

**Jill Norgren and Serena Nanda. *American Cultural Pluralism and the Law*. (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1988) 254 pp., \$45.00; \$16.95 paper.**

The authors' stated purpose for creation of this book was that no work could be found which was appropriate for undergraduate students in an interdisciplinary course which related legal issues in case law to cultural pluralism. The authors stated that they desired to create "a book of readings drawing primarily on case law, but also including a wide variety of social science and humanitarian materials... [with added] text which described and analyzed the content of these cases." The authors were very successful in this endeavor, in that they have put together an excellent compilation of cases which give a broad and varied overview of the legal precedents related to the concept of cultural pluralism.

The authors present an outstanding portrayal of the legal situations in which immigrant and other non-dominant group members find themselves presently and have found themselves historically. The organization of each of the sections of the book is very logical and assists the reader in appreciating the development of case law over decades of development. The book accurately describes the painful course taken by some groups in the move "from Brooklyn to Manhattan."

One of the more outstanding features of the book is the inclusion of very diverse groups. The book does not limit itself, as many works tend to do, only to the more visible minorities, but includes case law pertaining to religious minorities such as the Amish and Jehovah Witnesses as well. A plethora of groups, subdivided as racial, cultural, sexual and religious, are included. This broad view allows the reader to analyze contrasts and similarities in the legal perspectives of the different types of groups. In a very appropriate manner both majority and minority opinions from the major cases are cited and receive commentary as to major points of contrast.

As a final note, the work points out a particularly noteworthy contrast in the aims of the different groups, in that some (the Amish, in particular) have striven to remain outside the cultural mainstream to maintain their cultural autonomy, while other groups (such as women and homosexuals) have used the courts to be permitted to enter the mainstream. The difference in perspective was outstandingly portrayed.

—Glen M. Kraig

California State University, San Bernardino