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it was perceived by both the sending and host societies.

In commenting upon this demographic transition and its neighborhood consequences, Winnick does not fail to mention that the Puerto Rican influx was to a city that was shedding its industrial base and into "... a Sunset Park well past its prime" (p. 94). But to the author, the fate of an urban area is determined by more than the socioeconomic environment within which its residents live their lives and earn their livelihoods. It is "... the product of the character and behavioral propensities of the people who live there. The degree of community's organization or disorganization is determined by individual values and collective systems of belief." Thus, when Sunset Park turned as bad as it did, "... there are all kinds of possible explanations . . . but the critical one involves the behavioral deficits of successive groups of occupants" (pp. 8–10).

Thus, Puerto Ricans must be counted as immigrants who failed. And obviously not just in Sunset Park. Their difficulty in moving ahead economically or in maintaining stable communities has often been described, but the possible sources of their exceptionalism among immigrant groups are little understood. Their position within New York's society is very much like that of native-born blacks, as low men and women on the totem pole. In Winnick's telling, too many Puerto Ricans have become part of an "intractable underclass" (p. xii) though, judged on the basis of what he has written, Winnick seems notably incurious about the reasons for the Puerto Rican predicament or of its possible implications for a model of unsuccessful immigrant adaptation.

On balance, his view is that the social programs set in motion by the Great Society, which self-consciously addressed itself to uplifting the nation's poor, failed to achieve its goals. Worse, they exacerbated the problems of such groups as New York's Puerto Ricans or, by implication native-born blacks (who are virtually absent from Sunset Park).

For Winnick, the downward spiral of New York's economy and social order, so much in evidence in the 1970s, was arrested and even reversed in areas like Sunset Park when the new immigrants arrived in force in the 1980s. A mixed lot, their numbers included Spanish speakers other than Puerto Ricans, many Asians and a smattering of Caribbean blacks, Middle Easterners and southern and Eastern Europeans. Puerto Ricans remain in the area—only non-Hispanic whites continue to exit—but they are supplemented by other more successful immigrants.

The indicia of Sunset Park's rejuvenation are an increase in population, rising property values, bustling commercial strips, and a steep reduction in crimes reported against persons or property. For Winnick, this reversal in fortune owes little if anything to government intervention unless, that is, the latter includes measures encouraging immigration. The new immigrants themselves get ahead because they are market-oriented and the neighborhoods which are fortunate enough to attract them prosper again for the same reason. One doesn't have to read too far between the author's lines to detect a lively skepticism about the ability of externally-funded community-based organizations to stabilize or turn inner-city neighborhoods around. Given his long tenure at the Ford Foundation where he was responsible for its urban programs, such doubts need be treated seriously. It will be interesting to see whether his optimism on immigrant-based market-oriented models of inner-city revival in New York City will survive in a deteriorating economic environment. And certainly the story he tells in New People in Old Neighborhoods offers little but cold comfort to those in the other old neighborhoods who operate outside of the virtuous circle of ambitions and values which the author of this interesting study ascribes to the new immigrants.


KAREN LEONARD
University of California, Irvine

Gerber's title captures his contribution well: Gerber's chief concern is with pluralism in the United States, and his study insightfully discusses its development in a particular place. Thoughtfully written, carefully documented, and with findings clearly relevant to other places and times, the book exemplifies historical scholarship at its best. I am not a specialist in American history, but his ideas about
“ethnicization” and the part it played in developing social pluralism in nineteenth-century Buffalo applied well to twentieth-century rural California (where I have studied Asian immigrants).

In his introduction, Gerber defines “social pluralism” as “…characterized by public competition, conflict, and cooperation among large, complex groups composed of overlapping social solidarities;” and he proposes that, in Buffalo, ethnicity frequently shaped class relations (p. xi). Taking for granted (but not celebrating) the American social system’s ability to integrate newcomers and foreigners, he displays a sophisticated command of the recent historical literature throughout the book and analyzes an increasingly ethnic self-understanding and political mobilization among Buffalo’s Irish and German immigrants (and also among American Protestants, whom he sees as an emergent ethnic group embodying political power and ideological control in that period).

Gerber states that his study differs from other contemporary work in social history by focusing on the antebellum period, analyzing the formation of ethnic groups rather than assuming their existence, making politics a central concern of the research, and paying careful attention to the powerful class of native-born Americans (pp. xiv–xv); these claims and their importance are clearly established.

The continuity of issues and groupings from this period to the present is impressive, and his discussions have exciting applications to current struggles over the meaning and enactment of democracy among American elite and immigrant groups.

This book is a major contribution to the understanding of pluralism in America and to the comparative study of ethnicity and national identity as well. Readers of this journal will find it very rewarding.


HELEN I. SAFA
Center for Latin American Studies, University of Florida

This book, is a comprehensive review of the maquiladora industry in Mexico, which attempts to assess its impact on employment and balance of payments as well as examine specific industries and new trends, including the increasing penetration by Japanese manufacturers and debt for equity conversion programs that lower the purchasing price of these manufacturing plants. Most of the contributors are economists and specialists in management and finance, and only one is Mexican. The editor, also a professor of business, provides a good introduction to the volume as well as brief introductions to each of the various sections.

The editor claims to have presented a balanced analysis representing diverse viewpoints, but the contributions are heavily weighted in favor of the maquiladora industry, from both the United States and Mexican perspectives. It is undoubtedly true that the access to low wages provided through the maquiladora industry has enhanced the competitiveness of U.S. companies and the economic growth of U.S. cities along the border, which are among the poorest in the nation. Criticism has focused on the loss of jobs of U.S. workers, and the counter arguments presented in this book are not convincing, particularly in the light of the explosive growth of the maquiladora industry since 1982. Job loss in the United States to Mexican runaway shops affects not only women in the apparel and electronics industry, but a growing number of men also, as automobile plants relocate to the Mexican border. The book ignores completely the air and water pollution in these border cities brought on by maquiladoras,