

Secondly, Kim's study evinces theoretical sophistication and ambition. On the one hand, she grapples with the vast and varied theoretical writings on social movements. In reading *Bitter Fruit*, the reader will also become well versed in this interesting scholarly literature. On the other hand, she draws on the social constructivist writings on race to provide an overarching framework to make sense of the Red Apple boycott. She makes a useful distinction between racial power—as cumulative and interactive processes—and racial order—as reproduction of racial categories and racial hierarchy. She strives to go beyond the particulars of the boycott to say something deep and important about the racial conditions of the contemporary United States.

As impressed as I was by Kim's energy and erudition, I found much to quibble with in her book. Let me just focus on her emphasis on the racial dynamic. Needless to say, it would be foolhardy to discuss just class and political economy, but they do matter a great deal not only in the singular case of the Red Apple boycott but the very articulation of the Black-Korean conflict, which is really a subset of conflicts between poor African Americans and immigrant business communities across urban America. Although no one can deny the salience of racial power, the stress on race obfuscates other important dynamics that generated not only the Red Apple boycott but also the generalized specter of African Americans battling nearly every other group in American society. In this regard, she tends—perhaps inevitably—to exaggerate the salience of the Red Apple boycott in particular and of the Black-Korean conflict in general. To wit, consider the curious asymmetry between the scholarly articulation by African Americans and Korean Americans; viz., virtual neglect by the former, obsessive interest by the latter.

Beyond specters and quibbles, *Bitter Fruit*—written with verve and intelligence—signals the debut of a very promising scholar.

JOHN LIE
Harvard University

Market Economics and Political Change: Comparing China and Mexico. Edited by JUAN D. LINDAU and TIMOTHY CHEEK. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998. vii, 346 pp. \$65.00 (cloth); \$24.95 (paper).

Market liberalization and political change to democracy are currently paramount topics in the discussion concerning the today and tomorrow of most developing countries. *Market Economics and Political Change* treats the cases of China and Mexico comparatively from the political science perspective without ignoring the weight of history. It is divided into four sections. The first introduces the two countries and outlines the theoretical framework. Cheek and Lindau's chapter, which gives an historical introduction to each country, is the only one that adopts a truly comparative stance. Jorge Dominguez summarizes the different proposals as to how the liberalization of the market has influenced democratization. He bases his argument on the premise that there is no way of knowing whether free market economy is propitious for the existence, growth, and consolidation of democracy, but it does weigh the balance in its favor.

The second section of the book studies the regional contexts of China and Mexico and the common factors in their recent history. Robert Packenham places Mexico's historical experience in the context of South American countries and theoretically