

regarding the sequence in which to add it.

Until that fantasy is realized, the readers can perhaps profit most from those contributions written from the cross-cultural, rather than the ethnically specific, perspective. Realistically, the therapist is always immersed in a matrix of cross-cultural definition: one client is Asian, elderly, urban, female, and Catholic, while the next may be a young, rural, Anglo male married to a Chicana with a higher educational level than he has attained. How and where does the therapist in training learn to weigh the relative impact of these identity components? For which clients does gender, or age, or degree of disability form more salient identity than ethnicity?

While supplementary training workshops are one current response to the need for training in this area, several of the authors advocate the establishment of regional cross-cultural training centers as a more stable long-range solution. The major drawback to their proposal would be the temptation for educational institutions to deny their own responsibility for reform, essentially "farming out" that portion of the training program to specialized centers in areas of ethnic group concentration. Most educational institutions would then have minimum involvement in devising solutions to issues of ethnic group dissatisfaction with service provision, and would be denied the insights that result from considering the commonalities and differences of specific client populations.

A serious review of the goals of a truly American psychology, integrating an "empirical knowledge base . . . rooted in the social reality of a variety of individuals and groups" (70) is clearly in order. The authors advocate persuasively for the training of nonracist practitioners, and here they provide a needed stimulus for continued commitment to the changes necessary to realization of this crucial objective.

— Linda M. C. Abbott  
California School of  
Professional Psychology, Fresno

**Dino Cinel. *From Italy to San Francisco: The Immigrant Experience.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982) viii, 347 pp., \$25.00.**

Examination of Dino Cinel's *From Italy to San Francisco* will take the watchful coordination of both eyes. His introductory chapter draws one eye to clear professional "social history," supported by an extensive bibliography, dominated by Italian sources including official provincial

and national records and punctuated by a comprehensive bibliographical essay. The other eye is painfully drawn to some questionable scholarship.

"This study in Social History deals with the change and continuity in the lives of Italians who immigrated to the United States" (1). A focus on "returnees" and questions about their "effect . . . on their native land after returning" and "how . . . returnees [were] changed by American society" aptly manages the key to "The Immigrant Experience" (1). Book jacket diplomacy leads a reader to believe the study will make direct use of the "2,000 family sample" and anecdotes and interviews with "three generations of Italian families," but his study is not in any way a personal study of families in San Francisco or Italy. It is a discussion of campanilismo, ethnic rivalry, assimilation, and the effects of immigration on families as told through a wide variety of statistics. Also, a presumptuous attempt to reflect upon historical immigration scholarship permeates the work, aiding the author's own conclusions.

Cinel's statistics favor northern Italian fidelity, family closeness, literacy, and economic conditions. Liguria, Tuscany, Calabria, and Sicily represent north and south as "almost half" of San Francisco's Italians originated from these regions. Exclusively ignored by Cinel is Campania, which delivered 26% of America's Italians. The lack of any disclaimer about this absence creates questions about his corollary statements. Eighty-five percent of northern Italians were directed to the Western United States. San Francisco was never 20% southern Italians. This foundation, though professionally rationalized, makes his conclusions, especially about southern Italians, ethereal.

His work's bias shows in this quote: "Family problems in San Francisco had to be attributed to the corrupting influence of America, but in reality family life was far from idyllic in Italy, especially in the south" (195). Cinel's conclusions come from cumulative records indicating infidelity of wives in regions of high emigration. Can we blame today's fidelity norms on historical immigration stress as well? Further he says, "In the South the constant competition to secure the best land available affected family relations, especially between fathers and sons since southern children never remained with their parents after marriage" (177). This fact is simply logical since southern families lived three persons to one room. Cinel resorts to elaborate contrivance to ignore this simplicity.

Sicilian latecomers rivaled northerners for jobs with northern-born employers, but Cinel attributes this to campanilismo ignoring the explicit implications of class and racial discrimination. About Edna Dessary's statement, "Northerners are capable of great progress in the social organization of a modern society," he says, "Notwithstanding the discredited racial assumptions of her study, northerners were indeed likely to have more exposure than southerners to the urban industrial world" (116).

Unfortunately Cinel's work is an example of how Scientific Racism can infect modern scholarship with ancient prejudices retarding us into the 19th century. According to William De Marco, *Ethnics and Enclaves* (Ann Arbor: UMI Press, 1980), "prejudices [between north and south] were deeply rooted and often bore racial overtones" (1). Dino Cinel recognized this, but has failed to remove the enigma from his research.

—Jay Avellino  
Iowa State University

**David Cook and Michael Okenimkpe. *Ngugi wa Thiong'O: An Exploration of His Writings*. (Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc., 1983) 250 pp., \$11.50.**

The two professors of English at Nigerian universities who jointly prepared this small book did three things well. They produced an excellent critical study of Ngugi's writings, amply footnoted and indexed; they presented interesting facts about the Kenyan author's life, and they included enough information to let the works speak for themselves for and about Africa—a welcome change from non-African interpretations.

Ngugi's four novels tell much about the social and political change in his country and about the changes the writer underwent as well. Born in the so-called "White Highlands," he studied British literature at Uganda's Makerere University and at Leeds where he began writing his first novel, *The River Between*. This novel is set in colonial times when tribal customs were still intact, but when Kenyan society was at a crossroads. His next novel, *Weep Not, Child*, deals in part with the Mau Mau. *A Grain of Wheat* "centres on the struggle to free men's minds from the constraints of colonialism" and is a "passionate examination of heroism and treachery." A fourth novel, *Petals of Blood*, is his first one about independent Kenya and makes outright denunciation of capitalist practices through his leading characters. "The savageness of the attack [upon social injustice and calculated corruption] brings 'A Modest Proposal' to mind."

As chairman of Nairobi University's English Department, Ngugi suggested that the department be abolished and that a Department of African Literature and Languages be set up in its place. "We reject the primacy of English literature and culture," he stated. "We must in fact wholly Africanize and socialize our political and economic life."

Cook and Okenimkpe write: "It is significant that one of the subtlest