alien world.” Does one become more ethnic the further one gets from northern European Protestantism? Then what do we do with the Anglo American as an ethnic group? Caroline Dillman begs the question of ethnicity when she puts forth the Southern woman as an ethnic American: black men were lynched for her! Arguments like this make a mockery of the ethnicity, the otherness, of people not white. Ethnicity then becomes meaningless as a distinguishing factor. Who is the mainstream American if Southerners are ethnic, all those Polish and Italian Americans up north? Regionalism could more clearly define the experience of the Southern white woman than ethnicity. Edith Blicksilver might consider addressing the definition of ethnicity in a future edition of this fine volume.

The new material is clearly integrated into the original version. One story in the new edition, “My Mother’s House: A Dream Come True,” is a continuation of a tale on page 321. The following new story on page 415, “The Jewish American Princess Untrained for the Stress of Divorce and Single Parenthood,” also has a companion in the first edition. Blicksilver’s categories and themes are continued, and the four critical essays are a welcome and helpful addition. The best of the new material is the short story by Doris Betts, “Beasts of the Southern Wild.” This prizewinning collection will continue to be a major contribution to literature by and about ethnic American women. The editor’s appendices, class discussion questions, and suggested research topics are aids to teaching, but do not intrude for those just wanting a good read.

— Ann Rayson
University of Hawaii


A recurrent theme in the sociological study of racial and ethnic relations is the discipline’s inability to provide a clear and focused research agenda. Scholars in the field are troubled by their inability to agree as to the nature and scope of the discipline, and hence, the lack of an all-encompassing definition for the study of racial and ethnic relations. For example, a continual semantic debate exists over the appropriate usage and application of such concepts as “race” versus “racial” in sociological discourse. The Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations has been developed with this concern in mind.

According to editor E. Ellis Cashmore, the internal debates that characterize the field can be resolved if scholars channel their energies into identifying the central concern of racial and ethnic relations. For Cashmore, the main issue surrounds understanding the formation of social inequality that, in his estimation, is perpetuated by discrimination of subordinate groups by the dominant society. He defines this form of inequality as “institutionalized structured inequality” that is manifested through the various social institutions of power.
Cashmore is convinced that if scholars agree to the central problematic in racial and ethnic relations, then they will work towards resolving it. This, in turn, will provide the discipline with an external focus without spending time and energy on internal debates.

The Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations has been designed as a reference work that seeks to provide clear and concise definitions with which scholars of race relations can begin a fruitful and overdue dialogue. By no means are the entries designed as conclusive definitions, but rather as a collection of principles and definitions that can be modified in order to best explain changing power relations in society. The idea is to offer a more practical and applied approach to race relations with the objective of exposing the external beliefs that underlie the institutionalized structured inequality. The ultimate goal is the development of a knowledge base that will challenge inequality, and ultimately, help destroy it. Cashmore warns that if this does not occur, then we will continue to reproduce an impenetrable and insular academic discipline, which in turn, will limit our ability to develop external solutions towards the eradication of racial and ethnic inequality.

In its second edition, the Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations provides a completely updated text, including recent events, new research findings, and theoretical innovations in the field. For example, a definition for "Rational Choice Theory" and its recent application in the field of race and ethnic relations is provided. The dictionary is cross-referenced, and each entry is appended with reading references for further research. This reviewer appreciates the fact that the dictionary does not minimize divergent theoretical views in the field and provides separate theoretical perspectives when appropriate. For example, the dictionary provides both a sociological and biological definition of race.

A major weakness with the dictionary is that it falls short of providing a complete collection of theoretical paradigms and concepts for the study of racial and ethnic relations. A useful illustration can be found with the recent research interest in the intersection of race, class, and gender that has served to broaden the scope of the discipline. However, in fairness to Cashmore, he is well aware of this problem and accounts for it by developing a dictionary with fluid definitions that can be modified with the changing discipline. Hopefully, the next edition of the dictionary will include a table of contents. This will facilitate its use and make for a more efficient research tool. Nevertheless, this work is an important step in addressing some of the problems and concerns in the field, and an essential reference tool for scholars, practitioners, and teachers of racial and ethnic relations.

— Alberto L. Pulido
University of Utah