author attributes price controls to an "outgrowth" of Mexico's dependent location in the global order.

Schwartzman thus misses the chance to discuss how neoliberal policies were chosen by Mexico's ruling class to lower the cost of labor power. Cheap wages would give Mexico a comparative advantage for manufacturing. Massive out-migration and the loss of food self-sufficiency, however, were the unintended consequences (Gerardo Otero, "Neoliberal Globalization, NAFTA, and Migration: Mexico's Loss of Food and Labor Sovereignty," *Journal of Poverty* 15 [2011]: 384–402.). Schwartzman's dependency account also misses the strong political pressure exerted in Mexico by large business groups starting in the 1970s to reduce the state's role in the economy and for freer international trade and investment.

The book's conclusion revisits the U.S. migration debate, offering a moral and voluntaristic solution: involvement and compromise by stakeholders to their mutual benefit. But what about the major structural differences in political clout between ruling forces and other stakeholders? Why would the powerful compromise if they can impose their will? Unless, that is, a political coalition can be built from the bottom up. Ensuring that all workers in the United States have the same rights requires concerted efforts by social-democratic forces like unions. A starting point is to give all migrant workers a route to citizenship. For Mexico, the critical position on migration proposes to account for domestic political dynamics if we are to promote viable economic opportunities to retain its people.

Migration-Trust Networks: Social Cohesion in Mexican U.S.-bound Emigration. By Nadia Y. Flores-Yeffal. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2013. Pp. xxiv+200. $40.00.

Carmen Lamela
Universidade da Coruna

Migration-Trust Networks is the outcome of 13 years of research on Mexican migrant networks from the state of Guanajuato, complemented with short periods of ethnographic fieldwork in El Salvador. Nadia Y. Flores-Yeffal's main finding is the existence of a social phenomenon she calls the "migration-trust network" (MTN). What makes this network so special as to deserve a name of its own? Two properties stand out. One is the lack of direct reciprocity, which is recognized as "solidarity." Simply put, Flores-Yeffal is describing the mechanical solidarity of rural communities transplanted into migrants' destinations in the United States. The other is that this solidarity network doesn't run out. On the contrary, it keeps expanding and incorporating urban-origin migrants, because sharing the fundamental risk of being undocumented immigrants brings them all together.

In her theoretical framework, Flores-Yeffal nicely threads most of the theories and concepts in vogue in the mainstream academic study of international migration. These are Tilly's "trust network" concept, "social capital" as developed by Alejandro Portes, "transnational theory," "cumulative causation" theory and the "culture of migration" explained through Douglas Massey, and Robert Sampson's concept of "collective efficacy." Further, from the very beginning of the book, Flores-Yeffal admits her research is, methodologically speaking, a case study, and explains how international migration flow from Mexico to the United States is unique in several ways. The description of its history and uniqueness, although brief, is one of the research's strengths. However, as I will later explain, this stance is sometimes forgotten throughout the book.

According to Flores-Yeffal, MTNs are mainly the product of the extreme vulnerability of undocumented migration. She even claims that, overall, MTNs are socially homogeneous inasmuch as migrant members are victims of their legal condition in the United States. This argument runs counter to plenty of scholarly research that avoids focusing on migrants' legal status as a dichotomous variable—or the reification of illegality (see, e.g., Katharine M. Donato and Amada Armenta, "What We Know about Unauthorized Migration," *Annual Review of Sociology* 37 [2011]: 529–43). Of course, these debates have political consequences. Flores-Yeffal is reporting her findings, but she is also painfully struggling with the aggressive anti-immigrant rhetoric that prevails nowadays in America. Her option is to stress imposed vulnerability and to deny willingness and calculation in economic undocumented migrants.

I don't feel confident questioning Flores-Yeffal's findings and conclusions about Mexican undocumented migrants in the United States, but I can't accept most of her generalizations about international migration. Her claim that "international migrants all around the world initially do not want to leave their place of origin. . . . They feel forced to migrate given the lack of jobs and unemployment benefits in their home country" (p. 170) is a very naive discourse with plenty of unintended consequences. For example, it makes economic migration as "forced" as political migration. Also, it presents international migration as a disgrace or tragic destiny. Consequently, although in a short sentence the author does remind policy makers of the historical fact that international migration is a normal social phenomenon, she is much more concerned with convincing them about fair and humane ways to stop the flow. To do so, Flores-Yeffal claims that public policy should start by understanding the point of view of immigrants and by listening to their motives to emigrate. Using this approach, policy makers would learn that most Mexican migrants have no choice given the lack of opportunities back home. I'm afraid that the author's good intentions do not stand on their own. It's not easy, or fair, to read

migrants' discourse on motives as causal explanations of migration. And it is just plain unrealistic to believe that the state will consider migrants' motives a serious obstacle when nonmigrants' interests are at stake.

I strongly agree with Flores-Yeffal's opinion that scholarly interest in the social networks of migration doesn't explain exactly how they operate; and I think her research is an important contribution in this regard, although only at the microlevel. But what I value most is how she shows the mix of destinations in distinct migration flows (rural-origin and urban-origin Mexican migrants) merging into the same destination. Combining these two groups creates an intersection of very different social worlds. *Paisano* ties from rural communities are the core of MTNs. Family members join after the network matures. As for urban-origin Mexican migrants, Yeffal-Flores presents stories of failed family ties and "urban orphan migrants" rescued through the "MTN effect" by rural community networks—or similar groups—at destination sites. This adoption process suggests a story of downward mobility, but Flores-Yeffal doesn't develop this perspective.

The sociological appeal of this phenomenon is various. Traditional mechanical solidarity taking over organic solidarity in contemporary urban America is something of a novelty. Also, MTNs tell part of the inside story of the latest chapter of the long and complex history of Mexican-U.S. migration. In this regard, Flores-Yeffal clarifies what exhausts MTNs or activates their geographical expansion, as has in fact been occurring since the last decades. In her own words, "Social networks operate based on the demand for labor at the place of destination. Therefore, the MTN could cease to function if the demand for labor at the place of destination ceases to exist, regardless of all other factors" (p. 132).

The author doesn't conceal her admiration for the communitarian ethos characteristic of MTNs. She even feels impelled to thoerize that religious faith is at the root of such generosity. Perhaps, as the author herself acknowledges, an assessment of MTNs' advantages and disadvantages mainly represents a confrontation between immigrants' and nonimmigrants' points of view. But even if we abstract from this debate, there is a fundamental perspective that she is not seriously considering: there is great virtue in organic solidarity and in the civility of impersonal social relations. Quoting Alejandro Portes and Erik Vickstrom, "The emotional identification that the individual feels with her nation or her metropolis does not depend on mutual acquaintance with all their members, but rather on shared values and the recognition of a common normative order for the fulfillment of individual goals" ("Diversity, Social Capital, and Cohesion," *Annual Review of Sociology* 37 [2011]: 461–79, p. 473). Or, to put it another way, the nostalgia for community should not blur the right to indifference (see Ash Amin, *Land of Strangers* [Polity, 2012]).

But perhaps MTNs are not as communitarian as Flores-Yeffal wants us to believe. In fact, she gives enough accounts of anonymous generosity and civil ethics. All things considered, I think I'm going to keep the rich evidence and accounts of her research, but will not stay within the limits of her theoretical framework.

Documenting Desegregation: Racial and Gender Segregation in Private-Sector Employment since the Civil Rights Act. By Kevin Stainback and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2012. Pp. xxxiv+378.

Robin Stryker
University of Arizona

When I interviewed Al Golub, former deputy executive director of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), he told me he regretted that the EEOC failed to continue its short-lived early 1980s outreach to the social science academic community. Former EEOC Chief Economist Marc Rosenblum corroborated. Having held a series of conferences to exchange information and seek advice from academics—mostly economists—around the country, the EEOC considered, but ultimately declined, initiating a program of soliciting and funding enforcement-relevant academic research, including that pertaining to evaluating the agency's enforcement efficacy. Al died before Kevin Stainback and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey completed *Documenting Desegregation*. But he would have seen the book—appropriately—as an exemplar of what can be accomplished through communication and knowledge networks linking the EEOC to the academy.

Linking multiple subfields, including stratification, organizational, political, and economic sociology, and law and society, *Documenting Desegregation* provides a treasure trove of knowledge for scholarly and policy communities. The book methodically describes countrywide trends and variability—by time period, region, industry, occupation, and local labor market—in race and gender desegregation and resegregation from 1966, two years after enactment of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, through 2005. The EEOC made this and other research possible by allowing select scholars access, pursuant to confidentiality agreements, to the entire history of EEO-1 forms. These contain data that Title VII–covered private employers report to the EEOC and pertain to more than five million workplaces. The authors also draw on Current Population Survey data.

Documenting Desegregation is of widespread interest; it is necessary reading for any social scientist or policy maker interested in organizations or inequality. A short review cannot do justice to its nuanced analyses and