

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

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

—Homer D.C. Garcia
The Claremont Colleges

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

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

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

affirmative action plans; four case studies, each of which represent one of the four broad categories of institutions of higher education in the United States of America, *viz.* the major state university (Florida State University); the major private research university (Harvard University); a small private liberal arts college (Oberlin College); and the community college (Merritt College); and four appendices which represent an exceptional or rare treatment for any such work since it allows for the readers to get a comprehensive and objective view of the realities of the position of affirmative action without having to consult several supplementary sources outside the study.

The authors admit readily that any attempt at constructing and implementing an affirmative action plan, defined as "a preventive procedure designed to minimize the probability of discrimination" (5), will inevitably be met with a great deal of misunderstanding and, consequently, severe negative reactions. In an effort to aid in the circumvention of such abortive acts and to avoid the miscarriage of justice and fairness, the architects of this study view their accomplishments in this literary piece as polemical. Their support for affirmative action is expressed in a dual manner. First, they see their primary task as a contribution to "clarifying the concept of affirmative action embodied in Executive Order 11246, issued by President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1965" (5). Second, the study is intended to evaluate the effectiveness of implementing regulations concerning that Executive Order, especially as they relate to institutions of higher education and more specifically, as those regulations account for the change in the visible presence of black faculty members in those institutions. With respect to the former, one may conclude that not only is the task *fait accompli*, but that it is a superb and remarkably well-executed literary and scholarly piece of research. The latter, unfortunately, poses some problems which are bound to arise whenever the issue of affirmative action is raised.

The problem with that issue arises from two pertinent questions. On the one hand, one is bombarded with a seemingly simple question—why affirmative action? On the other hand, assuming that that question is answered positively, then—how does one avert the dangers of applying "quotas", and hence run the risk of being accused of "reverse discrimination"? The authors do not stop at a simplistic answer that affirmative action is to be seen as "a peaceful strategy for making the transition to a fair and equitable society (especially for those who have been disenfranchised socially, politically and economically)" (4), but they argue that affirmative action is deemed necessary if validity is to be attached to constitutional rights. Furthermore, they make a water-tight case for the government's assumption of a leadership role in the process service: "philosophically, the government's basic obligation as guarantor of the social contract and the right of all citizens is to take necessary actions to carry out the obligation" (10).

With respect to "quotas" and "reverse discrimination," the story is somewhat different. Running the risk of engaging in a semantic discussion, the authors muster the support of several key personalities in their contention that the *modus operandi* of affirmative action plans does not imply the formulation of quotas, but of goals. The arguments are not convincing, however, and the epitome of that dilemma is evident in their citing of Attorney General Griffin Bell's attempt at a subtle distinction that "a goal is something you do to alleviate past discrimination and looks to the day when the merit system operates. A quota is a fixed position" (87). While the authors advisedly point out that quotas are illegal, they hasten to suggest that quotas are an integral part of goals and may be of extreme importance in the "motivation of an institution" towards fulfillment of their affirmative action goals. The argument either breaks down or undergoes a process of compromise when the authors acknowledge that "a quota system would undoubtedly produce an outcry from the academic institutions. Nonetheless, such a procedure may be required in order to erase the legacy of racism within a reasonable period of time, in view of the projected slack demand, and thus, new temporary guidelines might be required" (262). This, however, may be the harsh reality of affirmative action: "The success of any affirmative action program depends upon individual minority group members and the extent to which they are able to take advantage of opportunities" (12).

This study is extremely important and the subject deserves thorough analysis and serious attention at this time when the ugly head of opposition to affirmative action plans has again arisen. It is comprehensive in terms of the legal battles that have transpired over the years and has sought to wrestle realistically with the gut-level issues which are still the focus of heated debates.

— P. Rudy Mattai
Lane College

Jack D. Forbes. *Native Americans and Nixon: Presidential Politics and Minority Self-Determination 1969-1972*. (Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center, University of California, 1981) 148 pp., \$12.00.

In *Native Americans and Nixon*, Jack D. Forbes, author of several monographs on the Indian in America's past, has undertaken an