atuação da Hospedaria com o suprimento de mão de obra grevista, atentando para a importância da manutenção da família e das redes de solidariedade entre a classe trabalhadora (ou a falta dela). No entanto, a análise carece de um olhar mais aprofundado sobre a atuação das lideranças sindicais e dos movimentos grevistas daquele período. A premissa de que as organizações dos trabalhadores em São Paulo fracassaram se comparadas a outros centros urbanos dominados por imigrantes precisaria ser melhor explicada. Duas lacunas se observam: a relação entre o mercado de trabalho industrial na capital e o sistema de colonato no interior paulista; a ausência de um diálogo entre o urbano e o rural, tendo-se a impressão de que as fronteiras entre um e outro estão distantes e pré-fixadas.

Por fim, os dois últimos capítulos são dedicados ao período do pós-guerra. Neles, se observa como os industriais e os trabalhadores e suas famílias reagiram de diferentes maneiras à crise econômica provocada pelo conflito mundial. Para tanto, o estudo observa as formas de organização de trabalho nos setores têxteis, ferroviários, de energia elétrica e comércio. Em comum a todos esses setores, o estudo aponta como as mulheres e afro-brasileiros continuaram sofrendo com as diversas formas de discriminações, ocupando a base da pirâmide social. Como mostra a autora, os industriais paulistas optaram pela repressão e o controle do ritmo de trabalho como a solução mais fácil e econômica para superar a crise. Nos últimos anos da década de 1920, em meio a uma cidade que crescia desordenada e freneticamente, a autora observa a consolidação de uma classe média composta por *white-collars*, constituída sobretudo por famílias de imigrantes, beneficiadas pela política de branqueamento da população. Ball, sensível às desigualdades raciais e de gênero, mostra com maestria como foram produzidas e propagadas na divisão de classes sociais. Tal percepção se fez visível até mesmo nas enchentes, quando os rios demandavam o caminho natural de seu curso, deixando milhares de trabalhadores literalmente nas margens da cidade.

Larissa R. Corrêa *PUC-Rio*

PABLO YANKELEVICH, ***Los otros: raza, normas y corrupción en la gestión de la extranjería en México, 1900-1950***. Ciudad de México: Bonilla Artigas Editores / El Colegio de México / Iberoamericana, 2019.

Mexican foreign policy is traditionally seen as Weberian, liberal, ambitious and influential. The diplomats of the interwar period promoted radical precedent-setting measures such as the automatic recognition of national governments or the equal sovereignty of rich and poor nations. Mexico was one of the only countries to support Finland in its hopeless Winter War with the Soviet Union,

or to back the Spanish Republicans against fascism, or to stand up to the United States over Cuba. Mexican diplomats chaired the Third Commission at Bretton Woods which (against British opposition) wrote international development as a goal into the UN Charter, and Alfonso García Robles won the 1982 Nobel Peace Prize for his key role in the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which declared Latin America a nuclear-free zone. Above all, Mexico stood out for its set-piece stances on refugees, welcoming huge numbers of Spanish refugees in the 1930s and Latin American dissidents in the 1970s. Mexico was on the face of it a superior version of the United States, credibly committed to democracy, beckoning in the huddled masses with the additional progressive proviso, first set down in the immigration law of 1908, that "all countries and races" were equal.

Pablo Yankelevich's new book slaughters that last cow. That there was intense xenophobia against Chinese communities across most of the North of Mexico was already well-known, as were the use of Artículo 33 to deport arbitrarily the odd *gachupín*, the casual, everyday antisemitism of the cities, and the less casual antisemitism of José Vasconcelos in his far-right dotage. *Los otros* however tells a far broader, systemic, and national story of racial discrimination, meted out on a hidden, graduated scale against all non-whites (and some whites too, if they were from Eastern Europe). The Mexican political and cultural elites of the revolution were not, once backstage, racial egalitarians at all. *In extremis* they sounded positively Trumpian: the Departamento de Migración told the president in 1929 that it "has always prevented the entrance of people of color in light of reports that they have committed many crimes" (p. 39), an idea restated in 1950 by Ernesto Uruchurtu, who claimed that the majority of foreigners were lawbreakers who were making Mexico "the latrine of the world" (p. 61).

This is depressing stuff; worse is that successive governments tried to operationalize these ideas. While Mexico proclaimed an official openness, aspiring to "not hurt the feelings" (p. 111) of other countries, bureaucrats and politicians drew up confidential memos (*circulares*) that added up to a parallel, undeclared policy of xenophobia and exclusion on cultural and eugenicist grounds. By the mid-1930s there were over four hundred of these memos in circulation. The more extreme matched any measure deployed against Asians: Circular 250 called for a blanket ban on all Jewish and Roma immigration. Non-governmental elites supported much of the racist logic: Ulises Valdés, the former director of UNAM's medical school, suggested rounding up all Chinese into explicitly wartime-type concentration camps to ensure efficient and complete deportation. (Concentration camps for Asians were indeed set up during World War II, albeit with less harsh conditions than in those north of the border). Even the Spanish refugees from Franco had a place in the eugenics of immigration: Gilberto Loyo observed that, beyond ideological solidarity, sheltering the Republicans would

be "the last opportunity that Mexico will have for many years to increase the volume of the Spanish population" (p. 117).

Having recovered this *ad hoc* policy program from near-oblivion, Yankelevich's other two arguments concern the mechanisms and successes (or otherwise) of its translation into reality. Cárdenas's government took steps to clear up the mess of covert *circulares* with a comprehensive 1936 immigration law, which seemingly liberalized policy while effectively banning the entrance of colored people. The law set quotas on how many could enter; non-whites were generally capped at 2% per ethnicity of the entire volume, but, in practice, were excluded wholesale. The Blacks and Jews who could pay exorbitant entry fees were allowed in; everyone else wasn't, and Mexico only admitted 2,000 Jewish refugees during the entire Second World War. The implementation of this law posed a general, phenotypical problem of how to ascribe race to people, and when officials tried to resolve it by drawing up a *cuadro clasificador*, they ended up with same sort of nonsensical tool as the *pinturas de castas*. The main problems, however, were not philosophical but practical. First, as with all other government departments, immigration agencies were hopelessly underfunded and undermanned. Immigration agents had to buy their own uniforms; with exiguous salaries and toothless oversight, many didn't bother. Their smaller offices lacked furniture, functioning typewriters, and in one case a concrete floor. Second, those that did exist were systematically corrupt. Some agents accepted bribes on an installment plan basis. So not only were *los otros* unwelcome, but even the numerical data about them was lost in a major failure of basic cognitive capacity.

The carefully correlated and exhaustive research Yankelevich has done to underpin these arguments ranges from the statistical—the final chapter will tell the reader all they ever wanted to know about the breakdown of those naturalized whom the authorities managed to remember, whether by national origin, gender, etc.—to the gaudiest of anecdotes. These are presented in entertaining but generalizing tallies from the major ports and both frontiers. They are complemented by some detailed and closely pursued stories, of which the two that stand out most are those of the key functionary Andrés Landa y Piña and the pantomime villain Rosendo Herrera. Herrera, the director of the immigration agencies in Mexicali and Nuevo Laredo, ran the entire gamut of corrupt practices: extortion of travelers and his own agents alike, bribery, and daylight robbery of state funds. Accused with plentiful evidence—on factional rather than high-minded grounds—by his equally corrupt former superior, he defended himself as a bureaucratic moral crusader whose honesty made him the victim of crooks high and low. The result was both irony and bureaucratic tragedy: Herrera got away with it and continued in his nefarious ways, and Landa y Piña was

forced to connive at it. Serious, dedicated, and apparently honest with money, Landa y Piña was in the end corrupt himself, not just through clientelism but through gross abuse of power, because he saw no choice in the matter. He could either get in line or get out.

Finally, *Los otros* is not just intrinsically valuable as a systematic uncovering of bureaucratic racism, crookedly operationalized to a hitherto unrealized extent, but also as an excellent case study of one of the more unpleasant ways in which post-revolutionary and *priista* governments added up the mathematics of domination. The policies and practices of migration are a part of the corrupt and violent side of the *dictablanda*, one resolution of Mexico's complicated equation of high levels of inequality, superficially low levels of conflict, and remarkable longevity. This gatekeeper state migration policy was one of the many ways a rent-seeking constituency was kept happy, with cash earned and favours delivered, the profits earned by smirking bullies at the expense of those incapable of answering back. As with Mexico's more remote and Indigenous populations, the attendant oppression was racialized and exercised against people who—unlike students, say, or urbanites in general—were neither particularly visible (the Jewish refugees who never made it out of soon-to-be Nazi Europe, the Black migrant workers from Belize or Texas, the confused American tourists, the Eastern European sex workers, the *pochos*), nor particularly cared for.

Paul Gillingham *Northwestern University*

ERYNN MASI DE CASANOVA, ***Dust and Dignity: Domestic Employment in Contemporary Ecuador***. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019.

Masi de Casanova's study of domestic work in Guayaquil, Ecuador centers on two questions: "What makes domestic employment in Ecuador a bad job?" and "How can working conditions be improved?" (p. 122). To explore these questions, she engaged in collaborative research conducted with members of the Asociación de Trabajadoras Remuneradas del Hogar (Association of Remunerated Household Workers, or ATRH) in Guayaquil from 2010-2016. The resulting book makes a significant contribution to our understanding of domestic work in Ecuador (a woefully understudied topic) by placing it in comparative perspective and demonstrating the usefulness of class analysis in evaluating domestic work.

The book evaluates domestic work in Ecuador through three lenses. First, Masi de Casanova fruitfully applies the Marxian analysis of social reproduction to identify many of the challenges that face domestic workers. Domestic