with a very rich collection of hundreds of illustrations and images. It helps us to psychologically, historically, and politically understand the conflict between Whites and Blacks and to perceptually and artistically understand how many Westerners have stereotyped and distorted Africa and Blacks in Western popular and powerful cultures. These distortions and negative images/stereotypes, to a great extent, reflect the ethnic conflict between dominant and dominated groups.

Yueh-Ting Lee
Westfield State College


This book should appeal to a wide audience. It should be useful to researchers interested in the politics of race, culture, and class as well as researchers interested in the “new” urban sociology. Portes and Stepick develop a political economy analysis of the recent transformation of Miami into a Cuban American dominated city, using a variety of research methodologies which emphasize the unique historical development of Miami in an ethnic multicultural context.

Relying on a wide variety of data sources such as panel survey data of Haitian and Cuban refugees, personal interviews, census data, and newspaper accounts, the authors probe the development of Miami’s multiethnic community by examining the racial, political, and economic conflict between Cuban, Anglo, African American, Haitian, and Nicaraguan communities.

There are many strong attributes to this book. The book is very well crafted and beautifully written. However, the greatest strength of this book may lie in its theoretical contributions to urban sociology. The authors address the perennial themes of urban sociologists such as: Who rules? How can elites be made more accountable? What explains the plight of ethnic minorities? How can conflict be resolved? What is most interesting about this study is that past theories of urban development which focus on community power (Hunter, Wright, Mills), locals and cosmopolitans (Mills), and ethnicity and assimilation (Warner and Srole, Glazer, Moynihan, and Greeley), do not adequately explain the development of Miami.

In fact, the city of Miami does not resemble in the slightest the model of urban development depicted in studies of Chicago, Atlanta, New Haven, Boston, New York, or any other major U.S. city. For example, while the “business class” does exercise control in governing Miami, it is composed of recent immigrants, rather than
exclusively “old” families or corporate “branch” executives. This is particularly true in the case of the “growth machine” created by foreign-born builders and developers.

A second example of how urban development of Miami differs from other cities lies in the clash between local and outside corporate control. While this clash exists in Miami, proliferating local small businesses are owned mostly by immigrants, while the corporate “branch” offices are American-owned. Many of the latter are there not to produce goods for the domestic market but rather to sell services to other foreigners, often through the mediation of the local immigrant-owned firms.

Another unique difference in Miami is that the overlap of parallel social systems in the same physical space has given rise to what the authors describe as “acculturation in reverse” — a process by which foreign customs, institutions and language are diffused within the native population. As a consequence, biculturalism has emerged as an alternative adaptive strategy to full assimilation into American culture. Opponents of biculturalism, immigrants and natives alike, must either withdraw into their own circles or exit the community.

In conclusion, this book presents a fresh approach to understanding racial and ethnic conflict that may well play itself out in many urban cities on the edge of the future.

Manuel Avalos
Arizona State University West


Those who have read Racial Formation in the United States (1986) by Michael Omi and Howard Winant will find in E. San Juan, Jr.’s book an interesting, if not provocative, complement. Both books assert the centrality of race and racism in the social formation of the United States; however, Omi and Winant’s book is grounded in social science whereas San Juan, Jr.’s project is from a literary perspective.

Appropriately enough, the first chapter of the book focuses on race and literary theory. San Juan, Jr. acknowledges some of the reforms in the canon that have resulted in the inclusion of literary works by people of color. However, he thinks that while such efforts may have enlarged the parameters of the discipline, they have not been deepened enough. He sees, moreover, a certain contradiction in
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