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The contrast he draws between the paucity of such activity in Japan and the energetic political dissent in the United States is a splendid instance of the thesis. In the case of Japan, the feudal roots of constitutional democracy legitimized the preservation of a social and political hierarchy that was not consistent with the ideal of equality. Further, Japanese culture is conceived in terms of a collective identity that is founded on a religious image—the divinity of the race. Consequently, civil society is virtually indistinguishable from the state because both are conflated into the national community of the Japanese race. In the result, dissent is muted and never seeks to reconfigure the political domain.

The United States, on the other hand, functions under a very different set of historical conditions. Because hierarchy is superseded by a fundamental acceptance of political equality, socialist movements (unlike Europe) have been marginalized. Moreover, the forging of an American identity has occurred through an indigenous Protestant utopianism. Religious symbols and ideals express the piety of the American vision which the grubby world of politics constantly threatens to undermine. Hence, protest movements in America seek to purify the body politic. Disagreements over how the “purification” (61) is to be achieved define the competing agendas for the reconstitution of the political realm. For example, leftists advocate experimentation and innovation while rightists preach traditional values.

Many lessons can be drawn from this book. Perhaps the most important is that we ought not be sanguine about the future of democracy even though no serious rivals to it presently exist. Modern constitutional democratic regimes are built upon fault lines that can always fissure, especially in periods of great change. The rapacious economic globalization that we are undergoing today is surely one of those periods.

The concluding two chapters of Paradoxes of Democracy emphasize the role of trust in preserving the social equilibrium. Without trust, the dynamism of democracy cannot be positively channeled. It is an inevitable fact of modern democratic life that there will be constant efforts to redefine the political realm. The end result will be stable only if the political fabric is held together by trust. Indeed, it may well be ironic that the greatest challenges to democracy are just now emerging as its totalitarian, fascist and communist competitors leave the stage.

Eisenstadt’s thorough scholarship and complex writing style sometimes made it hard to keep track of the overall argument. But a careful and patient reading will be richly rewarded.

BRIAN DONOHUE  Sudbury College, Laurentian University

Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging
Stephen Castles and Alastair Davidson
New York: Routledge, 2000, pp. xiii, 258

There is an emerging consensus around the idea that globalization is weakening the nation-state and ushering in new modes of political organization. Scholars of migration and citizenship have picked up on this theme and argued that heightened levels of immigration caused by globalization have challenged traditional forms of citizenship. Castles and Davidson’s Citizenship and Migration offers one of the clearest and most detailed presentations of this argument.

The authors claim that “basing citizenship on a singular or individual membership in a nation-state is no longer adequate, since the nation-state
itself is being severely eroded” (viii). The way forward lies in theorizing a “new kind of state that is not constituted exclusively or mainly around the nexus of territoriality and belonging” (24). Rather, citizenship should be based on membership in a political community “without any claim to common cultural community” (24). However, since we are likely to continue living in a world of nation-states well into the future, policies such as official multiculturalism, dual citizenship and group rights for minorities should be utilized to deal with the challenges of globalization and to help smooth the way toward more appropriate forms of citizenship practice. By the same token, purely descent-based citizenship regimes should be abandoned along with nationalism, xenophobia and antiquated republican virtues based on the “warrior ethic.” Rules governing entry into and exit out of putatively sovereign states should also be revised to accommodate the needs of migrants shuttling between destinations in transnational networks.

The book is divided into 10 chapters. Chapters 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are attributed to Castles, while 2, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are Davidson’s. The authors’ decision to make this division of labour explicit is based on the fact that they did not always reach agreement (ix). The first chapter underscores the claim that globalization has undermined traditional notions of citizenship by exacerbating the inherent tension between universal rights and national homogeneity. It is followed by a useful survey of citizenship theories, spanning ancient Greece and Rome, through the Enlightenment and French Revolution, to the present era of globalization. Subsequent chapters touch on a variety of topics, including the formation and “racialization” of ethnic minorities, laws governing citizenship and naturalization, group rights for women and ethnic minorities, and processes of immigrant mobilization. In chapter 7, entitled “The End of National Belonging,” Castles and Davidson argue that multiculturalism policies and group rights do not go far enough in addressing the challenge of globalization because they fail to transcend the limits of the state. What is needed, they contend, are forms of supranational citizenship, modeled after citizenship in the European Union (EU). Chapter 8 provides a useful service by examining globalization and citizenship in the Asia-Pacific region; an otherwise neglected area in immigration studies.

As the preceding summary suggests, this is an ambitious book. For the most part, it is convincing because of Castles and Davidson’s familiarity with an impressive range of regions, countries and theories. However, the authors’ preference for a particular form of post-national, multicultural citizenship leads to several significant omissions. Most obviously, the overall success of the United States, Canada, Australia, and even France in incorporating large numbers of immigrants into citizenship suggests that contrary to the book’s central thesis, the nation-state and citizenship need not be rendered obsolete by globalization. Rather, what is noteworthy is the extent to which conceptions of national identity and citizenship have been stretched to accommodate newcomers’ identities and demands. Conversely, Castles and Davidson’s glowing depiction of European Union citizenship in chapter 7 largely ignores issues such as the “democratic deficit” and exclusion of non-EU nationals that have taken much of the lustre off supranational European citizenship. Similarly, the authors’ focus on formal means of immigrant incorporation causes them to overlook the role of consumerism and popular culture in integrating immigrants, particularly in the United States. “Market-driven” multiculturalism provides avenues for recognition that may be just as important as state-based remedies. Finally, and perhaps most importantly for political scientists, Castles and Davidson do not pay enough attention to the politics of immigration and citizenship. They neglect the increasingly important domes-
tic political cleavage pitting coalitions of progressive political forces against nationalist rivals. This last deficiency is all the more telling given the book's subtitle. It may have been remedied if the authors had taken competing arguments into account. There is a growing list of scholars including Miriam Feldblum, Randall Hansen and Christian Joppke who downplay the singular importance of globalization and point instead to domestic sources of change to citizenship norms and conceptions of national identity. Their work is not cited in Castles and Davidson's otherwise extensive bibliography.

In sum, Citizenship and Migration is an important, if controversial, addition to the literature on immigration, citizenship and globalization. It is suitable for senior undergraduates and graduate students, as well as specialists.

**Triadafilos Triadafilopoulos** *New School for Social Research*

**The Federal Future of Europe: From European Community to the European Union**
Dusan Sidjanski

*The Federal Future of Europe* is a sound and well-researched piece of scholarship and advocacy on Europe and the process of European integration. As noted by Jacques Delors in the introductory note, Dusan Sidjanski presents a continental perspective on the processes of European integration, a standpoint that will be of particular interest to Canadian scholars with interests in the study of Europe. This perspective asserts the importance of the federal approach in understanding the contemporary transformations of Europe, and while many Western scholars, particularly those in North America, might find this approach surprising, Sidjanski is treading in the footsteps of Alberta Sbragia's *Euro-Politics* (Washington: Brookings, 1992), and the more recent *The Choice for Europe*, by Andrew Moravcsik (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), both highly relevant contributions that attempt to arrive at the most complete and accurate explanations of the processes of European integration. Sbragia, as early as 1992, suggested an institutional model for the European Union similar to Germany's federal system (Sbragia, 1992, 257-295). In contrast, Moravcsik's view is that states' power determines the outcomes of interstates bargaining and that the European Union is an intergovernmental regime (Moravcsik, 7).

As stated earlier, *The Federal Study of Europe* has a dual purpose. First, Sidjanski makes the theoretical claim that a federalist approach provides the grounds for understanding the processes of European integration. In addition, however, Sidjanski's faith in the federalist argument also leads him to make a more political claim: the future of Europe is necessarily federal. Relying on social and historical descriptions, Sidjanski suggests that a federal Europe will emerge from the European integration process. Sidjanski's case for a future federal Europe is a strong one, bolstered by his answers to certain key questions: for example, why federalism has been a key founding idea of European integration and why federalism will remain a necessity.

Sidjanski's belief is that only a federal Europe can address contemporary European issues effectively, because only federalism can provide the necessary unity in diversity against the fragmenting effect of nationalism and intolerance. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the fragmentation and implosion of Yugoslavia are reminders and warnings that Europe, and particularly the new and forming European Union, has been and may still be prey to national rivalries and ethnic, religious and cultural intolerance (3).