Copyright © Royal Anthropological Institute 2023. Rights Reserved. This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: 'Horton, Sarah B. & Josiah Heyman (eds). Paper trails: migrants, documents, and legal insecurity. vi, 258 pp., bibliogrs. Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press, 2020. £22.99 (paper)', which has been published in final form at https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.13986. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with John Wiley & Sons Ltd's Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving (see: https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/self-archiving.html).

In contemporary immigration regimes, short-term and temporary legal statuses proliferate. The responsibility for gaining and maintaining legal status lies with migrants themselves and involves expert management of a plethora of paperwork, documenting all aspects of their lives. Focusing on paperwork, as the chapters in this volume do, provides fertile ground for examining the relationship between migrants and the state (15).

The volume's first part explores "the fundamentals of modern state identification and documentation" (27). Sharma's historical chapter examines the British Empire's first enactment of immigration controls in the 1930s. The end of slavery posed a problem for the Empire, which relied on a "cheapened and weakened workforce" (35). In meticulous detail, Sharma outlines how the introduction of indentured "coolie" labour resolved the issue, with contracts of indenture acting as an early form of immigration control. Anderson's chapter focuses on a key aspect of migrants' encounters with documents and bureaucracy: temporality. Reflecting on the U.K. context, the chapter examines the way in which migrants' (and citizens') lives are determined by bureaucratic timeframes. Migrants must manage to live within two different disjunctive temporalities: that of day-to-day life and that of immigration bureaucracies, whose long waiting-times put lives on hold. Recent years have seen U.S. federal immigration law become increasingly restrictive. Provine's and Varsany's chapter examines the ways in which U.S. states' policies around the issuing of driving licences can support or challenge federal immigration law. Their focus on driving licences reminds us that it is not only immigration-related documents which are significant to migrants' legal statuses.

Boehm's, Coutin's and Menjívar's ethnographic chapters, based on research conducted in the United States, form the volume's second part. Boehm's chapter draws on research conducted with DACA applicants and recipients, deportees and people in immigration detention centres. The chapter highlights the double-edged nature of official documentation for migrants. Despite common parlance, "documented" does not necessarily refer to migrants' legal right to remain. Documentary processes can lead to "authorization" but also "unauthorization". Further, documentary processes do not equate with legibility or transparency because documentary practices are shrouded in ambiguity. However, as Coutin's chapter shows, although immigration bureaucracy may be characterised by uncertainty and anxiety, they also create possibilities and opportunities. Successful outcomes are dependent upon migrants', and their advocates', skill in navigating immigration bureaucracy – what Coutin calls "legal craft" (132). Moving away from migrants' encounters with state bureaucracies, Menjívar's piece focuses on a recurring theme in the volume: the diffusion of immigration policy implementation into civil society. Interactions with employers, car dealers, real estate agents and others may lead to the request to see documentation. Picking up on another important theme of the volume, Menjívar recounts how these non-state documentation controls are highly racialised.

The title of the volume's final part, "Resistance and Refusal", is particularly apt for Gomberg-Muñoz's, chapter which draws on fieldwork with community organisations who actively implement a variety of strategies in order to protect themselves from deportation and exercise rights where they live (118). Ordóñez's chapter describes in rich and lively detail Kichwa migrants' documentary strategies. Unlike others described in the volume, Ordóñez's respondents are not looking to permanently settle, instead they adventurously follow opportunities and strategically navigate immigration bureaucracies while doing so. In my reading, this strategic navigation involves relentless efforts to get around the state (223) but not to resist or refuse it.

In migrants' encounters with immigration bureaucracies the devil is in the detail. Context and specificities in policies, timing and personal circumstances matter a great deal to the success of migrants' bureaucratic encounters. The importance of specificity emerges in the detail of the chapters but not in the volume as a whole. In large part this is due to a lack of

2

acknowledgement that the majority of the chapters (five out of eight) are based on research in the United States. The significance of the U.S. context *is* recognised, for example, the ever increasing securitisation of immigration policies is discussed at length. But, a more explicit reflection on the particularities of the U.S. context in relation to immigration bureaucracy would deepen the insights produced and allow for more productive comparison to other settings. This oversight may, in part, be due to the volume's overall lack of engagement with literature writing on migrants' bureaucratic encounters in Europe (and beyond) which has been a burgeoning field in the past decade (authors include Heath Cabot, Tobias Eule, Colin Hoag,Yael Navaro-Yashin, Anna Triandafyllidou and Anna Tuckett, to name just a few).

738 words.

Dr. Anna Tuckett, Lecturer, Anthropology, Brunel University London.