

[Paul Stock](#)

Book review: Iain Chambers, *Mediterranean crossings: the politics of an interrupted modernity*

**Article (Accepted version)
(Refereed)**

Original citation:

Stock, Paul (2009) *Book review: Iain Chambers, Mediterranean crossings: the politics of an interrupted modernity (Duke University Press, 2008)*. [Ethnic and racial studies](#), 32 (4). pp. 739-753. ISSN 0141-9870

DOI: [10.1080/01419870902819498](https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870902819498)

© 2009 [Routledge](#)

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/35734/>

Available in LSE Research Online: September 2012

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final manuscript accepted version of the journal article, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer review process. Some differences between this version and the published version may remain. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Book reviews

Iain Chambers, **MEDITERRANEAN CROSSINGS: THE POLITICS OF AN INTERRUPTED MODERNITY**, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008, 192 pp., £11.99 (pb).

Iain Chambers's evocative volume argues that the Mediterranean, both as 'a concept and a historical and cultural formation', is 'imaginatively constructed' by the mutual interaction of the many cultures bordering its waters (p. 10). *Mediterranean Crossings* focuses on the five hundred years from the early sixteenth century to the present: the period which marks the emergence and development of 'cartographies of power and knowledge that charted European expansion on a planetary scale' (p. 2). In this respect the Mediterranean exemplifies global patterns of shared encounter, colonialism, trade and imperial ambition. Readers should not expect, however, a linear narrative or an exhaustive account of cultural encounters across the region. Instead, Chambers investigates what he calls the 'liquid materiality' of the area: the ways in which 'overlapping territories and intertwined histories' suggest 'the making of a more multiple Mediterranean', where borders are 'both transitory and zones of transit' (pp. 3–5). The purpose here is to cut through so-called 'thickets of provincialism'; in other words, to escape the narrow and restrictive identity politics of modern nationalism. Chambers is interested in the 'visible and invisible networks' between cultures and is scathing about the artificial separation of those connections by ideological and literal borders. In making this case, he employs a very wide range of material, though some of the discussions are regrettably brief. Among the eclectic topics mentioned are: thirteenth-century Jewish merchants; the Mediterranean slave trade; the Crusades; the Algerian novelist Assia Djebar; Neapolitan popular music; Mediterranean cuisine; the politics of the veil; the evolution of the Arabic 'oud into the lute and the guitar; Caravaggio; rubbish collection and the *Camorra*; and, crucially, the occlusion of Muslim culture from modern ideas about Europe. One of the book's declared projects is to challenge received understandings of European cultural history by questioning the comfortable certainties of classicism, nationalism, and relentless 'progress' (p. 40).

Chambers is a professor of postcolonial studies and this specialism allows him to reposition the Mediterranean in terms of what 'the West' has 'marginalised, culturally repressed [and] physically (and metaphysically) eradicated' (p. 26). Occasionally, however, Chambers's arguments close down more sophisticated understandings of cultural encounter. He generalizes very readily about 'the West', and sometimes uses the terms 'First World', 'Occidental', 'European' and 'modern state' apparently interchangeably. He mentions, for example, the 'global imminence of Occidental whiteness' and the 'essential violence on which the authority of the modern state depends to secure its legitimacy', specifically law courts, policing and education (p. 5). These statements are methodologically problematic because they simplify or suppress more complex cultural interactions. Not only do they assume that 'the West' has been and remains homogeneous, but they further assert that Western modernity is always and everywhere characterized by violent oppression, an idea which makes cultural encounters uncomfortably formulaic and shuts down other interpretative possibilities. Chambers argues, for instance, that Napoleon's invasion of Egypt exemplifies the 'civilising mission' with which 'Europe has taken possession of the rest of the world' (p. 12). In some respects this is persuasive, but it also implies that cultural encounters and

influences flow only in one direction, from a homogeneous and appropriative 'Occident' to an equally uniform but passive 'Orient'. This risks oversimplification: Napoleon, after all, also 'laid claim' to Roman and Carolingian history with his European invasions and propaganda. Furthermore, Egypt was itself a rebellious province of the Ottoman Empire; the ruling Mamelukes had declared independence in 1786 before struggling bitterly against a Turkish army sent to recapture the territory. Napoleon's invasion certainly reveals an imperialist purpose, but it is also part of multi-faceted encounters between various transnational empires, colonized places, and different cultures in the Mediterranean. His proclamation to the people of Egypt, for example, mixes French Revolutionary and Islamic political language and thus exhibits a form of cultural interaction even at the moment of colonial appropriation.

The excellent chapter on Naples, however, avoids these problems by showing how different cultural traditions interact and morph in specific contexts. Naples, Chambers says, is a place 'of innumerable invasions and incursions' which 'embodies and incorporates foreign elements' while maintaining its initial form (p. 81). This is the highlight of the book: Chambers illustrates the fluid malleability of cultures and histories, while simultaneously remaining grounded in the local and the concrete. He usefully describes the Mediterranean, and the places within it, as 'composite localities', made unique by the wider negotiations of cultural encounters.

© 2009 Paul Stock
School of English and Humanities
Birkbeck, University of London

Ada I. Engebrigtsen, **EXPLAINING GYPSINESS: POWER, EXCHANGE AND INTERDEPENDENCE IN A TRANSYLVANIAN VILLAGE**, New York: Berghahn Books, 2007, xii, 217 pp. + tables, \$75.00(hb).

This rather one dimensional study deals with Roma in a curiously unnamed Romanian 'hamlet' in Transylvania. The author, who began her research without any previous knowledge or study of the Roma, knows little Romani or Romanian and is unfamiliar with much of the core literature in this field. This lack of sophisticated knowledge of the language and history of the Roma weakens what could otherwise be a very interesting study.

Regardless, *Exploring Gypsiness* does provide some useful insight into the life of Roma in at least one small corner of Romania though there is nothing really new in many of the conclusions reached by the author. This study is divided into two large sections, 'The Roma World' and the 'Roma as Villagers'. Much of what she discusses about the Roma merely fortifies what we know already about the Roma-the Roma have strong family structures with well-defined roles for males, females, and children. One of the overarching themes of the book, that the 'villagers and Roma form a social figuration of asymmetrical interdependency (p. 59)', is something specialists have noted for decades. This asymmetric relationship also affects male-female relationships in the Roma family and community.

Family and its strong interrelationships has always been one of the principal institutions that has bound the Roma together for centuries. Most of the Roma in this particular 'hamlet' were related and bound together into a *familia* that the author viewed as a 'moral category' (p. 77). Using photography as a research tool, the author defined the Roma *familia* a core household consisting of a married couple and their children, whether married or not. The larger *familia* also included their married sons and daughters and their children as well as any household related to any of the individuals in this extended *familia*. The author saw marriages as multidimensional, meaning that they could be entered into for both romantic and strategic reasons.

One of the most fascinating chapters deals with Roma leadership. The author began the second chapter discussing the life and activities of Joska, the *bulibaša* or head of the small Roma community in the village. She looks at the relatively well-to-do life of the *bulibaša* in

the first part of this chapter, and continues her tale in chapter six, where she explores his larger role in the Roma community. Joska's position required him to walk a tightrope since his important relationship with non-Roma made some in his village question his 'gypsiness'. Moreover, his power was not absolute since there were also other *Roma bare* (*Rom baro*) or 'big men' in the village who wielded considerable influence in the community. She points to the figure of Ion Cioaba, the head of Romania's *Calderari* or *Kalderaa* (coppersmith) Roma, as an example of a *Roma bare* whom some *gaje* regarded as the king or emperor of the Roma. For whatever reason, Cioaba became the public spokesman of the Roma in official eyes. She failed to mention Nicolae Georghe, an extremely prominent Romanian Roma political leader and scholar who had a legitimate international reputation as a Roma activist.

Engebriksen ends her study with a comparative look at the Roma 'hamlet' and its relationship with the nearby *gaje* village. Though much of this relationship is defined by traditional Romanian rural values about 'self-sufficiency, moderation and the ethos of labour', there was also a 'hierarchy of moral and biological traits' (p. 149) that determined 'social practice' and helped explain the innate xenophobia that exists among most *gaje*. The principal determinant of the relationship between the 'hamlet' Roma and the village *gaje* was the system of Roma begging that confirmed the *gaje* image of the Roma 'as childish spenders who can not plan ahead and always need the villagers to support them' (p. 173). The Roma cleverly used this stereotype to exploit *gaje* generosity, thus establishing a peculiar relationship that the author thinks underscores the peasants' dependency on the Roma and fortifies the Roma's sense of superiority to the *gaje*.

Unfortunately, such conclusions, particularly when based on unscientific observations, are not proven in the book because the author failed to establish strong relationships in the non-Roma community near the 'hamlet'. On the other hand, just the mere observations of Roma life and values over a significant period of time makes this book, with its flaws, still a contribution to the field of Roma studies.

© 2009 David M. Crowe
Elon University

Kevin R. Johnson, **OPENING THE FLOODGATES: WHY AMERICA NEEDS TO RETHINK ITS BORDERS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS**, New York: New York University Press, 2007, x + 289 pp., \$35.00 (hb).

A professor of law, Kevin R. Johnson makes a case for drastic liberalization of the United States' immigration laws. He openly advocates an immigration system of 'easy entry' in which no one would be excluded save those 'who truly endanger the national security and public safety' (p. 196). Johnson's book is and is intended to be a damning critique of restrictive immigration laws, and a hymn of praise to the advantages of unrestricted immigration such as neo-liberals envision. Johnson's argument cobbles together a variety of familiar evidence and arguments. Johnson does not break new ground in respect to either evidence or arguments. On the legal side, Johnson claims that: the existing immigration law is unjust, unfair, and inconsistent with American ideals; existing law is not preventing illegal immigration anyway so it would be better just to open the border; existing immigration law creates undocumented immigrants who threaten public health and lack basic human rights; existing anti-terrorism law discriminates against Muslims. Additionally, turning to the social and economic advantages of open borders, Johnson finds evidence that contradicts the claims of restrictionists. For example, he claims that Mexican immigrants are acquiring English and assimilating promptly; immigrants in general are less frequently incarcerated than non-immigrants; the adverse impact of unskilled immigrants upon wages is slight, if any; immigrant labour strengthens the national economy; Mexican immigrants have no irredentist ambitions; and immigration does not promote environmental degradation. Johnson concludes ringingly that open borders would be 'good for all Americans' (p. 168).

Surely this conclusion is exaggerated because if even one American would be disserved by open borders, open borders would not be good for all. That is a quibble, of course, but if open borders would be beneficial to most, but not all Americans, then how many would it benefit, and how many would it injure? That is a valid question. One would like to know how big is the minority that would be disserved by open borders, and what is their social influence? Additionally, if borders were abruptly opened, as Johnson desires, what would be the subsequent increase in the volume of immigration across them? If great, would that enhanced volume of immigration increase the undesirability of immigration to many Americans? Johnson's text does not address either issue. Possibly, by preventing a drastic increase in immigration, those closed borders he decries have created a situation in which the disadvantages of open borders are obscured to most people. If so, opening the borders would greatly increase the number of people disserved by immigration, and opening the borders would be most unwise. This issue might have been addressed in the book, but is not.

Finally, if open borders would be so overwhelmingly desirable, why then does the United States practise an unsound and self-defeating policy of immigrant restriction? Johnson pays little attention to this question, whose solution would so greatly energize a social scientist. From his discussion in Chapter 4 of immigration politics, a reader learns that the populist wing of the Republican Party opposes immigration for fear of cultural change; and, on the other side of the aisle, liberal Democrats fear that unrestricted immigration would put downward pressure on wages to the detriment of their trade union allies. These odd bedfellows gang up to perpetuate the unwise and counter-productive immigration laws that Johnson decries. As Johnson shows elsewhere that both these fears are groundless (immigrants assimilate and have no effect on native wages), the root problem of counter-productive immigration law is by implication lack of public understanding of how unrestricted immigration works to the advantage of all. By explaining yet again how desirable open borders would be, and banishing restrictionists' canards, Johnson apparently aspires to hasten the triumphant opening of the national borders.

In essence, Johnson has written a legal brief for open borders, leaving it to others to present a case for the other side. A rationalistic brief is appropriate for a lawyer, who thinks in terms of trials, evidence, adversarial law, and verdicts, but a social scientist reading Johnson's book may conclude, as I did, that it will go over well with those who already agree with it, and will be ignored by those who disagree.

© 2009 Ivan Light

University of California, Los Angeles

Dora Kostakopoulou, **THE FUTURE GOVERNANCE OF CITIZENSHIP**, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008 (Law in Context series), 230 pp., £23.99 (pb).

Dora Kostakopoulou addresses here probably the most crucial question in the field of citizenship: how can we reconcile the exclusionary principle of citizenship and the inclusionary logic of democracy? Or, in other words, how can we reform the nationality model of citizenship to make it compatible with contemporary developments of globalization and increasing cultural diversity without presupposing the eradication of nationality? Contrary to other studies that have treated the same or similar questions Kostakopoulou's book not only proposes interesting and well-founded solutions to this dilemma. A lawyer in training, Kostakopoulou brilliantly combines literature in law, sociology and public policy. Thereby, not only does she discuss a possible reconciliation of the logics of citizenship and democracy at an abstract theoretical level but she also proposes easily comprehensible political reforms.

To make her point, Kostakopoulou starts her journey by emphasizing two important, but mostly neglected, aspects in the scholarly debates on citizenship: first, retracing the history of citizenship, the author shows that citizenship as both a concept and an institution has evolved in a non-deterministic way (Chapter 1). Second, even those researchers who dispute

the normative relevance of national culture for political belonging and propose thin versions of nationalism are reluctant to make the case for a genuinely anational citizenship model (Chapters 2 and 3). The first aspect makes clear that there is no reason to believe that overcoming the nationality model of citizenship – and even its thinnest versions – is impossible. On the contrary, Kostakopoulou makes clear that it is each generation's duty to redesign its institutions so as to take into account changed circumstances and views of the world (p. 197).

Kostakopoulou's redesign turns around four main ideas, which are presented in subsequent chapters (3 to 7): naturalizations as a civic registration approach, citizenship based on domicile, citizenship as a variable geometry and the pluralist approach of incorporation. Although the order in which these ideas are presented does not necessarily follow a hierarchical logic from the more abstract to the more concrete and the interrelationships between these four ideas are not always made very explicit, the argumentation is very clear and most possible objections to her model are already anticipated.

The basic principles of Kostakopoulou's anational institutional design are citizenship based on domicile and the free will to choose a political belonging. Following the idea that democratic decision-making requires the involvement of all the community, it is domicile that attributes both relevance and weight to the connection that individuals have with a particular jurisdiction. In other words, all who live on a specific territory belong to the respective community. And as much as people are free to choose where to live they are free to choose their political belonging. Therefore, the only criterion for naturalization (beside absence of criminal records) is the subjective intention to reside indefinitely in a country. 'Indefinitely' does not mean that it cannot be dissolved. It rather means that dissolution does not feature as a relevant consideration at the moment of citizenship acquisition. Naturalization is thus mainly a process of civic registration, but still an important mechanism to define membership that is no longer based on ethnicity.

Against the objection that her model omits important requirements such as the acquisition of knowledge about the host society or language, Kostakopoulou retorts that the knowledge that is required to participate in politics is too complex to be captured by simple tests, and that there are enough examples of migrants with no linguistic knowledge who have contributed effectively in public life. To be sure that new arrivals do not seek to take advantage of the new state institutions there are indicators such as social ties, a professional career, membership in associations and many more to ascertain the intention to reside indefinitely in a country.

Is such a citizenship model too utopian? It is clear for Kostakopoulou that such an institutional reform cannot be introduced in a radical break (p. 201). As she shows in Chapter 6 on the variable geometry of citizenship, membership in a nation-state has never been clear-cut; there have always been many faces of differentiations within citizenship. New forms can therefore be introduced alongside established ones. The pluralist approach of incorporation which is presented in Chapter 7 proposes concrete pathways to inclusion and to making equal citizenship a reality. Some crucial objections, however, remain unanswered: how can we persuade citizens of a country to accept such a model? And if it is true that prejudice, which forms an obstacle to such a model, is often a by-product of nationalist discourse (p. 8), how can we avoid that part of the political elite produces such attitudes?

© 2009 Marc Helbling
Social Science Research Centre Berlin (WZB)

Mary Dewhurst Lewis, **THE BOUNDARIES OF THE REPUBLIC: MIGRANT RIGHTS AND THE LIMITS OF UNIVERSALISM IN FRANCE, 1918–1940**, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007, xv + 361 pp., \$24.95 (pb).

Mary Lewis examines French policies regarding immigrants through on-the-ground decisions in this illuminating study of the interwar years. The theoretical foil for her study

is 'Republicanism', an ideal, sometimes confused with historical reality, holding that the decisions of the French state are to be made according to rational rules applied universally, i.e. without regard to such particularities as ethnic origins. In the 1918–1940 period, Lewis demonstrates, the decisions with regard to immigrants were anything but universal.

France has a long history as an immigration society, as the historian Gerard Noiriel has documented. Yet the policy-making and -implementation of the interwar period lacked the guidance of core principles and the confidence in the success of integration efforts that this prior history should have inspired. Consequently, Lewis's account, perhaps of necessity given that the book also covers a period that girdles such tumultuous events as the end of the First World War, the Depression, and the run-up to the Second World War, is complex; she does an excellent job as a guide through the maze. The complexity was heightened by the political instability of the closing years of the Third Republic, which produced quicksilver shifts in France's political leadership. Certain tendencies, however, do emerge with clarity. Just after the war, national policy was grappling with the recruitment of foreign labour to rebuild the economy after the severe manpower losses in the trenches; and through a series of bilateral treaties France established an early guest-worker programme. The immediate postwar years also brought large numbers of refugees, such as the Armenians, to the Hexagon, and they proved the focus for vacillating policy stances. Then, during the Depression, the emphasis in policy was reversed as the goal became one of protecting French workers from economic competition with foreign workers. Finally, as war loomed again on the horizon, the state had an interest in forging bonds of reciprocal loyalty with as many mobilizable men as possible, and decision-making therefore leaned in favour of migrants.

Lewis's focus is on the rights that migrants could claim – in terms of residence, work and, ultimately, citizenship – and consequently she constructs her story to a large extent from the dossiers yielded by the archives of police, administrative and judicial agencies. It is this ground-level view of the working out of rights, which were not determined fully by national policy, that gives the book its spark. In the most interesting portion of the analysis from the perspective of immigration theory, Lewis shows that local agencies, placed at an intermediate administrative level and thus standing between the national state and the individual, were enormously consequential for decisions about rights. This finding emerges from a finely wrought comparison of two cities, Lyon and Marseille. Decisions in the two cities often turned out quite differently for similar cases: prefiguring Marseille's unusual place in the French immigration landscape today (for instance, the city was spared during the 2005 rioting), decisions there were relatively generous towards migrants, frequently converting them into long-term immigrants.

Wherever and whenever it took place, decision-making generally had to take into account, but not necessarily respect, a complex series of legal and social distinctions among migrants, and in this respect the Republican image of France is impossible to square with the record of those decisions. In the guest-worker period, it was much better, for example, to be Italian and thus a national of a country with which France had concluded a treaty than to be, say, Russian; it was also better to hold a job. It was usually better to have family present, especially if children were born in France. But the complexity of the panoply of distinctions, which shifted moreover from place to place and time to time, is impossible to convey in a brief space.

The contradictions between the Republican ideal and the treatment of migrants were especially glaring with respect to North Africans, who were French nationals but not citizens. They had begun to migrate to the metropole during the First World War, when their labour and military service were needed for the war effort. However, the welcome did not outlast the war, and during the 1920s, at the very moment when France was entering into treaties with European nations to recruit labour, North Africans were being rounded up and shipped home.

The Boundaries of the Republic is a brilliant corrective to a standard view that contrasts Republican and assimilationist France with, say, Germany of the past century and its ethno-cultural regime of rights. The book demonstrates the complex fault lines and intricate

administrative machinery on the basis of which French authorities went about deciding who was a temporary migrant and who was potentially an immigrant who could contribute to the national population. The story told by the book is especially revealing because it brings the focus down from the heights occupied by the national state, where policy-making gives the strongest appearance of being guided by principle, to the mundane levels of such local institutions as the police, where policy is in fact made through implementation and rights are ultimately defined. This story is not just of historical interest, for the same differentialist approach to the rights of migrants is all too visible today.

© 2009 Richard Alba
The Graduate Center, CUNY

Douglas S. Massey (ed.), **NEW FACES IN NEW PLACES: THE CHANGING GEOGRAPHY OF AMERICAN IMMIGRATION**, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2008, viii + 370 pp., \$42.50 (hb).

The growth of new immigrant destinations for Mexicans and other groups is one of the most important developments in recent US immigration. A quarter of the Mexico-born population of the United States lived in new destination states in 2000, up from just 10 per cent in 1990. The shift in new Mexican immigration away from California is particularly striking, declining from 63 per cent in 1990 to 28 per cent in 2000. In eleven empirical chapters and a well-synthesized introduction and conclusion, the editor and his collaborators explain why immigrants are settling in new destinations where they are received with great ambivalence.

In their introduction, Hirschman and Massey assess the many reasons that potentially explain the rise of new destinations, including the high cost of living in California, the saturation of its low-skilled labour markets, its hostile political environment toward unauthorized immigrants, and the greater freedom of mobility enjoyed by the 2.3 million Mexicans who legalized under the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) (though Donato and her colleagues find that new destinations attract a disproportionate number of Mexicans *recently* arrived in the United States). Massey argues that Mexicans in particular have increasingly migrated to new destinations as an unintended consequence of increased US border enforcement in urban areas of the southern border, which has shifted unauthorized migrants' crossing points from traditional places like San Diego and El Paso to remote areas of Arizona. While there is no question that the crossing points themselves have changed, the mechanism that would explain why migrants crossing in Arizona rather than California would then travel all the way to North Carolina, which implies first crossing other traditional destinations in the Southwest such as Texas, is not fully explained.

More compelling is the dual labour market explanation advanced in the text. American manufacturers and food processors faced unprecedented levels of foreign competition in the 1990s, even as US consumers' demand for poultry and pre-cut and pre-processed meats soared, leading the industry to move its factories to the Southeast and Midwest, areas with lower wages, less government regulation, weaker unions, and lower taxes. Even where factories were not relocated, their operations were radically deskilled and subcontracted in ways that made the jobs unpalatable for native workers. Employers grew to prefer Latino immigrants based on perceptions that they were a more compliant and industrious labour force. The secular trend toward population growth in the Sunbelt has also contributed to growing demand for labour in the construction and service sectors. Labour recruitment in Mexico and along the southern border initiated networked migration streams that quickly became self-perpetuating. These recruitment efforts targeting Mexicans, along with the low aggregate levels of human capital of Mexican migrants, powerfully explain why Mexicans have been more likely than other national-origin groups to disperse into the low wage jobs offered in new destinations, though, as the authors point out, other Latinos evince a similar pattern on a lesser scale.

Several of the chapters examine how Latino immigration has upset longstanding Southern notions of a black/white racial dichotomy. Marrow's chapter comparing ethnic conflict in two North Carolina counties argues that a greater proportion of African-Americans reduces political conflict because African-Americans have achieved a level of political representation that is not particularly threatened by mostly non-citizen and often unauthorized Latinos. On the other hand, a greater proportion of African-Americans is associated with more labour market conflict. The mechanism for the latter finding is not obvious, but the implication may be that a critical mass of African-Americans in certain occupational niches resists ethnic succession by newly arrived Latinos. If that is the case, then many employers' evident preference for Latino immigrant workers and the rapidity with which many occupational niches have been transformed from African-American to Latino suggest that greater conflict may be on the horizon, particularly in an economic downturn.

Another theoretically intriguing chapter is Jones-Correa's piece explaining why school officials in two counties surrounding Washington DC shifted significant resources to schools with growing numbers of poor immigrant students at a time of shrinking budgets and in the near absence of external political pressure. Jones-Correa concludes that the decisive explanation lies not in interest group politics, but rather in the professional norms and ideologies of education bureaucrats using public education as an instrument for engineering a more equitable and democratic society.

In sum, this volume is required reading for scholars of immigration to the United States. The introduction and conclusion would be appropriate for both advanced undergraduate and graduate classes.

© 2009 David Fitzgerald
Department of Sociology
University of California, San Diego

Sigrid Metz-Göckel, Mirjana Morokvasic and A. Senganata Müntz (eds), **MIGRATION AND MOBILITY IN AN ENLARGED EUROPE: A GENDER PERSPECTIVE**, Opladen and Farmington Hills, MI: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 2008, 304 pp., €20.90/£19.95/\$34.90 (pb).

Migration and Mobility in an Enlarged Europe: A Gender Perspective, which emerged from two conferences in 2005 and 2006, provides an invaluable perspective on (mainly) women's transnational mobility and migrations from and within Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). Sigrid Metz-Göckel, Mirjana Morokvasic and A. Senganata Müntz have compiled a multidisciplinary set of essays, one of the many strengths of this book, ranging from sociology to history, political science, geography and anthropology. The twelve contributions, in addition to the introduction, are organized in four parts.

The first three chapters contextualize the European landscape of the division of labour, in which post-wall mobility and migration are inextricably embedded. Krystyna Slany thoroughly lays out different systems that have influenced women's migration from and within CEE, followed by the presentation of socio-demographic data. Claudia Finotelli challenges the "'north-south axis' thesis' (p. 53) in terms of rigidity in immigration control, and convincingly shows that the toleration of irregular migrant domestics and caregivers serves as a *common* solution to structural demands for reproductive labour in both Italy and Germany. Providing ample descriptive statistics, Ludovica Banfi maintains that the resurgence of paid domestic work in Italy is determined by the level of educational attainment and professional status of employers, whereas it is women's employment status that plays a decisive role in hiring nannies.

Moving away from quantitative analysis, the next two parts offer richly textured analysis based on fieldwork. The three articles in Part II invite the reader into the micro world of employer-employee relationships. Ayşe Akalin's chapter stands out for its inquiry into *female employers'* active role in the making of flexible migrant domestics and caregivers. It reveals

dynamic processes of 'making' according to the normative Turkish cultural codes of domesticity and femininity while arguably the processes take linear steps. Dobrochna Kalwa analyses how Polish female migrant domestic workers actively mobilize their cultural knowledge of private life at home in negotiating structural constraints in their workplace in Germany. Sabine Hess contends that au pairs are yet another category of domestic workers, which is often disguised in the name of cultural exchange in the public discourse. The rationality of the moral economy in au pairs' supposed 'happy family integration' (p. 143) obliterates their worker status.

Part III highlights a resourceful quality in migration. David Karjanen conceptualizes the nature of women's accelerated cross-border mobility from CEE to post-industrial Western Europe as 'Just-in-Time' migration. He captures women's high mobility responding not only to sudden demands from employers, but also to social needs of family and friends. Hitherto, transnational mobility scholarship has emphasized a rather instrumental relationship to the place where women are migrating for work. In contrast, Norbert Cyrus's compelling analysis of illegally employed Polish domestics brings to the fore the cultivation of a new life-world in Berlin. Successful management of transnational lives, with the passage of time, culminates in pride, self-esteem, and multi-local attachment among Polish migrant women. Müntz examines how Polish migrant domestics and caregivers managed to find work in Germany, depicting four different personal and meso-level networks. Roos Pijpers vividly demonstrates how labour market restrictions in the Dutch-German Lower Rhine border region were circumvented in a complex, struggle-bound interplay between Polish migrants, labour recruiters, employers and Dutch authorities, which has enabled mobility among Polish agricultural workers.

The final part moves to broader issues of migrations from and to Poland. Dorota Praszalowicz puts contemporary Polish migrations into a historical perspective and offers insights into Polish migration studies which help the reader understand why certain streams are rendered invisible in academic discourses. The essay by Slany and Magdalena Ślusarczyk concerns new developments in Poland's immigration policy, which was implemented in a top-down manner and mainly concerns migrant impacts on labour markets.

While the introduction establishes the gendered dimension of mobility, I would have liked a more critical, elaborated theoretical engagement with the debate on transnationalism in relation to mobility, given that the majority of the contributions adopt a transnational perspective. This would have been a unique chance to bring European and gender perspectives into the larger ongoing transatlantic debate on transnationalism. This comment aside, the book is a highly stimulating read, with a well-balanced selection of quantitative and qualitative analysis, which attends to the context and historical specificity. Moreover, the volume does not fall into the structure-agency divide, but rather shows a continuum between the two, particularly in investigating the unprecedented intensity of women's flows into 'feminized' sectors on an 'off-the-books' basis as well as their precarious migration status. As hinted at in the introduction, this provides a useful starting point for discussion pertinent to the question of whether new mobility has led to the empowerment of migrant women (Kalwa, Cyrus), or the reinforcement of gender orders (Karjanen), in the intersection of 'race', class and gender.

© 2009 Kyoko Shinozaki
Department of Social Sciences
University of Frankfurt am Main

Panikos Panayi, **SPICING UP BRITAIN: THE MULTICULTURAL HISTORY OF BRITISH FOOD**, London: Reaktion Books, 2008, 283 pp., £19.95 (hb).

This is an instance where the title of a book promises less than it delivers. A glance at the glossy cover of Panikos Panayi's gastronomic expedition, *Spicing up Britain*, suggests that this is merely a volume about the history of Asian food in Britain. The reality is that it is

much more than this, for what Panayi has produced is a widely researched and detailed account of 'foreign food' in Britain set within the framework of the changing eating habits and lifestyles of the indigenous population over a period of more than 150 years. However, such an account cannot be undertaken without detailing the waves of immigrants whose presence has brought ethnic food to the tables of Britain. In all, this is a book about food, culture, ethnicity and identity, economic activity and mobility, and last, but not least, immigration in Britain.

Though the author presents the history of foreign food in Britain in chronological order, he initially anchors the book with a discourse on the contradictions which allow for the belief by some that British food is of 'poor quality and blandness' whilst others promote twenty-first-century Britain as 'one of the leading culinary centres in the world' (p. 12). A trawl through the changing face of food in Britain as it appears in the writing and marketing of English and foreign cookery books since the Victorian era helps explain the paradox. Though some may still consider traditional British food as unexciting and lacking in spice compared to that introduced by immigrants or Anglo-Indians returning from 'over there', others, such as the chef Gary Rhodes who is quoted as believing that British food is 'simple – with wonderful ingredients' (p. 13), have brought English cuisine to Michelin star heights.

This is a book which can operate on a number of levels and thus appeal to a range of readers. On one level it provides a straightforward and detailed account of the processes of immigration and settlement in Britain. Commencing with the Irish in the mid-nineteenth century and progressing through the German, Italian, Chinese and Central and Eastern European Jewish incomers in the years before the First World War, and continuing through to the migrants from the New Commonwealth who arrived in the second half of the twentieth century, the reader is provided with a mosaic of dietary habits, recipe books and food outlets, all indebted to the migrant presence. What emerges is a pattern of immigrant dietary need – or desire – being transformed into migrant entrepreneurship through small retail outlets providing for co-migrants. In the case of a significant few these have translated into large-scale economic success stories, as in the case of nationally and internationally renowned companies such as Tesco, J. Lyons, Patak's and Noon Products. At the same time as ethnic foods began to find their place in the range of consumer items favoured by British shoppers in supermarkets as traditionally British as Sainsbury's, so 'foreign' restaurants began to take up increasing space on the high streets of the nation.

The author divides the transformatory processes into three stages: the age of austerity; the years of culinary revolution; and the success of culinary revolution (pp. 187–209). In the context of migration we can see these as (a) the period of New Commonwealth entry – and the gradual opening of ethnic retail outlets; (b) the closing of that open door – and the establishment of Chinese and Indian restaurants from John O'Groats to Land's End; and (c) the arrival of migrants from the European Union and the presence of Eastern European staff in almost every restaurant and coffee lounge across the country. In the context of the nation's eating habits the three stages have now conflated and it becomes increasingly difficult to separate the indigene from the immigrant as the eating habits of both can now be catalogued as multicultural.

It is with the issue of multiculturalism that we can move to another plane, that of food and its relationship with identity. Panayi quotes Brillat-Savarin's 1825 aphorism, 'Tell me what you eat: I will tell you what you are' (p. 40), as the entrée to a discourse on the way food plays a part in the construction of national identity. An early example is in an English cookbook published in 1953 – still the age of austerity. The author, chef Philip Harben, considered that the 'Asian' national dish was rice – he did not denote national differences on the Asian continent – that of Germany the sausage, that of Italy macaroni, that of Scotland porridge, and that of Britain fish and chips (pp. 26–27). These are essentially 'national' foods, and one wonders how Harben would have dealt with a modern-day multicultural Britain in which, during Ramadan, Muslims eat bacon and eggs before sunrise; members of extreme right-wing nationalist groups go for a curry and a beer after a football match; and a young

Pakistani woman in East London can state that, 'Eating cornflakes for breakfast doesn't make me British.'

Spicing up Britain is a fascinating, accessible and enjoyable journey through British food and immigration history. It illustrates the way in which the nation's diet has changed – for the better – over the past 150 years and how immigration has influenced the eating habits of a nation. The book is one that can rightly demand its place on academic bookshelves and on those of lovers of food alike.

© 2009 Anne J. Kershen

Department of Politics

Queen Mary, University of London

Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer, **ANTISEMITIC MYTHS: A HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY ANTHOLOGY**, 2008, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 384 pp., \$24.95 (pb).

To subvert the Queen's Christmas Message to her subjects this year, Channel 4 Television hosts, unchallenged, Holocaust denier and antisemite Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, so its viewers can benefit from hearing his 'alternative world view'. A friend in South America emails this New Year: 'Today there's a big banner just outside my place (very central location, as you remember) by the Communist Party saying "Israel the Nazis of the Middle East" and showing the Israeli flag with a swastika inside the Magen David ... made me tremble, to be honest.'

The children and grandchildren of the Jews who fled to Israel from anti-Jewish racism in Europe, in the Middle East and in Russia have not yet found peace and neither has the antisemitism from which they fled been defeated. Israelis act and they interact with their neighbours; wisely and stupidly, aggressively and defensively, employing racist ways of thinking and antiracist ways of thinking.

When Jews act in the world their actions are often understood within antisemitic discourse and are often narrated using antisemitic language, but these processes are not usually conscious and are not usually clearly understood. Even many antiracists are only dimly aware of the nature of the rich resources of antisemitic assumption, trope and image which lie deep in the cultural unconscious and which sometimes shape the way that they themselves think about actually existing Jews who act in the world.

It is for this reason particularly that the material presented by editors Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer in *Antisemitic Myths: A Historical and Contemporary Anthology* is important. 'The Jewish Question' is again high on the agenda, is a live issue, for much respectable, intellectual and anti-bourgeois thought, although it is not at the moment so important in mass culture. 'The Jews' are thought to have thrown their lot in with imperialism in the Middle East, to have succeeded in joining a white 'Judeo-Christian' elite in America and to have dodged the line of racist fire in Europe by constructing Muslims as the 'new Jews'. The Holocaust piety of the 1990s is being smashed up by the taboo-breaking excitement of Holocaust blasphemy. Constructions of 'the Jews' in terms of ultimate morality or absolute victimhood are being replaced by more apparently radical ones. It again appears to be respectable to think of 'the Jews' as powerful, secretly cohesive, disproportionately influential and susceptible to the temptation of committing cold-blooded acts of child-killing.

Perry and Schweitzer offer us a compilation of Jew-hatred's greatest hits across the centuries. They give us extracts from texts demonstrating Christian demonization of Jews and blood libel; Jewish responsibility for Plague and how the Jews were expelled from Spain; from Martin Luther to Voltaire, the Catholic Church to Marx, the Dreyfuss affair to the pogroms, conspiracy theory to the Holocaust, Soviet antisemitism to Islamist and African American antisemitism.

This is material that every antiracist should know. This is material that everybody who wants to talk about Israel and Palestine should understand. This is material with which anybody who wants to be able to judge whether or not a contemporary text is antisemitic needs to be familiar.

Yet I fear that the material is presented in this 'anthology' in a form which is as likely to repel as to absorb contemporary antiracists. This is not only because today's anti-Zionist *Zeitsgeist* contains within itself a significant degree of auto-immunity against a serious consideration of antisemitism. It is also because the book is constructed within a political and sociological framework which is not going to be able to educate a new generation of antiracist activists and scholars on the nature and history of antisemitic mystification.

The book presents antisemitism less as a racism alongside other racisms and more as an ahistorical and unchanging fact of human history. While the aim of the work is not to offer a sociological or historical account of the causes and natures of distinct manifestations of Jew-hatred in different times and different places, it is not as concerned as it might be to problematize similarities and differences or to grapple with the complexity of geographical and historical contingencies. The material seems to respond to the characteristically antisemitic view which positions 'the Jews' at the centre of world history by attempting to thrust instead the antisemite into that pre-eminent position. It offers little explanation as to why and how the central themes of Jew-hatred reappear and reinvent themselves in radically different times, contexts and places.

Perry and Schweitzer repeat a standard misreading of Marx's *On the Jewish Question*, arguing that Marx was an antisemite, and in doing so they miss a key wider point of which Marx himself was acutely aware. Antisemitism is not only bad for Jews but when it is found within radical thought it is also an indicator of a wider sickness. In my view antisemitism is to be found, now hidden, now less so, as a potentiality within much contemporary anti-hegemonic, radical, liberal and socialist commonsense, and its presence there should be taken seriously by those of us for whom such political movements are important.

It is because antisemitism is a live and virulent threat that sociologically and politically sophisticated engagement with it is required. This book offers much necessary material but it does so within a framework which will not help to regenerate radical thought as much as it could do.

© 2009 David Hirsh
Lecturer in Sociology
Goldsmiths, University of London

Stephen Selka, **RELIGION AND THE POLITICS OF ETHNIC IDENTITY IN BAHIA, BRAZIL**, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007 (New World Diasporas series), 152 pp., \$59.95 (hb).

Stephen Selka's *Religion and the Politics of Ethnic Identity in Bahia, Brazil* addresses a puzzle that has haunted students of race: why the Latin American country with the largest population of Afro-descendants, a long history of slavery, and visible racial inequalities, has yet to develop a significant black movement?

Selka, a professor of African Diaspora Studies at Indiana University, attempts to solve this puzzle by focusing on the relationship between religion and black identity in the state of Bahia, known for its predominant Afro-Brazilian cultural traditions. Yet, he takes into account the difficulties involved in raising black consciousness in a nation that celebrates *mestiçagem* – the racial mixing of African, European and indigenous peoples – and whose religious syncretism allowed for the blending of Catholic principles and saints with African deities and rituals. It is very usual for Brazilians to attend both mass and a *candomblé* service.

Thus, *Religion and the Politics of Ethnic Identity in Bahia, Brazil* is an in-depth analysis of the link between religion and black identity, in which Selka avoids the temptation of focusing exclusively on the most African of all Brazilian religions: *candomblé*. In fact, his study of

black identity formation in Catholic and evangelical organizations is what makes this book provocative. Pentecostal churches in Brazil are generally hostile to Afro-Brazilian religions, labelled as 'cults for the devil'. Yet, as Selka demonstrates, many evangelicals are of African descent and, therefore, do not oppose black culture and religion. Moreover, some Protestant and Pentecostal groups are even engaged, directly or indirectly, in the politics of black identity.

Culture, religion and race in Brazil thus reflect the hybridity, syncretism and mixture which are at the very centre of representations of Brazilian nationality. This is, of course, acknowledged by Selka, a fine observer of the country's reality, which makes him argue that Afro-Brazilian identity is based on multiple and overlapping cultural, religious and political sources. In order to understand this identity, he points to the importance of avoiding any idea of essentialism and purity. According to Selka, *this is the reality of the African diaspora*, characterized by heterogeneity, unboundedness and hybridity. Thus, even a typical Afro-Brazilian religion such as *candomblé* cannot represent an untainted symbol of Brazilian blackness, since it is also embraced by a very large number of white citizens.

Selka further reinforces his argument by drawing on postmodern theoretical approaches. For him, the Brazilian black movement and its strategies are better grasped in the light of the literature on new social movements and cultural studies. Indeed, by placing identity, recognition and eradication of racial inequalities as its main goals, this movement has transcended the conventional struggle for tangible goals such as material goods and political power. Also, this perspective permits the author to treat culture not as a mere resource, but as a terrain of political struggle. The cultural practices of Afro-Brazilians, in this sense, acquire a political dimension insofar as they help to integrate African culture into representations of Brazilianness.

Selka also acknowledges that, despite a recent growth of black consciousness in Brazil, most of the black population still reject race-based politics, and do not identify themselves as Afro-Brazilians. His data clearly show that, while Brazilians do perceive the reality of racism, black organizations remain weak and voting patterns never conform to racial lines. An Afro-Brazilian consciousness is poorly developed even in the state of Bahia, seen as the 'Rome' of Afro-Brazilian culture.

Selka's overall explanation of the black movement's weakness, however, is clearly unsatisfactory. Eventually, he reproduces the movement's discourse, insisting that the ideologies of *mestiçagem* and racial democracy represent crucial obstacles to the construction of a *genuine* black consciousness. That is, Selka contradicts his own findings about the mixed nature of Afro-Brazilian identity, once it has drawn on different religions and cultures. His conclusion, then, brings us back to the question: how could Brazilians separate the *authentic* black elements from a culture in which African and European legacies are so closely intertwined? Indeed, the black groups in Brazil, which continue to pursue an essentialist line, have been mostly inspired by North American black Protestantism and Caribbean Rastafarianism, as well as by reggae and hip-hop, and the lifestyles associated with those rhythms, rather than by any feature of Afro-Brazilian culture.

These shortcomings notwithstanding, Selka's book is a well-written and richly detailed book, and will certainly become a reference for race studies in Brazil. The challenges facing analysts of Afro-Brazilian identity stem from the complex and peculiar ways in which religion, politics and racial consciousness have historically developed and intertwined in that country.

© 2009 Leone Sousa
Researcher, Sociology Department
University of Brasília, Brazil

© 2009 Paulo César Nascimento
Assistant Professor, Political Science Department
University of Brasília, Brazil

Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (eds), **WHITE LOGIC, WHITE METHODS: RACISM AND METHODOLOGY**, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2008, vii + 416 pp., \$36.95 (hb).

Bearing such a title, the new text from sociologists Tukufu Zuberi (University of Pennsylvania) and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (Duke University) aims to capture attention. By 'white logic, white methods' the editors refer not to a racial-essentialist claim, but to a context in which White supremacy has defined the techniques, practical tools, and processes of reasoning used to manufacture empirical data and analysis to support racist conclusions. By directly confronting what many understand as a value-neutral, impartial, and non-racialized field of social science, the editors and authors of the twenty-chaptered tome deliver their '... first collaborative effort to attack White supremacy in contemporary research on race as well as the methods most sociologists employ' (p. 4). In so doing, they explain how fundamental social scientific research methods and their underlying logics were established from and with a 'White' perspective, they survey how our understandings of race affect the shape of the field, and they propose alternative approaches for the practice of sociology in ways that contest the spectre of White supremacy that haunts it.

The varied chapters of *White Logic, White Methods* are held together by two complementary arguments. The first is a critique of what they call the 'race effect'. By this term, they mean to illuminate how a majority of sociological practice approaches race as either biological reality or unalterable individual characteristic. Such a perspective places a conceptual limitation on the researcher's ability to understand racial dynamics. Thus, when a sociologist writes that the 'effect of being Black on mortality is equivalent to over five years of increased age' (conventional in statistical methods), the character of the racialized individual becomes the causal factor, rather than the dynamics of unequal race relations. In this case, the sociologist's interpretation of the relationship between race and life expectancy is not based on empirical data, but is rather generated by the biases engendered by common statistical reasoning – an epistemological tradition born from eugenic-statisticians such as Francis Galton and Karl Pearson. Hence, the real question is not how a person's race causes (dis)advantage, but is rather how society responds to an individual's particular racial make-up. The authors write, 'When we forget or make slight of this point, social science becomes the justification for racial stratification' (p. 7).

The second argument concerns the quiet that follows the critique of the 'race effect'. This point is most appropriate given that the manuscript is not the first to lend voice to the assault on the racialized positivism of social science. It follows in a line of texts such as Joyce A. Ladner's *The Death of White Sociology* (1973), Patricia Hill Collins's *Black Feminist Thought* (2000), and Bruce R. Hare's *Race Odyssey 2001* (2002). Despite these landmark publications, the authors are particularly troubled by what they feel is a silent acceptance of research methods that promote racist conclusions in the face of counter-evidence. They write, '... it is the silence about the misuse of racial statistics as a cover for wrongheaded ideas about race across academic disciplines that remains at the heart of the problem' (p. 12). In this light, Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva's words are a clarion call for the renewed defence of social constructivism in a day and age in which biological determinist arguments are experiencing revival. This resurgence is due not only to the seductive simplicity of biological or race-as-individual characteristic arguments, but is also due to a patterned reluctance to critically engage such narratives within Western sociology's flagship journals, associations, meetings, textbooks and common discourse.

The authors are careful to posit that such domination is not monolithic, but has been and continues to be accompanied by resistance that lights the way '... to topple the reign of White logic and White methodology in sociology and in the social sciences' (p. 20). Their struggle is operationalized through a three-pronged attack: (1) the outline of alternative epistemologies, (2) the stoppage of research on the 'race effect' coupled with the examination of how systemic racial stratification produces disparate outcomes among racialized groups,

and (3) the production of both knowledge and action that unequivocally side with the racially oppressed.

Accordingly, the text's chapters, written by sociologists, law professors, communication scholars, and even statisticians, provide a rich array of techniques toward achieving this tripartite goal. Particularly insightful chapters are Oscar H. Gandy's treatise on the uncertainty of statistics, Charles A. Gallagher's section on new strategies for research in a supposed 'color-blind' era, and the narrative of John H. Stanfield II, whose deft concision illuminates many marginalized sociologists who deviated from the norm of White supremacist reasoning. Overall, the chapters show how 'White' sociology is less empirically grounded in the realities of racial inequality than it is an anaesthetic for those within its own ranks: '... like a painkilling drug, we want feel-good sociological analysis of race relations as a reflection of historically specific public cultures, which demand feel-good race relations' (p. 278).

In this vein, I was quite pleased to note the text's absence of the common strategy of salvaging and excusing both Western science and American society. Endemic to the liberal 'race-relations' bulwark, this approach often frames racism as a striking contradiction in American democracy, rather than a cornerstone of American thought, practice, and identity. By refusing to engage in the mystic moralizing of American 'exceptionalism', the text drives home a crucial point – the rise of professional sociology has almost perfect correlation with its decreasing ability to document, explain, and contest the existence and maintenance of a White supremacist society.

Unfortunately, I am wary of mainstream sociology's response to the text. When the tables turn to posit 'White' science itself as the data to be scrutinized and pathologized, a most unkind retaliation is often forthcoming. That such a response is so likely only gestures toward the necessity to provide data, counter-narratives and other intellectual weaponry toward the critique of White supremacy and normativity in its manifestation as 'science'. Yet the text does not rest on criticism alone. While the editors' choice of title seemingly centres the book in the Kantian enterprise of the critique of reason which has a storied tradition (e.g. Sartre, Spivak, Benjamin, Butler, Bourdieu, and Marx), they are not content with pointing out and judging the misdemeanours of sociology or the miscarriages of race research. The text summons and multiplies a resistive sociology of imagination that supplies pragmatic solutions. This is its greatest strength – it opens up a way to speak into what is currently an abyss of deafening silence.

© 2009 Matthew W. Hughey
Department of Sociology
University of Virginia