

especially significant in the midst of growing global concerns about the effect of development strategies on the environment.

Georges describes the differential impact of economic change and transnationalism on men and women and describes the different roles men and women have played in constructing transnational networks. The relationship between migration, class formation, and patterns of consumption is also detailed. Throughout the book, Georges uses a detailed local census she conducted to give us descriptive statistics that document and highlight the trends she outlines.

Changes in the U.S. economy, the political and economic history of the Dominican Republic, Dominican development strategies, and changing immigration law and policies in both the United States and the Dominican Republic, all emerge as important elements in the saga of Dominican migration to the United States. All these factors also contribute to the possibility of and necessity for migrants to remain rooted to their home society, even as they settle in the United States. Georges demonstrates these relationships, but she does not fully make the leap from her data to this analysis.

However, Georges's book is rich with examples of how and why the people of Los Pinos become transnational in their families, businesses, organizational life, and processes of class formation and differentiation. Almost 40 percent of the households in the village had a member in the United States. She describes the contingencies of decision making in households and families stretched across borders. These enduring relationships are enmeshed in expectations and obligations that extend between those in the village and persons long settled in New York. When children are grown and brought to New York, parents may take their turn to live on remittances in Los Pinos so that transnational migration extends across generations. Meanwhile, some businesses, including cattle raising, loan sharking, shop-keeping, and small manufacturing, run on the capital sent by transmigrants, while others—both legal and illegal—including child minding and the organization of undocumented migration, thrive on the interconnections.

Only one crucial element necessary for theorizing transnationalism is missing from Georges's account. Georges tells us nothing about the subjectivities and identities of transmigrants. As they go back and forth between the United States and the Dominican Republic, to which nation-state do these migrants think they belong? Have they constructed an identity that gives voice to their lives lived in social rather than physical locations? When Dominican politicians campaign in New York, even though Dominicans living there cannot vote in Dominican elections, how are they constructing the nature of their constituency? How do the complex intersections of race and ethnicity that turn Dominicans into Hispanics in New York play out in the political loyalties and personal identities of the migrants from Los Pinos? An exploration of why immigrants respond to their location within the world system by establishing transnational social fields must venture to ask not only how "community" is made but also how it is "imagined."

**Limits to Friendship: The United States and Mexico.** ROBERT A. PASTOR and JORGE G. CASTAÑEDA. New York: Vintage Books, 1989. xii + 415 pp., notes, index.

DAVID FRYE  
University of Michigan

Relations between the national governments of Mexico and the United States have from the beginning ranged from tense to openly hostile, mediated as they are by general cultural conflicts and misperceptions from both sides, and more specifically by competing and incompatible historical senses and interpretations of history. The promising project of this book is to take an entirely new tack at understanding Mexico–United States relations from a dual perspective. Part of that perspective is provided by the experience of the authors: Pastor is an American political scientist who served as a Latin American specialist in the Carter Administration; Castañeda is a Mexican political scientist who, the blurb states, "has advised the Mexican government on international affairs" (and who, in 1990, received death threats for his criticisms of that government in his *Los Angeles Times* column). Each was, at the time of writing, fresh from a year's sabbatical spent in the other's country in 1985–86. Even more promising is the structure of the book: rather than a single coauthored volume, it is shaped as a series of nine parallel chapters in which Pastor and Castañeda treat, as if in dialogue with each other, topics from "Shaping Minds and Attitudes"—"The Mexican Mind" (Castañeda) and "The American Mind" (Pastor)—to "Crossing Cultures"—"The Fear of Americanization" (Castañeda) and "The Fear of Mexicanization" (Pastor). The book is framed by a brief preface and a short conclusion, both written jointly.

The book's usefulness is compromised, however, by the authors' decision to use their facing chapters to *present*, rather than to analyze or critique, "the prevailing, mainstream view of each of our nations on an issue even though we might not personally share it" (p. xi); the authors use the term "nation" to speak of both state and people, as if they were one and the same). Though this tactic does help Castañeda and Pastor achieve one of their goals, "to enhance the reader's sensitivity to the differences between the United States and Mexico" (p. xi), it does nothing to advance the more important goal, at least from an anthropological point of view, of understanding the historical/cultural/social origins of our reciprocal misunderstandings. Instead, the dual chapters themselves become diplomatic documents, as it were: not analyses but objects to be decoded and analyzed. In the process, the promised dialogue of chapters is often reduced to a kind of sparring contest—always subdued and diplomatic—between competing worldviews.

The authors wander time and again from their general themes to focus their attention on the minutiae of events such as the state visit of Miguel de la Madrid to Washington in May 1984. Such diversions, and such attention to detail, would be rewarding if the events were used as revelatory incidents, illuminating the inner workings of Mexico–U.S. relations and interpretations. Instead, each author

aims to present his "own" government's view of specific conflicts arising on concrete occasions and to explain away the significance attached to the events by the other author. The cumulative effect of so much explaining away—as opposed to explaining—is a deadening feeling that the authors are churning needlessly through mountains of insignificance. Even mundane facts and figures are not immune from their covert competition: when Castañeda reports that after 1986, "1.8 million individuals applied for 'amnesty,' of whom approximately 74 percent were Mexican" (p. 318), Pastor follows with a reference to "1.8 million undocumented Mexicans [who] represented 74 percent of the 2.4 million people who applied" (p. 343). One of these sets of figures must be wrong and should have been corrected.

Pastor seems to me to go somewhat further than Castañeda in his adoption of an "official" voice, but perhaps I am more attuned to the tenor of an American voice than to a Mexican one. The tone of Pastor's writing, like that of a U.S. official in Latin America, strikes me as self-consciously brash, self-congratulatory, and often enough self-righteous (would a Mexican reader, I wonder, have the same reaction?). Perhaps the most egregious example is his blasé summary of the U.S. overthrow of the Arbenz government in Guatemala, precursor to more than three decades of dictatorship and terror in that country: "The United States successfully attained its objectives in a short time, and therefore Mexico's opposition did not seriously affect relations" (p. 156). Castañeda's parallel shortcoming, from the point of view of an anthropologist more familiar with rural and working-class Mexico than with the halls of power in Mexico City, is his manifest membership in what Guillermo Bonfil Batalla calls "the imaginary Mexico." This is the Mexico that imagines itself European, "cultured," middle class (at the least)—and which denies the existence of the "profound Mexico" of the majority, whose culture and society form part of the continuing history of Mesoamerican civilization. As Castañeda puts it, "during the last century . . . the country was transformed at dizzying speed from a rural, illiterate, backward, and largely peasant nation to the predominantly urban, literate, middle- and working-class society it is today" (p. 15). The universal triumph of the middle class! Imaginary Mexico, indeed. At least by appending the working to the middle class, Castañeda has saved them from being "backward."

Given the authors' adoption of official voices and attitudes, I probably should not have been surprised when I could not find "minimum wage" in the index, though I know that Castañeda has a discussion of it at some point. Nor, looking further, could I find "wages," "labor," "work," or "workers," despite the prominence of Mexican workers in discussions of U.S.-Mexico relations. This is certainly history from the top down. Nor will one find "women," "men," or "gender" in the index, nor for that matter any hint of gender analysis in the book. Pastor, for instance, notes that the *maquiladora* program was begun after the cancellation of the *bracero* agreements in 1964 "to absorb some of the surplus labor, but the program attracted mostly women instead of the ex-

braceros, who were mostly men" (p. 349)—as if that were something that simply happened through the cumulative choices of the Mexican "labor force," rather than as a result of the gendered labor policies of the *maquiladora* owners and the ex-bracero employers, respectively.

If I have gone on at length about the book's shortcomings, that is a reflection of my disappointment: between its promising presentation as a cross-cultural dialogue between "experts" and its accessibility as a fairly cheap and well-produced paperback, it had seemed an excellent candidate for use in a course on Latin American societies. Let us hope that other scholars, or even Pastor and Castañeda themselves, will continue the dialogue begun here, with greater anthropological insight and in a more critical tone.

***Ethnicity and Class Conflict in Rural Mexico.* FRANS J. SCHRYER. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990. xviii + 363 pp., tables, figures, notes, bibliography, index.**

MARIA TERESA KORECK  
University of Chicago

This book, by virtue of a vast array of descriptive and empirical detail, helps to demystify the view of rural Mexico as a highly homogeneous, or monolithic, and unproblematic entity. A crucial drawback, however, is that the book lacks a consistent theoretical perspective that can bind together its 17 chapters. This is apparent in the eclectic mix of approaches employed throughout this study of a series of peasant uprisings in postrevolutionary Mexico.

Frans Schryer begins by evoking one symbolic incident

On April 21, 1978, the cry "the Indians are coming" went up over the city of Huejutla, the judicial administrative center for nine municipios that constitute the core of the Huasteca Hidalguense. . . . While the rumor proved to be unfounded, a high level of peasant militancy and political violence throughout the seventies was very real. [p. 3]

The present study, which describes and analyzes this agrarian conflict, is the outcome of research conducted in the region of Huejutla between 1980 and 1987.

Huejutla—defined and described in chapter 3 as inhabited by Nahuatl language speakers and Spanish-speaking Mestizos—is an ethnically diverse region in the state of Hidalgo, which constitutes a fraction of a larger region known as the Huasteca. According to Schryer, significant differences exist between villages within Huejutla. For example, local communities are consistently identified as either Indian or Mestizo. Cross-cutting these ethnic distinctions is a crucial contrast between northern and southern zones with respect to differences in land tenure, village administration, and social structure.

Schryer's project is to describe and analyze the various ways in which the form assumed by contemporary class struggles was a function of the different socioeconomic structures and cultural values found