of ethnic group more precisely, but found it too difficult or costly to separate such labels as Belgian, Swiss, Nigerian, and Indonesian (each referring to an ethnically heterogeneous population) from more clearly ethnic labels such as Czech or Welsh. An explanatory footnote in the census report could be used for much of the data in ethnic studies, particularly in the United States: “In this report, the terms ‘ancestry’ and ‘origin’ (and ancestry group and ethnic group) are used interchangeably” (US Census 1983:1).

Using 1977, 1978, and 1980 data from the General Social Survey, Alba & Chamlin (1983) observe a rising number of individuals who, although of mixed ethnic (country of origin?) ancestry, identify themselves with only one. “This occurrence appears to corroborate assertions of a ‘resurgence of ethnicity’ but points as well to a fundamental change in the nature of ethnicity, as ethnic identifiers are increasingly individuals with mixed ethnic ancestry, who are likely to have a muted ethnic identity” (Alba & Chamlin 1983:240).

Race and Ethnicity

Is race one of the defining characteristics of ethnicity? Dozens of books and articles include both race and ethnicity in their titles or discussions in a way that indicates overlapping concepts; this is testimony to a certain ambiguity on the question (see, e.g., Stone 1977; van den Berghe 1983; Eisinger 1980; Steinberg 1981; Williams 1975). Specifically in the United States, the question arises. Are Blacks an ethnic group? Are they distinguished by culture rather than, or more than, or in addition to race? Are Mexican Americans a racial group?

If race is thought of strictly in physical anthropological terms, it has no place in the definition of ethnicity. Its technical biological meaning should not be

confused with ethnicity (M. G. Smith 1982). Such a concept, however, is of interest to the geneticist. Its dimensions are measured only by sophisticated instruments, not by a few readily visible morphological traits. [And in this sense, there are dozens of races—34 in Dobzhansky's analysis (1962).] Sociology is interested in races only as socially visible divisions. Although these are based on some genetic component, the changing attention to and interpretation of that component is the critical sociological fact. There is now widespread if not universal agreement among scholars that "racial differences derive social significance from cultural diversity" (Kuper in Kuper & Smith 1971:13, see van den Berghe 1983:222; M. Kilson in Glazer & Moynihan 1975:236–266; A. Smith 1981:160–2; Keyes 1976; Taylor 1979).

In sum, to keep the definition within bounds, I will define an ethnic group . . . as "a segment of a larger society whose members are thought, by themselves and/or others, to have a common origin and to share important segments of a common culture and who, in addition, participate in shared activities in which the common origin and culture are significant ingredients" (Yinger: 1976:200). Some mixture of language, religion, race, and ancestral homeland with its related culture is the defining element. No one of these by itself demarcates an ethnic group.

DEMOGRAPHIC ASPECTS OF ETHNICITY

It is a truism to say that the absolute and proportionate sizes of ethnic groups in a society, their comparative rates of change, and their locations are highly significant aspects of that society's ethnic situation. One can scarcely begin a study of ethnicity without observing, for example, that over 80% of South Africa's population is nonwhite, that the size of the guest worker population has greatly increased Western Europe's diversity, that the dominant Russians in the Soviet Union will soon be a numerical minority, that the black, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic population of the United States increased from 17% of the total to over 23% between 1970 and 1980. In societies all over the world, differential rates of natural increase and incoming streams of migrants and refugees are changing the ethnic mix.

Since at least two *Annual Review of Sociology* articles (Petersen 1978; Massey 1981) have dealt with important aspects of this issue, I will call attention only to some of the recent literature and some of the questions examined therein. One cannot distinguish sharply between refugees (of whom there have been at least ten million in the world continuously during the last several years) and immigrants. Four criteria, however, can help one think of a continuum: (a) the degree to which the migrants are pushed out of their homeland or pulled into a new land by perception of opportunity and safety; (b) the degree to which they are subordinated in an ethnic-racial stratification

system or are given opportunities for status improvement; (c) the illegality or legality of their migration; and (d) the likelihood that the move will be temporary or permanent (Simpson & Yinger 1985: Ch. 3).

Refugees are almost certainly destined for a prolonged period as seriously handicapped ethnic minorities, especially when they make up a high proportion of the population in a country with few economic opportunities, such as Somalia, Pakistan, Jordan, and Sudan.

Western Europe has relatively few refugees in the strict sense. However, the decision in the early 1970s to restrict and if possible reverse the flow of guest workers, sought and welcomed in large numbers over a 20-year period, has created something close to a refugee population. They face an uncertain legal situation, a sometimes hostile public opinion, and sharply diminished job opportunities. Yet many of the refugees see little to be gained by returning to their homelands—Turkey, North Africa, India, Jamaica, for example—and their children have known life only in Europe (see, e.g., Krane 1978; Rist 1978; Amersfoort 1982; Rex & Tomlinson 1979; Freeman 1979; Dignan 1981; Martin 1980).

Changes in the U.S. law in 1965 and in the economic and political situations around the world had a profound effect on the countries of origin of immigrants to the United States. In the 1961–1965 period, the countries with the largest representation (in thousands) were Mexico (223), Canada (175), Germany (136), Great Britain (92) and Italy (83). In the 1976–1980 period these had shifted to Mexico (303), the Philippines (197), Vietnam (162), Cuba (159), and Korea (153). (Data furnished by the Statistical Analysis Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, US Department of Justice.) These data do not directly indicate a shift in the ethnic situation. There is strong indication, however, of growth in ethnic awareness among many of these newcomers and of discrimination against them (see, eg, Bryce-Laporte 1980; Reimers 1981; Burawoy 1976; Portes 1984).

America's changing ethnic situation has been influenced not only by the approximately 750,000 immigrants and refugees who have been admitted per year during the last decade, but also by an unknown number of undocumented aliens who have entered. The Bureau of the Census has estimated that number to be between 3.5 million and 6 million. The physical difficulty of reducing this number (half or more of whom have crossed the long border with Mexico) is matched by the political difficulty of arriving at a policy that will simultaneously satisfy two competing interests. Those who want "to regain control over our borders," to reduce labor competition, to slow the rate of population growth, or to lower the alleged drain on welfare budgets conflict with those who welcome the ready supply of low-cost labor, who put a high value on maintaining friendly relations with Mexico, or who believe that a steady flow of new immigrants is of great value to the country (see Bustamente 1977; Ehrlich et al

1979; Crewdson 1983). In 1984 the US Congress was engaged in struggle with a bill that sought to satisfy several of these desires, including some that are, at least to a degree, mutually contradictory.

THE SOURCES OF ETHNIC SURVIVAL AND REVIVAL

Although developmental theory, Marxist theory, and widespread beliefs about the effects of urbanization predicted a sharp decline in the strength of ethnic attachments, the ethnic factor continues to be a significant element in most societies. Is this simply a matter of a theoretical error being corrected, an assumption being effectively challenged?

In my judgment, earlier theories may be no more in error than their critics, who, while making a necessary and valuable correction, tend to exaggerate the ethnic revival, especially with reference to the United States. The nature of ethnicity has changed, in some ways drastically. To think of oneself as an Oglala Sioux or Chippewa is quite different from thinking of oneself as a Native American resident of Chicago or Los Angeles. We lose explanatory power if we equate contemporary urban ethnicity—with its large symbolic, affective qualities—with the more deeply rooted attachments and firmer boundaries of less mobile times and places. The latter may decline in some settings even while the former grows in influence.

Can the several, partly contradictory explanations of the sources and strengths of ethnicity be brought within one system? A number of recent studies have moved significantly in that direction by combining attention to the interest basis of ethnic strength with attention to the symbolic and affective aspects of a primordial attachment (McKay 1982; Lal 1983; A. Smith 1981; Stein & Hill 1977; I. Light in Keyes 1981:54–86; Glazer & Moynihan 1975). One can agree with Epstein's remark (1978:xi): "The one major conviction that emerged [from his study of ethnicity] was the powerful emotional charge that appears to surround or to underlie so much of ethnic behavior." That charge is strong in part, however, not simply because it is connected with primordial sentiments, but also because it is connected with contemporary interests. Daniel Bell argues persuasively (in Glazer & Moynihan 1975:169) that material interests are well served by ethnically based movements precisely because they "combine an interest with an affective tie."

Although less often discussed, a third major source of the continuing influence of ethnicity requires attention. Not only is ethnicity felt as a primordial sentiment, an emotional attachment to "my people," and a valuable tool for the protection or enhancement of status. It is, in addition, a way of trying to deal with the experience of anomie and the feeling of alienation. It can be seen as a "mode of reintegration of population elements into structures which are less anomic and alienative than their members might otherwise be exposed to" (T.

Parsons in Glazer & Moynihan 1975:69; see also Greeley 1971: Ch. 13; DeVos in DeVos & Romanucci-Ross 1975:25–6). In a rapidly changing society, strongly influenced by instrumentalism and rationality, it is difficult to know who one is. We look for a “brand name” (Herberg 1955) or declare with Jesse Jackson that “I am somebody.”

When social conflict brings renewed attention to one’s ancestry, and it appears that one’s interests will be served by affirming that background, these influences may combine with feelings of alienation from the larger society and with the sense of living in an anomic world to strengthen an ethnic identity (Yinger 1976, 1983).

Many current students of ethnicity emphasize that it is situational, emergent, adaptable, durable through flexibility, an instrument in economic and political struggles (Allworth 1977; Yancey, Eriksen, & Juliani 1979; Hannan 1979; Galaty 1982; Okamura 1981; Cohen 1974; Gans 1979). Interpretations of this fact, however, vary. Some see it as a sign of ethnic strength and durability, an indication of the weakness of the assimilationist argument. Others regard this situational, flexible quality as a sign of the fragility of ethnicity as usually understood. To some degree this disagreement is a matter of definition. I recently sat in on a conference of university students that was organized around the theme: “Asian Americans, an Etcetera Minority in Search of a Definition.” It was fascinating, and a bit startling, to watch persons of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Indian, Filipino, and Vietnamese backgrounds begin to define themselves as an ethnic group. This is quite different from seeing oneself, let us say, as a Kaoshan-Chinese from Taiwan or a Hakka from Fukien (Dreyer 1976; L. Pye in Glazer & Moynihan 1975:489–512). It is essential, if the term ethnicity is to be used to cover such a range—from Hakka immigrants to Asian Americans, e.g.—that the differences as well as the similarities be thoroughly examined.

Some scholars, it should be noted, are not comfortable with complex, multivariable explanations of ethnic survival and revival. Such explanations seem to them to be ad hoc descriptions rather than fundamental interpretations. A few have sought one basic reductionist principle to account for ethnic solidarity. Van den Berghe, for example, has developed what he believes to be a parsimonious theory based on sociobiology; according to him, “ethnic and racial sentiments are extensions of kinship sentiments” (van den Berghe 1981:80). They should therefore express the sociobiological principle of inclusive fitness.

This may be a plausible (but scarcely testable) partial explanation of the origins of ethnicity. However, it is of little use, in my judgment, to explain the ethnic solidarity of large, heterogeneous, and changing ethnic groups in modern societies—groups influenced by intermarriage, conversion, adoption, and intergroup alliances, not to speak of the highly diluted effect of the principle of inclusive fitness in very large and mixed populations.

Another reductionist approach to the study of ethnicity is the application of rational choice theory. Behavior is seen as the result of interaction between the structural conditions and individual preferences (Hechter et al 1982; Banton 1983). Based on or similar to classic economic theory, rational choice theory sees little to be gained by introducing unconscious motives or normative influences. I would emphasize that the overwhelming dominance of structural conditions in some circumstances leaves little room for the play of choice, rational or otherwise. It is those conditions—their origins and supports—that are often most in need of analysis in ethnic relations theory. Yet I shall make a rational choice to wait and see. This approach is new and relatively undeveloped. There may be a way to blend it into a more complex theory rather than substituting it for all the others. Its conservative implications may not be intrinsic.

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF ETHNICITY

The current strong scholarly interest in ethnicity is the result of the convergence of several different approaches to the study of the dynamic ethnic situation. Three in particular should be noted: (a) studies of racial and cultural minorities, of stratification, discrimination, and social conflict; (b) major theoretical strands in urban sociology and in ethnology concerned with cultural variation—strands that have become interwoven as formerly somewhat isolated peoples come together in metropolitan areas; and (c) studies developing from the interest shared by political sociology and political science in state building, development, and the impact of cultural heterogeneity on the political process.

Ethnicity, Social Stratification, and Discrimination

Most studies combine two or all three of these approaches to some degree. In this section I note recent work, mainly in the well established social stratification tradition, that emphasizes how ethnic and racial systems are involved in patterns of inequality and conflict (Yinger, 1983). Basic general studies include the continuing examination of ethnocentrism and cultural differences (Brewer & Campbell 1976; LeVine & Campbell 1972; Turner & Singleton 1978), of prejudice (Apostle et al 1983; Seeman 1981), and of stereotypy (Hamilton 1981; Miller 1982; Tajfel 1982; Lieberson 1982).

Apostle et al (1983) strengthen our understanding of racial attitudes by distinguishing among perceptions, explanations, and prescriptions—aspects of such attitudes that have somewhat different sets of causes and effects. (They prefer the term “racial attitudes” to “prejudice.” In my judgment they are not synonyms. Presumably there can be nonprejudiced perceptions, explanations, and prescriptions.)

Recent studies of stereotypes have been of particular value in strengthening the theoretical base in cognitive social psychology. Stereotypes affect interac-

tion in ways that restrict the flow of disconfirming information and may actually produce confirming experience. In many instances, the old adage has to be reversed: Believing is seeing. In what Pettigrew calls "the ultimate attribution error" (1979), negative acts of members of outgroups are seen as caused by their permanent, even genetic, characteristics. Their positive acts, however, are explained by transitory, situational forces.

A phenomenon closely related to stereotypy is opposition to members of an ethnic minority because of their perceived tendency to violate traditional values, such as self-reliance, the work ethic, and discipline. This has been called "symbolic racism" (see, e.g., McConahay & Hough 1976; Rosenthal 1980; Kinder & Sears 1981). By most measures, older forms of prejudice and stereotyping have declined, but opposition to minorities remains at quite a high level, supposedly because they are seen as threatening central values. The implied causal connection, however, requires careful study. The concept of symbolic racism focuses our attention in a useful way on the shifting bases of interethnic discrimination; but it may cause us to exaggerate the shift. In many ways, symbolic racism is quite old-fashioned, with roots, as Kinder & Sears observe (1981), not only in deep feelings of morality and propriety, but also in early-learned racial fears and stereotypes.

Some of the consequences of those fears and stereotypes are examined in the continuing stream of studies of ethnic and racial discrimination, particularly with reference to the United States, although Great Britain, Israel, the Soviet Union, South Africa, and other societies have been extensively examined. To cite only some of the most recent work, the wartime relocation of Americans of Japanese background continues to be the subject of great interest (Irons 1984; Commission on Wartime Relocation 1982). With the large increase in the number of persons of Chinese background in the American population, they too are receiving increased attention (Cheng & Bonacich 1984; Glick 1980).

Discrimination carried to its ultimate degree—genocide—continues to be a topic of study and commentary (as well as of enormous outrage and grief) because it continues as a fact of human experience and because the consequences of genocide in the past persist (see Kuper 1982; Fein 1978; Dadrian 1976; Horowitz 1976). At least since the United Nations Convention on Genocide, 1951 (the United States is not among the 80 countries that have signed it), the concept of genocide has been stretched beyond its literal meaning to include serious bodily and mental harm and efforts at the cultural destruction of an ethnic group (Dadrian 1975). This usage is found particularly in victimology, which can be defined as the study of violent discrimination.

I will illustrate only some of the additional lines of investigation of the way ethnic differences are involved in stratification systems and in the pursuit of interests by referring to internal colonialism, split labor markets, and resource mobilization. In each instance, the interaction between dominant and minority groups is the focus of attention.

INTERNAL COLONIALISM This concept is not new, but only in the last two decades has it been used extensively to help account for ethnic differences in economic and political strength. Blauner's influential paper (1969) characterized the colonization complex as one in which the minority was brought in by force, its culture and social organization weakened, its life "managed and manipulated" by ethnic outsiders—all of this justified by racist doctrines. In the most ambitious development of this theme, Hechter (1977) argued that in Britain, even extensive industrialization and urbanization, social and physical mobility, and the growth of literacy and political participation did not succeed in bringing the Celtic fringe or periphery into the core of British national development.

The concept of internal colonialism has been applied to a number of settings, for example to a Marxist society (Karlovic 1982), and to the Southwest of the United States (Barrera 1979), and has been studied comparatively (Stone 1979; A. Smith 1981: 29–35). Once a group has established its dominance, according to internal colony theory, it is often able to maintain "a cultural division of labor: a system of stratification where objective cultural distinctions are superimposed upon class lines" (Hechter 1977:30).

This interpretation is not without its weaknesses and its critics. It can make a "colony" appear to be more homogeneous in class and culture than it is, deflect attention from the domination over lower classes within the core, and cause one to overlook offsetting processes of integration of core and periphery (see, e.g., Glazer 1971; Moore 1976).

SPLIT LABOR MARKETS A substantial body of literature in both economics and sociology develops a segmented, or dual, or split labor market theory of ethnic and racial domination. It builds upon earlier theories of class conflict, particularly Marxist, but with a stronger empirical basis and a more complex picture of the forces at work (for example, see Bonacich 1972, 1975, 1976; Cain 1976; Cummings 1980; Edwards, Reich, & Gordon 1975; Marshall 1974; Mukabe 1981; Szymanski 1976). The basic structure of a split labor market as described by Bonacich (1972, 1975) is one with three classes: capitalist, cheap-labor, and higher-priced labor. The outcome of this situation is not fixed.

If employers are powerful they can drive out or drastically weaken the position of higher-priced labor, as is the case under slavery. If higher-priced labor is powerful enough they can drive the cheaper labor out of the labor market or block its entrance. Under other conditions, higher-priced labor can get a kind of compromise with employers under which they win a monopoly over the best jobs. Finally, under such conditions as a high demand for labor, political democracy, low ratio of minority workers, and the like, higher- and lower-priced labor may combine in an attempt to reduce the power of employers. In large and complex labor markets all four of these processes may be going on at once, as we believe to be the case in the United States (Simpson & Yinger 1985: Ch. 3).

These observations based on split labor market theories are derived in a general sense from Marxist thought. They clearly demand, however, significant modifications of the belief that ethnic divisions would fade in the modern capitalist world or that "false consciousness" would disappear in light of the recognition by the members of several ethnic groups that they were all being exploited (see Rex 1973).

Identification of the conditions under which the various processes occur and in what mixtures and comparative strengths has not been fully explored. Segmentation is not clear-cut under open market conditions (Greenberg 1980). Employers are sometimes ambivalent, for a mixture of profit, legal, and moral reasons. Some dominant workers are more vulnerable than others to minority competition, increasing the likelihood that they will show prejudice and will try to strengthen barriers to the entrance of lower-priced workers into their markets (Cummings 1980). Even less-skilled workers can mobilize resources to improve their positions (Hodson & Kaufman 1982).

RESOURCE MOBILIZATION This last point leads to a more general comment on resource mobilization. Since two recent chapters in the *Annual Review of Sociology* have dealt with this topic (Jenkins 1983; Olzak 1983), I will refer to it only briefly. "Ethnic mobilization is the process by which groups organize around some feature of ethnic identity (for example, skin color, language, customs) in pursuit of ethnic ends" (Olzak 1983:355). This is, of course, a strategy of dominant as well as of minority groups (see, e.g., Adam & Giliomee 1979). It is only recently, however, that much attention has been paid to efforts by the less powerful to improve their circumstances, even though minority group strategies have often contained an implicit, if not entirely explicit theory of resource mobilization. Such theories define what are believed to be the best ways to activate members, to aggregate their limited, scattered resources, and to secure outside help. Social policy of dominant groups may stimulate this process by helping the poor and disadvantaged who are entering a segmented labor market to define themselves as an ethnic group with common interests (Herbstein 1983). Although weak in competitive resources, a group may not be weak in pressure resources, to use a distinction developed by Blalock (1979:53–54), including leadership (Leifer 1981; see also Coleman 1971; Lithman 1983).

This issue in the study of ethnic groups has, fortunately, been built upon the general theory of resource mobilization (see, for example, particularly, Zald & McCarthy 1979; Gamson 1975; Gamson, Fireman, & Rytina 1982; Oberschall 1973; Piven & Cloward 1977; Jenkins & Perrow 1977; Tilly 1978).

Ethnicity as Culture

Drawing on the pioneering work of Park, Thomas, and Znaniecki and a kind of second generation in such studies as those of Gans (1962), Keil (1966), Suttles (1968), and Hannerz (1969), students of ethnicity have written scores of books with an emphasis on particular groups more than on intergroup relations. To be sure, virtually all of these studies, including those of Park and Thomas (see Lal 1983), also deal with the stratification aspects of ethnic relations. They approach those aspects, however, most commonly within the framework of cultural analysis.

I will merely list a small sampling of such works, with reference only to the United States and to the last few years, before commenting on some of the themes found in these kinds of studies (see, for example, Horowitz 1983; Saran & Eames 1980; Fallows 1979; Connor 1977; Tomasi 1977; Lopata 1976). Many of the books that focus in particular on a single ethnic group deal, among other things, with family patterns and religion—topics that lead inevitably back to society-wide and interethnic questions.

FAMILIES AND ETHNICITY This is well illustrated by interpretations of ethnic families. Many would agree, I believe, with the summary of Mindel & Havenstein (1981:431): "Somewhere between these great grindstones that would pulverize traditional family organization a type of family, once consigned to oblivion—being ground or melted down—persists: protean, adaptive, conservatizing, generating meanings, and forming a sense of identity partly from the realities of an earlier time, partly from the exigencies of the present."

Such an analysis is incomplete until it is put alongside the evidence regarding intermarriage, which I will define simply as marriage across a socially significant line of distinction. Rates of intermarriage vary widely, with the United States having among the highest. Because the lines drawn by religion, race, and ethnicity (in the sense of national origin) do not coincide, interpretation is difficult (Benson 1981). I think it is correct to say, however, that rates of intermarriage in the United States are higher than is noted by most students of ethnicity, that they are higher among younger cohorts, and that attitudes have become more favorable toward intermarriage.

Drawing on a number of sources, one can make the following estimates of intermarriage rates in the United States: Catholic, 40%; Jewish, 40%; Protestant, 18%. (Conversion of one or the other partner after marriage reduces these rates by about half.) Asian American rates are 10%–25% (depending upon country of origin); Black, 2%; Native American, 30% (not including Hispanics, many of whom have Indian ancestors). Ethnicity defined as national origin (which is the way most of the data are given) shows rates of intermarriage ranging from 5% to over 80%, depending upon country of origin, the time

period, generation in the country, rural or urban residence, status, locality and region of the country, and other variables.³ (See Alba 1981; Alba & Kessler 1979; Blau et al 1982, 1984; S. Cohen 1977; Gurak & Fitzpatrick 1982; B. Kim 1977; McRae 1983; Murguia 1982; Peach 1980; Porterfield 1978; Schoen & L. Cohen 1980).

RELIGION AND ETHNICITY It is difficult to doubt that religion today, as in the past, is one of the crucial defining characteristics in ethnic identity and one of the rallying points in ethnic conflict. Whether religion is a major cause of that conflict is much more difficult to determine, since religion often covaries with class, with demographic characteristics, with length of residence in a society, and other factors. Reversing generations of Muslim religious tolerance, Shiite fundamentalism in Iran, for example, directs its attacks not only against other societies but also against minority religious groups within Iran. Many of the Bahais, Zoroastrians, Jews, and Christians differ from the majority in ethnicity as well as religion; but they also differ in occupation and class.

The conflict in Northern Ireland is sometimes seen in religious and ethnic terms, a continuation of the generations-long struggle between the Irish-Irish and the Scotch-Irish. Religious leaders seeking to stop the violence speak of "Protestant fundamentalism and Catholic nationalism" as "equally guilty in supposing that God had sanctified their national and cultural prejudices" (*Irish Times*, July 21, 1983:14). These national and cultural facts, however, rest on a strong base of economic and political issues.

In Latin America, some segments of the Catholic Church, long seen as a bastion of strength for the ruling groups, are now major participants in the struggle to increase the economic and political rights of peasants, most of whom are Indian or mestizo (Lernoux 1982; Levine 1981).

Research on religion and ethnicity in the United States during the last several years has continued along well-established lines. Greeley (1976) has documented the rapid and educational advance of ethnic Catholics. Black-white church segregation has continued to decline (Hadaway et al 1984). The Black church, although sharing leadership positions more widely with politicians, lawyers, and others, continues to be seen as a major source of influence (Childs 1980; Lincoln 1974). The dominant branch of the former Black

³These are rates of intermarriages, which are not always distinguished from individual rates. If 60 persons from a given group *intramarry* and forty *intermarry*, 57% of the 70 marriages involving a member of that group are intermarriages. Transposition of one rate into the other can be made by use of the following formulas, with x being the group rate and y the individual rate:

$$y = \frac{100x}{200 - x} \quad x = \frac{200y}{100 + y}$$

Muslims, now the American Muslim Mission, is moving in the direction of Sunni Muslim orthodoxy (see, for example, Mamiya, 1982), but some of the black Americans who feel most alienated continue to support the harshly separatist Black Muslim approach of Louis Farrakhan. And, as a final illustration, the controversial relationships between Native Americans and dominant Christian churches and missions have been the subject of renewed attention (Bowden 1981; Deloria 1973).

Ethnicity and Politics

We need only the headlines to tell us how frequently ethnic borders and state borders fail to coincide. Connor (1972) notes that in 53 of 132 states there were more than five significant ethnic groups. Only 12 (9%) were essentially homogeneous; in 25 others (19%) one ethnic group made up more than 90% of the population. The nation-state is a powerful idea; but the facts and the ideology of ethnic diversity are also powerful. Much of the recent literature on ethnicity deals with the various ways in which the collision between these two conflicting views on how to organize a multiethnic society are dealt with and the consequences of the various choices.

ETHNICITY IN DEVELOPING STATES With dozens of new states formed since World War II, the process of nation-building (or, more appropriately, state-building, whether around one or more nations) and the related process of modernization have been subjects of a great deal of study (see, for example, C. Young 1976, 1982; Burgess 1981; Smock & Smock 1975; Bell & Freeman 1974; Lee 1983; Horowitz 1975; Schermerhorn 1978; Weiner 1978; Rothschild 1981; Williams 1982; Connor 1972; W. Skinner in Despres 1975:131–57). Young (1982:84–5) skillfully states the prevailing interpretation and, I think it fair to say, the prevailing fact:

A number of strategies were pursued in executing the nation-building design. The colonial pattern of avid classification largely ceased; indeed, the state frequently sought to replace ethnic categories by those based on territory. . . . Thus the overly exuberant celebration of ethnicity is viewed with suspicion by the state. A number have forbidden the formation of ethnic associations, which were generally tolerated by the colonial state. . . . That politicized ethnicity is a potential—and potent—threat to the nation-building mission has been a prime factor in the widespread adoption of single-party or military formulas of governance, where open political competition is averted.

In some developing states, of course, ethnicity has been accepted as an organizing principle, to some degree because no one ethnic group has had sufficient power to declare itself the core. The results have been mixed, with states such as Yugoslavia (Rusinow 1977; Karlovic 1982; Bertsch 1977) and Malaysia (Hirschman 1975; Nagata 1980; Abraham 1983) having contained, but by no means eliminated, the conflict, while others such as Lebanon (Hewitt

1977; Baaklini 1983) have suffered protracted civil war that belies the fairly optimistic views of a decade ago (Smock & Smock 1975).

ETHNICITY IN DEVELOPED STATES Ethnicity is an important political fact in most industrialized states also. The sub-nations of Western Europe, as William Petersen calls them (in Glazer & Moynihan 1975:177–208), and those of Canada have not only persisted but in several instances have become more assertive in recent decades. In Belgium, Great Britain, Holland, Spain, and Canada, for example, they have tested the efforts to maintain central state dominance if not absolute hegemony (Ragin 1979; Hall 1979; Dofny & Akiwo-wo 1980; Thompson 1983; Richmond 1984; Rex & Tomlinson 1979; Hechter 1977; Nielsen 1980; Olzak 1982; Guindon 1978).

Communist societies have not escaped these difficulties (Connor 1984). Ethnic attachments remain strong in China, among the at least 40 million non-Han ethnics, many of them along the USSR border (Dreyer 1976). Such attachments are more clearly a significant political fact in the Soviet Union, especially among residents in the Baltic region, Jews, and the Muslims along the southern border (King 1973; Azrael 1978; Allworth 1977; Rakowska-Harmstone 1977).

The ethnic relations of few countries have been studied with such intensity as those of Israel; over 25% of the population is Arabic, mainly Palestinian. Toward them, government policy and individual attitudes and behavior are powerfully influenced by the stressful international situation. Among the great variety of Jews—North African, Middle Eastern, and European in origin—ethnic lines among those from more similar backgrounds are being drawn less clearly (one may be European, for example, rather than Polish), but the more distinctive cultural groups remain distinct, their separate identities underlined and intensified by class differences and conflict (see, eg, Shokeid & Deshen 1982; Smootha 1978; Lustick 1980; Simon 1980; Rosenstein 1981).

ETHNICITY IN AMERICAN POLITICS As Rothschild notes (1981: Ch. 7), ethnopolitics is not always or necessarily uncompromising, zero-sum, and strident. Although it can make life much more complicated for the central elites, it can also be a resource and a vivid reminder of problems that, if not resolved, will seriously weaken the state. Many of the studies of ethnicity and politics in the United States are built, in various ways, around that theme. They deal with the degree to which the ethnic factor strengthens the influence of otherwise underrepresented groups or, on the other hand, how it divides and weakens the democratic process.

For some time the political aspects have had a place in the studies of American ethnicity. The many political dimensions of the civil rights move-

ment brought the issue clearly into the public arena. And the influence, or alleged influence, of American ethnic groups on foreign policy continues to attract both scholarly and public attention (as a sample, see Eisinger 1980; Said 1977; Enloe 1981; Lambert 1981; Clark & Ferguson 1983: Chs. 3, 4; M. Kilson in Glazer & Moynihan 1975: Ch. 8).

Enloe observes that states (she is referring primarily to the United States) seeking to expand and solidify their authority may attempt to co-opt ethnic organizations, to block their influence by denying them access to essential activities, and to reenforce a public ideology supporting individual rights while discrediting communal rights. These very activities, however, can contribute to the mobilization of ethnic groups. Even though "the BIA [Bureau of Indian Affairs] has always been viewed by Indian activists as a vehicle by which the American state made Indians poor and dependent" (Enloe 1981:133), it has also been a focus of Indian mobilization. The Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] makes day-by-day decisions of vital importance to Hispanics but mainly out of their control. "The INS has become a stimulus for Chicano (and other Hispanic groups) mobilization. One result of that ethnic mobilization is that the INS today has its first Hispanic director, just as the BIA has its first Indian director" (Enloe 1981:133).

A final question regarding the impact of ethnicity on politics receives more public than scholarly attention. How do ethnic groups influence a state's international relations? In the United States, ethnic group spokesmen (how representative they are is problematic) and individual activities have been concerned—to cite the most visible cases—with American policies toward and the internal politics of Israel, the Arabic states, the USSR, Ireland, Vietnam, South Africa, Mexico, Cuba, and Central America. Among the nearly half-million refugees from Vietnam in the United States, some (in a way similar to that of some Cuban refugees and immigrants) seek to organize opposition to the current regime in Hanoi. One group claimed "credit" for the murder of a Vietnamese refugee who supported that regime (Talbot 1982).

Do such internally divided ethnic groups and those that are more nearly unified pose a threat to a state? Based on their study of several cases, Suhrke & Noble (1977) believe that the answer is no in most instances. This is also the judgment of most of the authors in *Ethnicity and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Said 1977), although their views tend to be more qualified. In the Preface, Said observes, I think correctly, that in his judgment "the image of national interest has become blurred." Perhaps the strongest effects of ethnic concern and activity on foreign policy issues are not directly on the government, but on interethnic relations, as between Jews and Blacks, for example, or between Mexican Americans and Anglos.

ETHNICITY, THE MILITARY, AND THE POLICE Despite pioneering work by Stouffer and his associates (1949), Janowitz (1964, 1965), Moskos (1966), and others, it is only since about 1970 that the issue of the ethnic makeup of military and police forces has been a topic of extensive research. The increase in interest reflects, in particular, the fact that the ethnic makeup of new states strongly influenced control over their armed forces and also that the civil rights movement in the United States focused attention on the ethnic and racial membership in the armed forces and the police as well as on their treatment of minorities.

Colonial powers have often used as foot soldiers or junior officers persons from smaller ethnic groups, or those presumed to have a martial tradition, or believed to be more likely to be loyal to the regime (Janowitz 1981; Enloe 1977, 1980; Kirk-Greene 1980). Most of the new states, are made up of diverse ethnic groups, sometimes hostile to each other and almost certainly competitive. One of the most difficult tasks is to shape statewide constabulary and armed forces out of units whose main loyalty has been given to the separate ethnic groups. The dominant ethnic group may soon come to be seen as repressive if, in the name of state-building, it seeks complete control over the military forces. Lacking a relatively homogeneous civic culture, the leaders may seek to forge a kind of military unity.

Industrialized and developed societies have not escaped the problems associated with ethnic imbalance in the military and police forces (W. Young 1982; Binkin & Eitelberg 1982). They may seek to diversify and democratize the selection process by affirmative action programs, civil rights laws, and executive orders, as has happened in the United States. If the society at large, however, contains discriminatory structures, these will affect the outcomes. The least powerful racial and ethnic groups in the United States are still greatly underrepresented in the police forces (Cooper 1980). Although they are not underrepresented in the armed forces (Blacks constitute nearly twice as large a proportion in the military as in the total population), they make up a much lower share of the senior officers, due to lack of seniority, lower average amounts of training, and discrimination (Binkin & Eitelberg 1982). They also face problems of discrimination from the surrounding communities at home and abroad, and are more likely to receive harsh sentences from the criminal justice system (see Hayles & Perry 1981; Moskos 1973; Hope 1979). Among civilians, police brutality and discrimination are often alleged by members of ethnic minorities, not without cause (see, e.g., *The New York Times*, Oct. 19, 1980:1 & Nov. 11, 1982:35; Fernandez, Haug & Wagner 1976:84-98).

Enloe (1977:137) summarizes this issue well: "Military and police forces are rarely neutral actors in ethnic conflicts. They are typically ethnically

imbalanced as a result both of historical socioeconomic maldistributions of opportunities and of deliberate recruitment strategies pursued by central government elites." She goes on to note that modernization and professionalization of security forces do not guarantee their communal or political neutrality.

CONCLUSION

Slowly research is moving beyond the rather strongly ideological discussions to ask: To what degree, in what ways, under what conditions, and with what consequences do ethnic groups occupy an important place in a social structure? Under what conditions are they relatively less salient? Perhaps the best way to conclude this review is to note a few of the corollary questions that linger in my mind after study of the immense body of literature that has appeared in the last several years.

How does widespread emphasis on and identification with ethnic groups, rather than (or more than) on classes, influence the level and the nature of conflict? When societal strains are organized along ethnic boundaries, are they less negotiable, more intractable, with a higher emotive component? Or does such organization make it possible for the otherwise powerless to mobilize resources that are out of reach when they act as individuals?

Who within an ethnic group, if anyone, profits in terms of status, income, and power, by an emphasis on ethnic divisions? Ethnic movements are typically inspired and led by higher-status persons. Is it they who have the most to gain?

Under what conditions does assimilation begin and persist; what conditions retard it; and what are its long-run effects on various groups? These are intrinsically difficult questions, made more difficult by the varying premises and values that influence researchers. If one assumes that assimilation is inevitable and desirable, important questions are not even asked. If one assumes that it is always one-way, discriminatory, and results in dead-level uniformity, contradictory evidence may be overlooked.

Perhaps we need continuously to emphasize a dilemma faced by multiethnic societies: Under assimilative pressure, cultures may be lost that contain elements needed for adaptation to a changing world—the loss of a kind of cultural gene pool. Under pluralistic and separatist pressures, cultural forms may be preserved that are maladaptive and unjust—sexist, racist, harshly stratified, and militarized.

Ongoing research gives promise that we will be able to examine these questions and issues more powerfully in the years ahead.

Literature Cited

- Abell, T., Lyon, L. 1979. Do the differences make a difference? An empirical evaluation of the culture of poverty in the United States. *Am. Ethnol.* 6:602-20
- Abraham, C. E. R. 1983. Racial and ethnic manipulation in colonial Malaya. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 6:18-32
- Adam, B. 1978. Inferiorization and 'self-esteem'. *Soc. Psychol.* 41:47-53
- Adam, H., Giliomee, H. 1979. *Ethnic Power Mobilized: Can South Africa Change?* New Haven, Conn: Yale Univ. Press
- Alba, R. D. 1981. The twilight of ethnicity among American Catholics of European ancestry. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 454:86-97
- Alba, R. D., Chamlin, M. B. 1983. A preliminary examination of ethnic identification among whites. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 48(2):240-47
- Alba, R. D., Kessler, R. C. 1979. Patterns of interethnic marriage among American Catholics. *Soc. Forc.* 57(4):1124-40
- Alexander, K. L., Cook, M., McDill, E. L. 1978. Curriculum tracking and educational stratification: some further evidence. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 43:47-66
- Allworth, E., ed. 1977. *Nationality Group Survival in Multi-Ethnic States: Shifting Support Patterns in the Soviet Baltic Region.* New York: Praeger
- Amersfoort, H. van. 1982. *Immigration and the Formation of Minority Groups: The Dutch Experience 1945-1975.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Apostle, R. A., Glock, C. Y., Piazza, T., Suelzle, M. 1983. *The Anatomy of Racial Attitudes.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Archdeacon, T. J. 1983. *Becoming American: An Ethnic History.* New York: Free
- Astin, A. W. 1982. *Minorities in Higher Education: Recent Trends, Current Prospects, and Recommendations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Azrael, J. R., ed. 1978. *Soviet Nationality Policies and Practices.* New York: Praeger
- Baaklini, A. I. 1983. Ethnicity and politics in contemporary Lebanon. In *Culture, Ethnicity, and Identity: Current Issues in Research*, ed. W. C. McCready, pp. 17-56. New York: Academic
- Banton, M. 1983. *Racial and Ethnic Competition.* New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Barrera, M. 1979. *Race and Class in the Southwest.* South Bend, Ind: Univ. Notre Dame Press
- Basham, R., DeGroot, D. 1977. Current approaches to the anthropology of urban and complex societies. *Am. Anthropol.* 79(2): 414-40
- Bell, W., Freeman, W. E., eds. 1974. *Ethnicity and Nation-Building: Comparative International and Historical Perspectives.* Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage
- Benson, S. 1981. *Ambiguous Ethnicity: Interracial Families in London.* New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Berger, J., Rosenholtz, S. J., Zelditch, M. Jr. 1980. Status organizing processes. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 6:479-508
- Bertsch, G. K. 1977. Ethnicity and politics in socialist Yugoslavia. *Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 433:88-99
- Beuf, A. H. 1977. *Red Children in White America.* Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
- Binkin, M., Eitelberg, M. J., with Schexnider, A. J., Smith, M. M. 1982. *Blacks and the Military.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Inst.
- Blalock, H. M. Jr. 1979. *Black-White Relations in the 1980s: Toward a Long-Term Policy.* New York: Praeger
- Blau, P. M. 1977. A macrosociological theory of social structure. *Am. J. Sociol.* 83:26-54
- Blau, P. M., Becker, C., Fitzpatrick, K. M. 1984. Intersecting social affiliations and intermarriage. *Soc. Forc.* 62(3):585-606
- Blau, P. M., Blum, T. C., Schwartz, J. E. 1982. Heterogeneity and intermarriage. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 47:45-62
- Blauner, R. 1972. *Racial Oppression in America.* New York: Harper & Row
- Blauner, R. 1969. Internal colonialism and ghetto revolt. *Soc. Probl.* 16:393-408
- Bonacich, E. 1976. Advanced capitalism and black/white relations in the United States: a split labor market interpretation. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 41:34-51
- Bonacich, E. 1975. Abolition, the extension of slavery, and the position of free blacks: a study of split labor markets in the United States, 1830-1863. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 81(3): 601-28
- Bonacich, E. 1972. A theory of ethnic antagonism: the split labor market. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 37:547-59
- Bowden, H. W. 1981. *American Indians and Christian Missions: Studies in Cultural Conflict.* Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Brewer, M. B., Campbell, D. T. 1976. *Ethnocentrism and Intergroup Attitudes: East African Evidence.* Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage
- Bryce-Laporte, R. S., ed. 1980. *Sourcebook on the New Immigration: Implications for the United States and the International Community.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction
- Burgess, M. E. 1981. Ethnic scale and intensity: the Zimbabwian experience. *Soc. Forc.* 59:601-26
- Burke, F. G. 1981. Bilingualism/Biculturalism

- in American education: An adventure in wonderland. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 454:164-77
- Burawoy, M. 1976. The function and reproduction of migrant labor: comparative material from southern Africa and the United States. *Am. J. Sociol.* 81(5):1050-87
- Bustamante, J. A. 1977. Undocumented immigration from Mexico: research report. *Int. Migration Rev.* 11:149-77
- Cain, G. G. 1976. The challenges of segmented labor market theories to orthodox theory: a survey. *J. Econ. Lit.* 14(4):1215-57
- Cheng, L., Bonacich, E., eds. 1984. *Labor Immigration Under Capitalism: Asian Workers in the United States before World War II*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Childs, J. B. 1980. *The Political Black Minister: A Study in Afro-American Politics and Religion*. Boston: Hall
- Clark, K. B., Clark, M. P. 1947. Racial identification and preference in negro children. In *Readings in Social Psychology*, ed. T. M. Newcomb, E. L. Hartley, pp. 169-78. New York: Holt
- Clark, T. N., Ferguson, L. C. 1983. *City Money: Political Processes, Fiscal Strain, and Retrenchment*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
- Cohen, A. 1974. *Two-Dimensional Man*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Cohen, E. G. 1982. Expectations states and interracial interaction in school settings. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 8:209-35
- Cohen, E. G., Roper, S. S. 1972. Modification of interracial interaction disability: an application of status characteristic theory. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 37:643-57
- Cohen, R. 1978. Ethnicity: problem and focus in anthropology. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 7:379-403
- Cohen, S. M. 1977. Socioeconomic determinants of intraethnic marriage and friendship. *Soc. Forc.* 55(4):997-1010
- Coleman, J. S. 1971. *Resources for Social Change: Race in the United States*. New York: Wiley
- Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. 1982. *Personal Justice Denied*. Washington, DC: USGPO
- Connor, J. W. 1977. *Tradition and Change in Three Generations of Japanese Americans*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall
- Connor, W. 1984. *The National Question in Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Connor, W. 1972. Nation building or nation destroying. *World Politics* 24:319-50
- Cooper, J. L. 1980. *The Police and the Ghetto*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat
- Crowdson, J. 1983. *The Tarnished Door: The New Immigrants and the Transformation of America*. New York: Times Books
- Cummings, S. 1980. White ethnics, racial prejudice, and labor market segmentation. *Am. J. Sociol.* 85:938-50
- Dadrian, V. N. 1976. The Victimization of the American Indian. *Victimology* 1:517-37
- Dadrian, V. N. 1975. The common features of the Armenian and Jewish cases of genocide: a comparative victimological perspective. In *Victimology: A New Focus*, Vol. IV, *Violence and Its Victims*, ed. I. Drapkin, E. Viano, pp. 99-120. Lexington, Mass: Heath
- Davis, C., Haub, C., Willette, J. 1983. U.S. Hispanics: changing the face of America. *Pop. Bull.* 38(3):whole issue
- Della Fave, L. R. 1980. The meek shall not inherit the earth: self-evaluation and the legitimacy of stratification. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 45:955-71
- Deloria, V. Jr. 1973. *God Is Red*. New York: Dell
- Despres, L. A., ed. 1975. *Ethnicity and Resource Competition in Plural Societies*. The Hague: Mouton
- DeVos, G. A. 1978. Selective permeability and reference group sanctioning: psychocultural continuities in role degradation. In *Major Social Issues*, ed. J. M. Yinger, S. J. Cutler, pp. 7-24. New York: Free
- DeVos, G., Romanucci-Ross, L., eds. 1975. *Ethnic Identity*. Palo Alto, Calif: Mayfield
- Dignan, D. 1981. Europe's melting pot: a century of large-scale immigration into France. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 4(2):137-52
- Dinnerstein, L., Nichols, R. L., Reimers, D. M. 1979. *Natives and Strangers: Ethnic Groups and the Building of America*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Dobzhansky, T. 1962. *Mankind Evolving*. New Haven, Conn: Yale Univ. Press
- Dofny, J., Akiwowo, A., eds. 1980. *National and Ethnic Movements*. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L. 1981. The effects of race, status, and ability on helping behavior. *Soc. Psychol. Q.* 44(3):192-203
- Dreyer, J. T. 1976. *China's Forty Millions: Minority Nationalities and National Integration in the People's Republic of China*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press
- Edwards, R. C., Reich, M., Gordon, D. M. 1975. *Labor Market Segmentation*. Lexington, Mass: Heath
- Ehrlich, P. R., Bilderback, L., Ehrlich, A. H. 1979. *The Golden Door: International Migration, Mexico and the United States*. New York: Ballantine
- Eisinger, P. K. 1980. *The Politics of Displacement: Racial and Ethnic Transition in Three American Cities*. New York: Academic
- Elkins, S. M. 1959. *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

- Enloe, C. H. 1981. The growth of the state and ethnic mobilization: the American experience. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 4(2):123-36
- Enloe, C. H. 1980. *Ethnic Soldiers: State Security in Divided Societies*. Athens: Univ. Georgia Press
- Enloe, C. H. 1977. Police and military in the resolution of ethnic conflict. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 433:137-49
- Epstein, A. L. 1978. *Ethos and Identity: Three Studies in Ethnicity*. London: Tavistock
- Fallows, M. R. 1979. *Irish Americans: Identity and Assimilation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Fein, H. 1978. *Accounting for Genocide: National Response and Jewish Victimization During the Holocaust*. New York: Free
- Fernandez, C. A., Haug, J. M., Wagner, N. N. 1976. *Chicanos*. St. Louis, Mo: Mosby
- Fishman, J. A. 1984. *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Language and Ethnicity in Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton
- Fishman, J. A., ed. 1966. *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton
- Fishman, J. A., Ferguson, C. A., Das Gupta, J., eds. 1968. *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley
- Francis, E. K. 1976. *Interethnic Relations: An Essay in Sociological Theory*. New York: Elsevier
- Freeman, G. P. 1979. *Immigrant Labor and Racial Conflict in Industrial Societies: The French and British Experience 1945-1975*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Frisbie, W. P., Neidert, L. 1977. Inequality and the relative size of minority populations: a comparative analysis. *Am. J. Sociol.* 82(5):1007-30
- Galaty, J. G. 1982. Being 'Massai': being 'people-of-cattle': ethnic shifters in East Africa. *Am. Ethnol.* 9:1-20
- Gamson, W. A. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Homewood, Ill: Dorsey
- Gamson, W. A., Fireman, B., Rytina, S. 1982. *Encounters with Unjust Authority*. Homewood, Ill: Dorsey
- Gans, H. J. 1979. Symbolic ethnicity: the future of ethnic groups and cultures in America. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 2:1-20
- Gans, H. J. 1962. *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans*. New York: Free
- Garcia, J. A. 1981. Political integration of Mexican immigrants: explorations into the naturalization process. *Int. Migration Rev.* 15:608-25
- Gecas, V. 1982. The self-concept. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 8:1-33
- Geertz, C. 1963. *Old Societies and New States*. New York: Free Press
- Glazer, N. 1983. *Ethnic Dilemmas 1964-1982*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press
- Glazer, N. 1971. Blacks and ethnic groups: the difference, and the political difference it makes. *Soc. Probl.* 18:444-61
- Glazer, N., Moynihan, D. P., eds. 1975. *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press
- Glick, C. E. 1980. *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese Migrants in Hawaii*. Honolulu: Univ. Hawaii Press
- Gordon, M. M. 1978. *Human Nature, Class, and Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Gordon, M. M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Greeley, A. M. 1976. *Ethnicity, Denomination, and Inequality*. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage
- Greeley, A. M. 1974. *Ethnicity in the United States: A Preliminary Reconnaissance*. New York: Wiley
- Greeley, A. M. 1971. *Why Can't They Be Like Us*. New York: Dutton
- Greenberg, S. B. 1980. *Race and State in Capitalist Development: Comparative Perspectives*. New Haven, Conn: Yale Univ. Press
- Guindon, H. 1978. The modernization of Quebec and legitimacy of the Canadian state. *Can. Rev. Sociol. Anthropol.* 15:227-45
- Gurak, D. T., Fitzpatrick, J. P. 1982. Inter-marriage among Hispanic ethnic groups in New York City. *Am. J. Sociol.* 87:921-34
- Gutman, H. G. 1976. *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom 1725-1925*. New York: Pantheon
- Hadaway, C. K., Hackett, D. G., Miller, J. F. 1984. The most segregated institution: correlates of interracial church participation. *Rev. Relig. Res.* 25(3):204-19
- Hall, R. L., ed. 1979. *Ethnic Autonomy—Comparative Dynamics: The Americas, Europe and the Developing World*. New York: Pergamon
- Hamilton, D. L., ed. 1981. *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Hannan, M. 1979. The dynamics of ethnic boundaries in modern states. In *National Development and the World System*, ed. J. Meyer, M. Hannan, pp. 253-75. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Hannerz, U. 1969. *Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
- Hayles, R., Perry, R. W. 1981. Racial equality in the American naval justice system: An analysis of incarceration differentials. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 4:44-55
- Heath, S. B. 1983. *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. London: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Hechter, M. 1977. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Develop-*

- ment, 1536–1966. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Hechter, M., Friedman, D., Appelbaum, M. 1982. A theory of ethnic collective action. *Int. Migration Rev.* 16(2):412–34
- Heisler, M. O., issue ed. 1977. Ethnic conflict in the world today. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 433:whole issue
- Herberg, W. 1955. *Protestant-Catholic-Jew*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday
- Herbststein, J. 1983. The politicization of Puerto Rican ethnicity in New York: 1955–1975. *Ethn. Groups* 5:31–54
- Hewitt, C. 1977. Majorities and minorities: a comparative study of ethnic violence. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 433:150–60
- Hill, M. S., Ponza, M. 1983. Poverty and welfare dependence across generations. *Econ. Outlook USA* Summer:61–64
- Hirschman, C. 1983. America's melting pot reconsidered. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 9:397–423
- Hirschman, C. 1975. *Ethnic and Social Stratification in Peninsular Malaysia*. Washington, DC: Am. Sociol. Assoc.
- Hodson, R., Kaufman, R. L. 1982. Economic dualism: a critical review. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 47:727–39
- Hope, R. O. 1979. *Racial Strife in the U.S. Military*. New York: Praeger
- Horowitz, D. L. 1975. Ethnic identity. In *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*, ed. N. Glazer, D. P. Moynihan, pp. 111–40. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press
- Horowitz, I. L. 1976. *Genocide: State Power and Mass Murder*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction
- Horowitz, R. 1983. *Honor and the American Dream: Culture and Identity in a Chicano Community*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press
- Humphreys, P., Berger, J. 1981. Theoretical consequences of the status characteristic formulation. *Am. J. Sociol.* 86:953–83
- Hurh, W. M., Kim, H. C., Kim, K. C. 1979. *Assimilation Patterns of Immigrants in the United States: A Case Study of Korean Immigrants in the Chicago Area*. Washington, DC: Univ. Press America
- Irons, P. 1984. *Justice at War: The Story of the Japanese Internment Cases*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Janowitz, M., ed. 1981. *Civil-Military Relations: Regional Perspectives*. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage
- Janowitz, M., in coll. with Little, R. 1965. *Sociology and the Military Establishment*. New York: Russell Sage. Rev. ed.
- Janowitz, M. 1964. *The Military in the Political Development of New Nations*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Jenkins, J. C. 1983. Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 9:527–53
- Jenkins, J. C., Perrow, C. 1977. Insurgency of the powerless. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 42(2):249–68
- Juliani, R. N. 1982. Ethnicity: myth, social reality, and ideology. *Contemp. Soc.* 11(4):368–70
- Kanter, R. M. 1977. Some effects of proportions on group life: skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *Am. J. Sociol.* 82:965–90
- Karlovic, N. L. 1982. Internal colonialism in a Marxist society: the case of Croatia. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 5:276–99
- Keil, C. 1966. *Urban Blues*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Keyes, C. F., ed. 1981. *Ethnic Change*. Seattle: Univ. Wash. Press
- Keyes, C. F. 1976. Towards a new formulation of the concept of ethnic group. *Ethnicity* 3(3):202–13
- Kim, B. C. 1977. Asian wives of U.S. servicemen: women in shadows. *Amerasia* 4:91–115
- Kinder, D. R., Sears, D. O. 1981. Prejudice and politics: symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 40(3):414–31
- King, R. R. 1973. *Minorities Under Communism: Nationalities as a Source of Tension among Balkan Communist States*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press
- Kirk-Greene, A. H. M. 1980. 'Damnosa Hereditas': ethnic ranking and the martial races imperative in Africa. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 3:393–414
- Kuper, L. 1982. *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven, Conn: Yale Univ. Press
- Kuper, L. 1977. *The Pity of It All*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Kuper, L., Smith, M. G., eds. 1971. *Pluralism in Africa*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Lal, B. B. 1983. Perspectives on ethnicity: old wine in new bottles. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 6:154–73
- Lambert, R. D. 1981. Ethnic/racial relations in the United States in comparative perspective. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 454:189–205
- Laumann, E. O. 1973. *Bonds of Pluralism: The Forms and Substance of Urban Social Networks*. New York: Wiley
- Leifer, E. M. 1981. Competing models of political mobilization: the role of ethnic ties. *Am. J. Sociol.* 87(1):23–47
- Lernoux, P. 1982. *Cry of the People: The Struggle for Human Rights in Latin America—The Catholic Church in Conflict with U.S. Policy*. New York: Penguin
- Levine, D. H. 1981. *Religion and Politics in Latin America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- LeVine, R. A., Campbell, D. T. 1972. *Ethno-*

- centrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes and Group Behavior*. New York: Wiley
- Lewis, M. 1978. *The Culture of Inequality*. Amherst: Univ. Mass. Press
- Lewis, O. 1966. The culture of poverty. *Sci. Am.* 215:19-25
- Lewis, O. 1959. *Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty*. New York: Basic
- Lieberson, S. 1982. Stereotypes: their consequences for race and ethnic interaction. In *Social Structure and Behavior: Essays in Honor of William Hamilton Sewell*, ed. R. Hauser et al, pp. 47-68. New York: Academic
- Lieberson, S. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Lieberson, S. 1963. *Ethnic Patterns in American Cities*. New York: Free
- Lieberson, S., Hansen, L. K. 1974. National development, mother tongue diversity, and the comparative study of nations. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 39(4):523-41
- Lincoln, C. E. 1974. *The Black Experience in Religion*. Garden City, NY: Anchor
- Lithman, Y. G. 1983. *The Practice of Underdevelopment and the Theory of Development—The Canadian Indian Case*. Stockholm: Univ. Stockholm
- Lopata, H. Z. 1976. *Polish Americans: Status Competition in an Ethnic Community*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Louden, D. 1981. A comparative study of self-concepts among minority and majority group adolescents in English multi-racial schools. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 4:153-74
- Lustick, I. 1980. *Arabs in the Jewish State*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
- Mamiya, L. H. 1982. From Black Muslim to Bilalian: the evolution of a movement. *J. Sci. Study Relig.* 21:138-52
- Marshall, R. 1974. The economics of racial discrimination: a survey. *J. Econ. Lit.* 12(3):849-71
- Martin, P. L. 1980. *Guestworker Programs: Lessons from Europe*. Washington, DC: USGPO
- Mason, D. 1982. Race relations, group formation and power: a framework for analysis. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 5:421-39
- Massey, D. S. 1981. Dimensions of the new immigration to the United States and the prospects of assimilation. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 7:57-85
- Massey, D. S., Mullan, B. P. 1984. Processes of Hispanic and Black spatial assimilation. *Am. J. Sociol.* 84(4):836-73
- McConahay, J. B., Hough, J. C. Jr. 1976. Symbolic racism. *J. Soc. Iss.* 32(2):23-45
- McCreedy, W. C., ed. 1983. *Culture, Ethnicity, and Identity*. New York: Academic
- McKay, J. 1982. An exploratory synthesis of primordial and mobilizationist approaches to ethnic phenomena. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 5:395-420
- McRae, J. A. 1983. Changes in religious communalism desired by Protestants and Catholics. *Soc. Forc.* 61:708-30
- Melville, M. B. 1983. Ethnicity: an analysis of its dynamism and variability focusing on the Mexican/Anglo/Mexican interface. *Am. Ethnol.* 10(2):272-89
- Miller, A. G., ed. 1982. *In the Eye of the Beholder: Contemporary Issues in Stereotyping*. New York: Praeger
- Mindel, C. H., Havenstein, R. W., eds. 1981. *Ethnic Families in America: Patterns and Variations*. New York: Elsevier. 2nd ed.
- Moore, J. W. 1976. American minorities and 'new nation' perspectives. *Pac. Sociol. Rev.* 19:447-67
- Morgan, G. D. 1981. *America without Ethnicity*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat (Nat'l. Univ. Publ.)
- Moskos, C. C. Jr. 1973. The American dilemma in uniform. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 406:98-106
- Moskos, C. C. Jr. 1966. Racial integration in the armed forces. *Am. J. Sociol.* 72(2):132-48
- Mukabe, T. 1981. The theory of the split labor market: a comparison of the Japanese experience in Brazil and Canada. *Soc. Forc.* 59:786-809
- Murguia, E. 1975. *Assimilation, Colonialism, and the Mexican American People*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
- Murguia, E. 1982. *Chicano Inter-marriage: A Theoretical and Empirical Study*. San Antonio, Tex: Trinity Univ. Press
- Nagata, J. A. 1980. *Malasian Mosaic: Perspectives from a Polyethnic Society*. Vancouver: Univ. British Columbia Press
- Nielsen, F. 1980. The Flemish movement in Belgium after World War II: a dynamic analysis. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 45(1):76-94
- Novak, M. 1972. *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics*. New York: Macmillan
- Oberschall, A. 1973. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Ogbu, J. 1978. *Minority Education and Caste*. New York: Academic
- Okamura, J. Y. 1981. Situational ethnicity. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 4:452-65
- Olzak, S. 1983. Contemporary ethnic mobilization. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 9:355-74
- Olzak, S. 1982. Ethnic mobilization in Quebec. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 5:253-75
- Padilla, A. M., ed. 1980. *Acculturation: Theory, Models and Some New Findings*. Boulder, Colo: Westview
- Patterson, G. J. 1979. A critique of 'the new ethnicity'. *Am. Anthropol.* 81:103-5

- Patterson, O. 1977. *Ethnic Chauvinism: The Reactionary Impulse*. New York: Stein & Day
- Peach, C. 1980. Which triple melting pot? A re-examination of ethnic intermarriage in New Haven. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 3:1-16
- Peach, C., Robinson, V., Smith, S., eds. 1981. *Ethnic Segregation in Cities*. London: Croom Helm
- Petersen, W. 1978. International migration. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 4:533-75
- Pettigrew, T. F. 1979. The ultimate attribution error: extending Allport's cognitive analysis of prejudice. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 5:461-76
- Pettigrew, T. F. 1978. Three issues in ethnicity: boundaries, deprivations, and perceptions. In *Major Social Issues: A Multidisciplinary View*, ed. J. M. Yinger, S. J. Cutler, pp. 25-49. New York: Free
- Pettigrew, T. F. 1969. Racially separate or together? *J. Soc. Iss.* 25:43-69
- Piven, F. F., Cloward, R. A. 1977. *Poor People's Movements*. New York: Pantheon
- Porter, J. R., Washington, R. E. 1979. Black identity and self-esteem: a review of studies of Black self-concept, 1968-1978. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 5:53-74
- Porterfield, E. 1978. *Black and White Mixed Marriages*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall
- Portes, A. 1984. The rise of ethnicity: determinants of ethnic perceptions among Cuban exiles in Miami. *Am. Soc. Rev.* 49:383-97
- Ragin, C. C. 1979. Ethnic mobilization: the Welsh case. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 44:619-35
- Rakowska-Harmstone, T. 1977. Ethnicity in the Soviet Union. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 433:73-87
- Reimers, D. M. 1981. Post-World War II immigration to the United States: America's latest newcomers. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 454:1-12
- Rex, J. 1981. A working paradigm for race relations research. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 4(1):1-25
- Rex, J. 1973. *Race, Colonialism and the City*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Rex, J., Tomlinson, S. 1979. *Colonial Immigrants in a British City: A Class Analysis*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Richmond, A. H., issue ed. 1984. Ethnic nationalism and postindustrialism. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 7(1):whole issue
- Rist, R. C. 1978. *Guestworkers in Germany: The Prospects for Pluralism*. New York: Praeger
- Rosenberg, M. 1979. *Conceiving the Self*. New York: Basic
- Rosenberg, M., Simmons, R. G. 1972. *Black and White Self-Esteem: The Urban School Child*. Washington, DC: Am. Sociol. Assoc.
- Rosenstein, C. 1981. The liability of ethnicity in Israel. *Soc. Forc.* 59:667-86
- Rosenthal, S. J. 1980. Symbolic racism and desegregation: divergent attitudes and perspectives of Black and White university students. *Phylon* 41:257-66
- Rothschild, J. 1981. *Ethnopolitics: A Conceptual Framework*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
- Rusinow, D. 1977. *The Yugoslavian Experiment: 1948-1974*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Said, A. A., ed. 1977. *Ethnicity and U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Praeger
- Saran, P., Eames, E. 1980. *The New Ethnic: Asian Indians in the United States*. New York: Praeger
- Schelling, T. C. 1978. *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*. New York: Norton
- Schermerhorn, R. A. 1978. *Ethnic Plurality in India*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press
- Schoen, R., Cohen, L. E. 1980. Ethnic endogamy among Mexican American grooms: a reanalysis of generational and occupational effect. *Am. J. Sociol.* 86:359-66
- Seeman, M. 1981. Intergroup relations. In *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives*, ed. M. Rosenberg, R. H. Turner, pp. 378-410. New York: Basic
- Shavit, Y. 1984. Tracking and ethnicity in Israeli secondary education. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 49(2):210-20
- Shokeid, M., Deshen, S. 1982. *Distant Relations: Ethnicity and Politics among Arabs and North African Jews in Israel*. New York: Praeger
- Simon, R. J. 1980. *Continuity and Change: A Study of Two Ethnic Communities in Israel*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Simpson, G. E., Yinger, J. M. 1985. *Racial and Cultural Minorities*. New York: Plenum. 5th ed.
- Smith, A. D. 1981. *The Ethnic Revival*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Smith, M. G. 1982. Ethnicity and ethnic groups in America: the view from Harvard. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 5:1-22
- Smith, T. W. 1980. Ethnic measurement and identification. *Ethnicity* 7:78-95
- Smith, T. W. Feb. 1982. *Problems in Ethnic Measurement: Over-, Under-, and Misidentification*. Chicago: GSS Tech. Rep. No. 29
- Smock, D. R., Smock, A. C. 1975. *The Politics of Pluralism: A Comparative Study of Lebanon and Ghana*. New York: Elsevier
- Smootha, S. 1978. *Israel: Pluralism and Conflict*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Spangler, E., Gordon, M. A., Pipkin, R. M. 1978. Token women: an empirical test of Kanter's hypothesis. *Am. J. Sociol.* 84:160-70
- Stein, H. F., Hill, R. F. 1977. *The Ethnic Imperative: Examining the New White Ethnic Movement*. University Park: Pa. State Univ. Press

- Steinberg, S. 1981. *The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America*. New York: Atheneum
- Stone, J., issue ed. 1979. Internal colonialism. *Ethn. & Racial Stud.* 2(3):whole issue
- Stone, J., ed. 1977. *Race, Ethnicity, and Social Change*. North Scituate, Mass: Duxbury
- Stouffer, S. A., et al. 1949. *The American Soldier*. 2 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Stryker, R. 1981. Religio-ethnic effects on attainments in the early career. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 46:212-31
- Stuckert, R. P. 1976. 'Race' mixture: the Black ancestry of White Americans. In *Physical Anthropology and Archaeology*, ed. P. B. Hammond, pp. 135-39. New York: Macmillan
- Suhrke, A., Noble, L. G., eds. 1977. *Ethnic Conflict in International Relations*. New York: Praeger
- Suttles, G. D. 1968. *The Social Order of the Slum: Ethnicity and Territory in the Inner City*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Szymanski, A. 1976. Racial discrimination and White gain. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 41(3):403-14
- Tajfel, H. 1982. Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Ann. Rev. Psychol.* 33:1-39
- Talbot, S. 1982. The Vietnamese front—in America. *The Nation* (Dec. 11):618-20
- Taylor, M. C., Walsh, E. J. 1979. Explanations of Black self-esteem: some empirical tests. *Soc. Psychol. Q.* 42(3):242-53
- Taylor, R. L. 1979. Black ethnicity and the persistence of ethnogenesis. *Am. J. Sociol.* 84(6):1401-23
- Thernstrom, S., ed. 1980. *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press
- Thompson, J. L. P. 1983. The plural society approach to class and ethnic political mobilization. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 6:127-53
- Tilly, C. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley
- Tomasi, S. M., ed. 1977. *Perspectives in Italian Immigration and Ethnicity*. New York: Cent. Migration Stud.
- Turner, J. H., Singleton, R. Jr. 1978. A theory of ethnic oppression: toward a reintegration of cultural and structural concepts in ethnic relations theory. *Soc. Forc.* 56(4):1001-18
- US Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. April 1983. *1980 Census of Population: Ancestry of the Population by State: 1980*. Suppl. Rep. PC80-S1-10. Washington, DC: USGPO
- van den Berghe, P. L. 1983. Class, race and ethnicity in Africa. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 6:221-36
- van den Berghe, P. L. 1981. *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. New York: Elsevier
- Waxman, C. I. 1977. *The Stigma of Poverty: A Critique of Poverty Theories and Policies*. New York: Pergamon
- Weber, M. 1968. *Economy and Society*, Vol. 1, ed. G. Roth, C. Wittich. New York: Bedminster
- Weiner, M. 1978. *Sons of the Soil: Migration and Ethnic Conflict in India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Williams, C. 1982. Social mobilization and nationalism in multicultural societies. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 5:349-65
- Williams, R. M. Jr. 1978. Competing models of multiethnic and multiracial societies: an appraisal of possibilities. In *Major Social Issues: A Multidisciplinary View*, ed. J. M. Yinger, S. J. Cutler, pp. 50-65. New York: Free
- Williams, R. M. Jr. 1975. Race and ethnic relations. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 1:125-64
- Wilson, W. J. 1980. *The Declining Significance of Race*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 2nd ed.
- Wolf, E. R. 1982. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Woodrum, E. 1981. An assessment of Japanese American assimilation, pluralism and subordination. *Am. J. Sociol.* 87:157-69
- Yancey, W. L., Ericksen, E. P., Juliani, R. N. 1979. Emergent ethnicity: a review and reformulation. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 41:391-402
- Yinger, J. M. 1985. Assimilation in the United States: with particular reference to Mexican Americans. In *Mexican Americans in Comparative Perspective*, ed. W. Connor. Washington, DC: Urban Inst. In press
- Yinger, J. M. 1983. Ethnicity and social change: the interaction of structural, cultural, and personality factors. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 6:395-409
- Yinger, J. M. 1981. Toward a theory of assimilation and dissimulation. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 4:249-64
- Yinger, J. M. 1976. Ethnicity in complex societies. In *The Uses of Controversy in Sociology*, ed. L. A. Coser, O. N. Larsen, pp. 197-216. New York: Free
- Yinger, J. M., Simpson, G. E. 1978. The integration of Americans of Indian descent. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 436:137-51
- Young, C. 1982. Patterns of social conflict: state, class, and ethnicity. *Daedalus* 111(2):71-98
- Young, C. 1976. *The Politics of Cultural Pluralism*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press
- Young, W. L. 1982. *Minorities and the Military: A Cross-National Study in World Perspective*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood
- Zald, M. N., McCarthy, J. D., eds. 1979. *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics*. Cambridge, Mass: Winthrop