

Introduction: Assimilation and the Model Minority Ideology

Eric Mark Kramer

The point of this book is to bring together experts from a variety of "minority" backgrounds and from around the world to give their learned and unique perspectives on the most pervasive ideology today, which is assimilation on a global scale. The basic premise of this book is that both a developed *country* and a developed *market* are different from a developed *community*. They need not be mutually exclusive, but neither is it assumed that they are necessarily consonant. Increasingly, even the behavioral sciences are reducing all human behavior to simple material exchange, evaluations of human behavior solely in terms of utilitarian "skills," such as "flexibility" and technical expertise. Thus we have the domination of a new morality put forth by bourgeois positivism.

This book presents thirteen original chapters written specifically for this project. Each one offers answers to several questions, including what it means to become a "global citizen" and what it means to be a "model minority" in a global economy. Another issue is whether forced compliance in the name of reducing uncertainty really makes a person happier, more well adjusted, balanced, or evolved. The process of becoming a "mainstream person" involves first being marginalized with the implication that something is inadequate about one's attitude, cognitive competence, and/or behavior. The process of assimilation is manifested as various forms of enforced and/or rewarded acculturation. With the vast human migration from the agrarian world to the urban world that is currently under way, the notion of assimilation has become a global phenomenon. What is occurring is a global shift from village milieu to city lifestyle. This migration is a polycentric and global phenomenon whereby the "promised land" is nowhere in particular; instead it is a way of life and a mindset—an urban lifestyle. This process is far more than a simple change in geography. Moving from the village to

the cityscape involves a mutation in worldview and self-identity. Additional issues these authors address involve the persuasive assumptions that lead the world in this direction and what might be lost in the process.

For tens of thousands of years humans organized their lives according to the pacing, obligations, and expectations of the Mesolithic hamlet. From the point of view of globalism, the village is a narrow experience functioning to retard the personal, economic, and intellectual development of its inhabitants. But we ask whether it is accurate to refer to the village lifestyle in such evaluative and impoverished terms. Does not this way of life, which has sustained the species for countless generations, have anything of value to offer the future beyond its very existence and ability to conceive (language)? Today, traditional communities and their ways of living are vanishing overnight. The benevolent claim that wealthy nations should not turn their backs on the rest and leave them poor and ignorant is not an anachronistic attitude but a driving motive in the neo-colonial justification for globalism.

It is argued by many of the authors in this volume that the urbanizing process involves an entirely new set of values, desires, and expectations from what has been known before and still is known today for millions of humans in less developed communities. Beneath the overarching appeal of becoming cosmopolitan is the threat of being left behind, having no competitive edge and, literally, no future.

Many publications couch this faith in a neopositivistic rhetoric, which erroneously conjoins cognitive learning theory with development political economics and evolution theory. The dominant ideology of cultural/economic adaptation, which reaches from global sociocultural and economic restructuring to the level of reorganizing the cognitive architecture, the very way of thinking of individuals (their mindset) presents itself as an inevitable and natural course of progress for the human species. The moral ideology of progress is widely used to justify the universal value of assimilation both within and among nations. A keystone concept in the justification of benevolent assimilationism is the notion of the model minority, which will be assessed in this collection. This is often stated in terms of being "forward looking," "flexible," and "adaptable." The model minority is basically one who willingly struggles to get in line for the operation of being cognitively, emotionally, and behaviorally reorganized, in hopes of being accepted and rewarded by the system.

Unlike many other books (referenced later) that critique globalism in highly abstract terms, such as macroeconomics, geopolitics, or cultural studies, this volume takes a close look at what it is to be a model minority at the level of personal experience.

THE GLOBAL PERSON

At the turn of the twenty-first century there are profound forces working overtly and covertly to create the so-called global village and the transcultural

person, or global citizen. In the interest of global efficiencies, cultural mainstreaming and convergence are self-accelerating; great efforts are under way to universalize uniform business law, management feedback and control, communications interconnectivity, and so forth, to facilitate cultural and economic homogenization. The Western model of infrastructure, however, is not merely a tool for expansion. It presumes a set of values, expectations, motives, and definitions that are foreign to much of the rest of the world's population. In the process, thousands of linguistic communities and local cultures are becoming extinct. Rising expectations and a sense of inadequacy are proliferating across the globe. The promise of a new global world leads many to the inevitable conclusion that their own cultures are bastions of ignorance, irrationality, and inferiority. To move "ahead," one must abandon the ways of one's own culture and one's own personal way of thinking, escape parochial subjectivity, and become objective and rational. To be rational and developed, a person should become objective in their self-evaluation. But of course a set of criteria (values) is implied in that process of self-criticism. One's parents and grandparents—indeed all of one's tradition—come to be seen as foolish and immature. Culture itself, insofar as it is embodied and localizable, comes under attack by cosmopolitan transcending truth and beauty. Thus many argue that progress can occur only to the extent that a less developed person abandon his or her traditional self. Rising expectations and the felt need to "grow," "learn," and "evolve" work at the level of individual self-esteem, ambition, ethics, spirituality, and identity.

The overarching concern taken up in this collection is the issue of the shrinking variety of meanings, values, expectations, motives, and ways of living. The central and shared theme of all the authors herein is the possibility that what is emerging is a monoculture, a global city. Not only is urbanization around the world increasingly driven by the same dreams and motives and manifesting the same outcomes, but the city metaphor leads to a very different set of evaluative criteria than the village metaphor. The very notion of what is a moral and successful human being is being universally urbanized. In this volume, the case is made from various perspectives that a global city (rather than a global village culture) is emerging with profoundly different consequences for human beings, not just systems. Although there is an overwhelming number of books celebrating the various technical, economic, political, and moral advantages of global connectivity and cosmopolitanism, this collection takes up a different side of this momentous process. We examine the loss of localism, concerns about sovereignty (including that of self-identity and self-definition), and the moral assumption that a single ideal path of progress to the right future is known and is of equal value to all. Six questions guide all the authors. They are:

1. What are "developing peoples" expected to develop into?
2. How may this global process be based on a false set of utopian assumptions?
3. How are persistent and resistant groups viewed by the dominant ideology of positive assimilation?

4. How do resistant peoples endure?
5. What kinds of pressures are coming to bear on resistant peoples to encourage them to change?
6. If identity and meaning depend on difference, then is it not important for us all to protect cultural diversity?

In short, in daily life, what does it mean to be developing, to be normal, abled, fit, an in-group member? Assumptions and conceptual entanglements are explored. For instance, in much literature growth, learning, integration, adaptation, evolution, satisfaction, and progress are confused or used interchangeably without rigorous definition. Much literature harbors a strong ethnocentric bias in favor of ideological positivism in the style expressed by the St. Simonians and neo-Hegelians.

RESEARCH AGENDA

The issue of globalism and diversity spans several academic fields, including sociology, psychology, anthropology, communications, development studies, geography, international studies, and the literature of minorities. What is presented herein is a brief overview of the major themes now drawing enormous attention.

There are many books entirely dedicated to single groups. Examples include: Laotian refugees in the United States (Foot, 1990; Haines, 1988), Lithuanians in Chicago (Van Reenan, 1990), Finns in Minnesota (Jarvenpa, 1992), Chinese in Canada (Tian, 1999), whites in Hawaii (Whittaker, 1986), Senegalese in Italy (Carter, 1997), Soviet children in Israel (Horowitz, 1986), and so forth. There are also many books dedicated to single approaches and levels of analysis, such as adaptation (Ng, 1998), adjustment (Sung, 1987), postcolonialism (Hoogvelt, 1997; Juan, 2000; Narayan & Harding, 2000), resistance (Haig-Brown, 1988; Spring, 2000), accommodation (Jo, 1999; Zia, 2000), preservation (Flinn, 1992), assimilation (Axtell, 1986; Bacon, 1996; Gordon, 1964; Miller, 1984; Silverstein, 1995), the politics of tolerance (Bartolome & Macedo, 2000), multiculturalism (Aguero, 1993; Barnhill, 1999; Lester, 1995; Nieto, 2000), globalizing threats to democratic comportment (Barsamian, 1992; Bowden & Chomsky, 1998; Chomsky, 1979; Cox & Sinclair, 1996; Greider, 1997; Held, 1996; Storper, 1997; Strange, 1996), and international trade and economics (Ambrose, 1997; Dunkley, 2000; Viotti & Kauppi, 1998).

There are many books singly dedicated to specific contexts like immigrant children in schools (Gibson, 1998; Giroux, 1993; Gutek, 1996; Miyares, 1998; Tucker, 1998; Zhou & Bankston, 1998), crossing religious boundaries (Fenton, 1988; Widder, 1999), multicultural counseling (Battle, 1997; Paniagua, 1997; Parker, 1998), constructing gender across cultures (Julia, 1999), Native American experiences (Fenelon, 1998; Kroeber, 1994), cultural extermination (Dia-

mond, 1997; Gheerbrant, 1992; Margolis, 1992; O'Connor, 1998), multicultural and cross-cultural management (Seelye et al., 1996), and so on.

In this volume we illustrate how many concepts and processes (such as multiculturalism, diversity, assimilation, globalism, aboriginal resistance, and so forth) are interrelated. This collection offers a multiplicity of views on these themes. The following essays offer actual as well as theoretical illustrations of these centralizing processes. Readers will also find a selected bibliography of the most important works about the increasingly global reach of assimilationism and the idea of being a model minority as an ideology promoting the dissolution of diversity and the consequence of self-hatred. We want to show how assimilationism has moved beyond colonial nation-building to a global phenomenon. We illustrate how quite diverse groups, such as the disabled and Ainu in Japan and Native Americans in the United States, are resisting being either defined by dominant interests or being encouraged to integrate and disappear.

In Chapter One, "*Gaiatsu* and Cultural Judo," Eric Mark Kramer draws on the rich literary voices of Meiji and post-Meiji Japan to demonstrate how assimilation and adaptation to Westernization pose a profound—and in many instances excruciating—choice to modernizing nations. The fundamental question is whether an individual or a nation must give up their tradition to modernize; if the answer is yes, then the primary issue becomes what that decision means.

Chapter Two, "The Hidden Justification for Assimilation, Multiculturalism, and the Prospects for Democracy," by John W. Murphy and Luigi Esposito, exposes the primary arguments and philosophical assumptions used to justify assimilationism. If these presuppositions are not understood, changes in governmental policy may not have much impact on how minorities are treated. Specifically, current approaches to social integration are based on a very conservative view of social order. Moreover, this imagery requires that cultural differences be sacrificed to preserve social harmony. Multiculturalists, on the other hand, have abandoned this general approach to sociological theory; thus they have set the stage for cultural differences to be appreciated and embraced. The new social imagery advanced by advocates of multiculturalism allows the proliferation of cultural differences to be viewed as compatible with order. In this regard, multiculturalists support a far-reaching strategy for democratizing culture and order. Murphy and Esposito discuss the consequences for a democratic ideal of authentic alternatives in the face of powerful and singular solutions to personal and social problems. They address the assumption that there is one best order, one rationality that demands implementation as a natural course of progress.

Chapter Three, "Adopting the Caucasian 'Look': Reorganizing the Minority Face," by Masako Isa and Eric Mark Kramer, explores the proposition that ideology is more than skin deep. They explore how the Caucasian phenotype is promoted around the globe as the ideal model of beauty. This chapter considers

the process of convergent thinking about what beauty is and its value, specifically in Japan. The chapter also explores the consequence of this hegemonic force by observing that the cosmetic industry (including cosmetic reconstructive surgery) around the globe never promises to make people look more African or Asian but always (so far as this research shows) to look more white European. This dissatisfaction with one's own face as inadequate, often even ugly and/or "primitive," is presented as a manifestation of the attempt to assimilate to a singular image of beauty, an attempt that presupposes a sense of dissatisfaction and even, in some cases, self-hatred.

In Chapter Four, "The Violence of Assimilation and Psychological Well-Being," by Chi-Ah Chun and Jung Min Choi, the central argument is that equality cannot be gained as long as minorities accept and work within the framework of the assimilation perspective. Due to its dualistic philosophy, the assimilation perspective does not allow for egalitarian relations to ensue. The assimilation perspective hinders minorities from understanding properly the nature of oppression. To be sure, the assimilationist perspective is grounded on inherent hierarchy and symbolic violence. Assimilation is a promise built on a dubious foundation that presupposes cultural supremacy and domination. Assimilation is accompanied by the loss of tradition, community, and (possibly most important) self-respect. Obviously, within this framework, a person's well-being is threatened. Indeed, to organize an egalitarian society, the assimilation perspective must be dismantled. Specific research conducted with Asian American women in California regarding their effort to fit into mainstream expectations of beauty by turning to cosmetic surgery is presented in this chapter.

In "The Ainu: A Discourse on Being Japanese," by Masazumi Maruyama, the effort of the Ainu in Japan to survive ethnic and cultural extermination is discussed. Japan is a relatively homogeneous country, but its purity is often overstated by both Japanese and foreign observers of Japan. The Ainu constitute one of the minority groups in Japan, along with Korean Japanese and *Ryuku* people (those in Okinawa). Due to their relatively few numbers, minority groups in Japan have tended to be overlooked both in social reality (e.g., discrimination) and in academic attention. This chapter redresses this oversight of minorities in Japan generally and of the Ainu in particular. Several aspects of the Ainu's struggle to survive will be described to shed light on what it is like to be a minority in general and in Japan in particular. This chapter especially focuses on the interplay between national identity and ethnicity (or diversity) in the modern nation-state system. In doing so, this chapter examines (1) how the identity of the Ainu was created; (2) why the "Japanese" felt the need to incorporate or assimilate the Ainu people into Japan; (3) how the Ainu have struggled against discrimination by the Japanese and to redefine their identity in their own terms; and finally (4) how we should reconceptualize the key concepts of nation, ethnicity, and the relationship between them. Commentary about the value of preserving diversity in postmodern Japan will serve as a conclusion to this chapter.

Chapter Six, "Headache and Heartbreak: The Elusiveness of 'Model Minority' Status Attainment for African Americans," was written by Lonnie Johnson Jr. and Charlton D. McIlwain. In this chapter the authors discuss the model minority ideology, how it was manifested in the past, and how it is currently used in American society to mandate conformity among groups of people who by definition are seen as inferior to the dominant Eurocentric ideal. This ideology promotes self-hatred, the disintegration of individual identity, and the adoption of a new identity prescribed by dominant social forces. The model minority ideal is propagated through kin ideologies of assimilation and cultural adaptation. However, in this pursuit, few if any have managed to cross the finish line. Few black Americans have attained that status in which one's life and social actions are completely satisfactory to dominant white society, providing for a place of acceptability among whites and a state of psychological well-being for minority individuals. This is the case principally because there is no clear model. Those who have begun on this quest find that they are indeed chasing a ghost, a figment of the imagination. This chapter seeks to reveal the elusiveness of model minority status by demonstrating how the model contradicts itself and debunks its own definitional and ideological foundations. Finally, Johnson and McIlwain critique how the ideology of the model minority manifests itself in black culture in the notion of racial authenticity, which dictates whether or not one is really black. It only stands to reason that if dominant society defines the ideal minority, then the reactionary force is for minorities to define the real minority. Essentially, this is another type of ideal. They are the "should be's" of opposing forces attempting to maintain social dominance, whether it be inter- or intraracial dominance. In this bipolar struggle for dominance, to become more ideal is to become less real, and vice versa. Ultimately, definitional attempts toward solidifying racial identity, whether ideal (model minority) or real (racial authenticity), are centered around a game of social dominance and posturing. As such, they are often understood better not by the conceptual logic of definitional issues, but rather by the logic of social survival and dominance.

Chapter Seven, "Being Disabled in Modern Japan: A Minority Perspective," by Miho Iwakuma, presents interviews and observations about the dominant discourse that distorts transparent communication about disability in Japan. Despite the pervasiveness of disability in societies, persons with disabilities (PWDs) remain hidden minorities within most societies, including modern Japan. Communication between "abled" and "disabled" people tends to be awkward and filled with anxiety. Indeed, as with other minorities, stereotypes and prejudices against PWDs feed into this communication distortion between the nondisabled and PWDs. The core of this communication problem stems from the difficulty the disabled have in telling their stories about being disabled. Social etiquette makes the nondisabled feel uncomfortable about discussing the everyday experiences of the disabled. As a result, instead of asking questions directly of PWDs, members of the nondisabled majority rely on minority spokespersons' voices and generate perceptions about minorities from those

few highly selective and managed voices. However, these minority spokespersons attain such a position by being the most successfully adapted and presentable according to nondisabled criteria. For PWDs, the most successful level of adaptation refers to the stage when one no longer feels oneself to be disabled. The issue is how one can, without conscious awareness of being disabled, speak about disability experiences on behalf of others with disabilities. Other minority groups experience a similar dilemma. There is a vicious circle of miscommunication between the majority and the minority. The majority learns from the limited voices of appropriate minority spokespersons, who share experiences more with the majority than with other PWDs. The members of the minority feel a need to change who they really are and adapt to the majority to be heard. But for many, such a change is impossible. This chapter discusses this communication dilemma. It also explores the paradoxical role of minority spokesperson by using the example of PWDs. The author is especially interested in the perspectives of PWDs, such as how PWDs perceive themselves through the eyes of the mass media and of the nondisabled. The research presented includes not only an analysis of mass media coverage of PWDs but also autobiographies of PWDs and interview data obtained in Japan.

Chapter Eight, by Philip Lujan and Karola, is titled "Successful Indians: Benevolent Assimilation and Indian Identity." This essay argues that Native Americans (Indians) have been the targets of perhaps the most concerted, lengthy assimilationist push confronting any ethnicity in the history of the United States. Yet relatively few Native Americans seem to have made it as successes in mainstream American terms (i.e., maintaining a prominent, secure, or financially rewarding job and lifestyle). Those who have may experience pressure from both the Indian and non-Indian communities, thus threatening their ability to maintain positive self-images as Indians. Unlike many studies about Indians, this chapter presents research that does not attempt to define "real" Indianness in either legal or cultural terms. Instead, it takes Indianness as an ascribed identity that is simultaneously posited (by Indians and non-Indians alike) as an achievement. Because Indian identity is posited as achieved, as such it is precarious. This situation is one of the major stresses facing successful Indians, though it is by no means the only one. For example, Indians fit into both collectivist and individualist cultural categories, which may bring pressures to bear on successful Indians trying to maintain familial and tribal ties on one hand, and to assert individuality in a conformist mainstream workplace on the other. This chapter explores the tug at identity and other issues confronting successful Indians through extensive theoretical grounding informed by ethnographic interviews. Interviewees were drawn from both reservation and nonreservation populations, from positions both within and without the Indian world.

In Chapter Nine, "Abandoned People in Japan: The First Generation of Koreans in Japan," by Richiko Ikeda, the struggle by Korean Japanese to be accepted into mainstream Japanese society is presented. It has been said that to be suc-

cessful in Japanese society, Koreans in Japan must either hide their ethnic identity or be naturalized. However, Ikeda presents data that show that to become Japanese legally is not enough to be totally accepted or even to survive in Japan. The assimilation policy the Japanese government has adopted has not diminished discrimination against Koreans; instead, the policy has facilitated it. Koreans in Japan are Others who are created and maintained to make Japanese feel more Japanese. They are a model minority that has been forced to assimilate into the dominant society, but theoretically and practically they cannot assimilate. To integrate properly by the dominant plan, they must remain marginal, for that is their desired function within the larger system of relationships. Thus, to be an ideal minority means for Korean Japanese to be a scapegoat. The model minority ideal in Japan involves assimilating like a robot, not exercising free will, and accepting the normative role they are given, including the dominant expectations that follow. The need for nursing homes for Koreans reveals that older Koreans born and raised in Japan have not adapted to Japanese culture. Younger Koreans display a search for identity, which also proves that they have not assimilated. This chapter describes the present situation of Koreans in Japan and shows how major assimilation/adaptation theories in the social sciences fail to explain the real world of real minorities.

Chapter Ten, "Old and New Worlds," by Algis Mickunas, traces the ways Eastern European immigrants to the United States regard their Old Countries and their new home in terms of utopian imageries and the dystopian disruption of such imageries. The complexity of the issues includes religious, moral, and familial relationships with "outsiders" and the building of ethnic communities. It also involves the preservation of languages. Drawing on several forms of knowledge, Mickunas demonstrates how self-segregating Eastern European communities in the United States suffer from diasporic alienation whereby, despite their dreams, they cannot hang on to the identities they had had in the Old Country while simultaneously being unable to become Americans despite their abilities to thrive economically.

In "Demythologizing the 'Model Minority,'" Eungun Min traces how the perception of Asian Americans in general has evolved in the United States from that of being a reserved and uncivilized people to the dominant model minority image. In the 1960s, the media promoted the model minority theory through stories laden with statistics (e.g., SAT scores) depicting Asian Americans as a homogeneous and exceptionally accomplished and industrious minority group. Initially, Asian Americans enjoyed the flattering image assigned to them by their white evaluators. They were extolled as a model minority who had overcome racism and had successfully integrated themselves into American society. By the late 1960s, however, a greater ethnic consciousness and political activism among the Asian community created a backlash against this image. Underlying the misinterpreted statistical evidence may be the notion of the superiority of Anglo Saxon values. Often, Asian Americans are said to succeed because of their work ethic and because their values are compatible with

Anglo Saxon values. Thus, the model minority theory ultimately serves a purpose. This theory bolsters the much-valued American dream. At a time when minority groups conducted civil unrest and mass political protests, the portrayal of Asian Americans as a successful minority served a need. The myth defended and promoted the very foundations of economic stability more than democracy and an image of egalitarianism not only domestically but internationally.

Ultimately though, as is demonstrated, the prevalence of the model minority theory would later have an immense impact on society. Widespread acceptance of the model minority success story hints at discrimination, an excuse not to undertake the difficult task of reforming U.S. schools to help students understand and value a multicultural society, which the United States has become. The attitude that there is no need to worry about Asian American children because they are doing better than everyone else is divisive and destructive. The reality is that recent immigrants and refugees from Southeast Asia, China, the Philippines, and the Pacific Islands require the same special attention that any member of a cultural minority in America requires. This essay examines: (1) the history of mythologizing Asian Americans as model minorities, (2) various models of the ideal minority, and (3) underlying ideologies of model minority discourses and advocacy. It also suggests an alternative theoretical framework for understanding Asian Americans.

"Asian Indians and the Model Minority Narrative: A Neocolonial System," by Archana J. Bhatt, explores questions of race, equality, and civil rights generally and the issue of Asian Indian attempts to fit into America specifically. Though it has been about three decades since the Civil Rights Act was passed, the underlying and lasting effects of that era and that particular piece of legislation resound throughout today's race politics. One particular element of the civil rights era that continues to attract attention is the notion of minority status, specifically model minority status as a presumed set of criteria for identifying nonwhite yet good citizens. Originally used to identify African Americans who conformed to the dominant social system, *model minority* is a phrase used to identify groups of minorities who live according to the current social guidelines. Currently, most Asian immigrants tend to fall in this category. Model minority is a classic colonial setup in that a few are utilized to control the many. By identifying Asian Americans as model minorities, the conservative right wing manages to create a rift between minority groups within the United States. In a parallel ideological construct to the house slave/field slave scenario, Asian Americans are encouraged to see their lot as one of privileged status, in comparison to the lot of other people of color. They also see themselves as better than their field counterparts. Finally, they consider their status to be a direct result of their skills, their willingness to work, and their ability to perform. They believe that their counterparts lack something that keeps them in the fields. In actuality, the status of house slave versus field slave is solely based on the whims of the master (in this case, the dominant culture/political

powers that be). The status of model minority doesn't sit completely well with all Asian Americans. This chapter focuses on Asian Indian Americans, positing that one reason the Indian American community is so susceptible to the beguilements of the model minority status is because of the status these immigrants held in India. Most Indians in the United States are upper-class, upper-caste Indians who see themselves as socially equal to the members of the dominant culture. Their status in India, although not transferable to the United States, is what defines them, and they use it as a reference point for their place in the race politics of the United States. Indian Americans see themselves as members of higher society in India and thus, by correlation, as members of the high society in the United States. What is lost in the translation is the non-refutable foreignness of Asian Americans. Unlike African Americans and Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans hold a permanent status of foreigner, regardless of length of stay in the United States. Indian Americans also do not recognize that by taking the status offered them by the dominant culture, they accept their place within the power structure, and that place is automatically subservient to those in power. This chapter examines the concept of model minority specifically within the Asian Indian American community. The chapter reviews the historical elements of Asian immigration and the history of the phrase *model minority*. An argument is made regarding the effectiveness and impact of such a system in contemporary U.S. race politics.

Chapter Thirteen, "A World of Cookie-Cutter Faces," by Rachael Rainwater-McClure, Weslynn Reed, and Eric Mark Kramer, explores global trends in cosmetic surgery as empirical evidence of the extreme efforts many thousands of individuals go to in an effort to fit into the emerging aesthetic system. This chapter critiques adaptation ideology and its impact on individuals trying desperately to conform to expectations of what counts as beautiful. It also compares and contrasts fusion theory with cultural adaptation theory, holding each up to the empirical fact of widespread cosmetic surgery as a response to a global sense of forced compliance.

Chapter Fourteen, "Cosmopoly: Occidentalism and the New World Order," by Eric Mark Kramer, presents a critique of various intellectual justifications for absolute cultural conformity on a global scale from Hegel to Spencer and beyond. This chapter empirically challenges the secure and pleasant-sounding ideology of the global village and the claim that the world is a richer and happier place because of globalism.