

greatly enhanced if CRT scholars made more effort to engage the scholarship of allied disciplines.

On the other hand, it can be said with equal force that law has rarely appeared on the radar screen of the social sciences. Indeed, as Stanford Lyman has shown, leading social theorists from Robert Park to Gunnar Myrdal to Talcott Parsons gave scant attention to the issue of civil rights. Critical race theory goes a long way toward filling this gap, and precisely because it has evolved as a discrete field of inquiry, it offers social scientists an alternative paradigm, replete with critical perspectives on the racial order and promising new constructs and formulations. Perhaps now that critical race theory has reached full flower, there will be more cross-fertilization with the social sciences. Together with a rival volume published in 1995 (by Kimberle Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, et al.), Delgado and Stefancic's anthology provides the medium for bringing critical race theory into the social science canon for the purposes of both scholarship and pedagogy.

To their credit, the editors include excerpts from Randall Kennedy's well-known dissent, "Racial Critiques of Legal Academia." Its inclusion is rhetorically effective because it helps to highlight the issues that lay at the heart of the CRT movement and to bring readers into the controversy that has raged since the inception of critical race studies. It would have been even more effective had the editors included rejoinders to Kennedy's article, along with other selections that illustrate the ongoing debates between "the CRITS" and their critics.

One peevish criticism: most of the selections are excerpted from the original text, but there are no ellipses to indicate this. Granted, ellipses are unsightly and distracting to the reader, but by notifying readers that material has been deleted, they perform an important function. Presumably, the continuing vitality of critical race studies will result in more editions of this volume, and I would urge the editors either to employ ellipses or to otherwise forewarn readers that they are reading redacted material.

Stephen Steinberg
Queens College and Graduate Center,
City University of New York

Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States. By Ronald Schmidt, Sr. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000. xi + 213 pp. Tables, notes, references, and index. \$21.95.

Ronald Schmidt's fine book presents and critiques contending positions in debates over Official English, bilingual education, and other volatile issues involving language differences in the United States. He engages his subject from a variety of theoretical perspectives often missing from much writing on

language policy. Schmidt invokes usefully the literature on nationalism, national identity, ethnicity, equality, and identity politics to explain the volatility of language issues. He demonstrates cogently that political conflicts about language policy are multi-layered conflicts about status, equality, pluralism, assimilation, and, ultimately, national identity. As Schmidt writes, "Because of its own characteristics and potential importance in the constitution of identities (individual, ethnic, national), language has the capacity to engage people's interests and political imaginations on a deeply emotional level" (p. 56). According to Schmidt, the oft-repeated arguments over the empirical merits of alternative language policies stem from more fundamental differences in the conception of national identity. He uses the concept of the "imagined community" to show that conflicts ostensibly about language are better understood as conflicts about the content of our imagined national identity.

Schmidt is unsentimental in his thorough presentations of the arguments of partisans on both sides of these divisive questions. Assimilationists tend to view the acquisition of English and the public abandonment of other languages as a prerequisite for a cognizable American identity. Pluralists, on the other hand, tend to see national identity itself as multi-ethnic and multi-cultural and therefore claim state support for some version of linguistic pluralism. The author usefully identifies significant areas of agreement between assimilationists and pluralists: all agree on the dominance of English and on the need for mastery of English to achieve many of the successes defined within our culture.

Schmidt is equally unsentimental in evaluating the contending arguments. He criticizes assimilationists for their oversentimentalized view of history and immigration, which downplays unresolved legacies of conquest and violent subordination of non-English speaking peoples in the United States. Schmidt criticizes pluralists for their utopian, unrealistic proposals given a racist and undeniably Anglo-dominant context. The most profound differences between assimilationists and pluralists lie in their vastly different conceptions of the identity of the nation:

The conflict between assimilationists and pluralists in relation to U.S. language policy comes down to a fundamental disagreement over the inherent nature of the country itself and its identity as a national polity. What sort of national community are we? Are we an inherently multiethnic and multilingual political community, whose genius and national promise lie in our ability to combine cultural diversity with social equality? Or are we a transethnic, English-speaking nation, whose multilingualism is a transitional and transitory result of our generous and open-armed immigration policy? (p. 178)

Schmidt's response to these language and identity dilemmas is "pluralistic integration," a program of legislative and policy reforms designed to conserve

and develop the country's languages by strengthening the retention of non-English languages while acknowledging the need for mastery of the dominant English language. His proposals are useful but limited. They are vulnerable to the criticisms he makes of unrealistic pluralist proposals.

Schmidt's analysis is insightful and constructively advances the quality of arguments over language policy. One concern with reformulating language policy arguments as arguments between competing visions of the imagined American community is that ultimately the substantive content of our "imagined community" is defined more by power than choice. This is not a criticism of Schmidt's vision, only a caveat that the assimilationist view has been far more powerful than any pluralist view in defining the imagined American community. Although the rhetoric of pluralism has often been employed, it is hard to think of extended periods when the rhetorical promise of pluralism has been realized. With no end in sight, these remain hard political times for pluralists.

Juan F. Perea
University of Florida

World War Two and the American Indian. By Kenneth William Townsend. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico press, 2000. x + 273 pp. Photographs, bibliography, notes, and index. \$35.00.

In 1942, Chickahominy Chief O. Oliver Adkins wrote to the War Department protesting the efforts of Virginia's State Registrar, Walter Ashby Plecker, to categorize Indians as African Americans, thereby forcing them into segregated units during the war. Refusing categorization as "white or black," Chief Adkins promoted another category: "American Indians of the State of Virginia" to embrace tribal sovereignty and cultural identity. Though denied by officials, his efforts, according to Kenneth William Townsend, represented a "forceful new attitude, or spirit, among the native inhabitants to carve their own place in society—apart from whites and blacks" (p. 102).

Stories like this that address race, identity, and self-determination, make Townsend's *World War II and the American Indian* an important contribution to American Indian history. By contextualizing Indian participation in the war within a range of Native experiences from 1930 to 1950, Townsend, from Georgia Coastal University, convincingly argues that, "whether bound for assimilation or retrenchment, World War II was the crossroads for Native Americans, and ultimately, for federal Indian policy" (p. 3). He employs the metaphor of a "crossroads" to investigate different motivations for American Indian support for and resistance to the war. While some enlisted to "resolve an uncertain identity or channel their lives in a new direction," others enlisted out of tribal