

accused Japanese indigenous theories of, at best, atavism and, at worst, nationalism, are themselves limited by the paucity of their own thinking and stuck in modernist modes of comparative analysis. Anthony Giddens, as an exemplar of mainstream Western sociological thought, is a particular target. Instead, it may be the Japanese tradition, with its more holistic approach to sociological explanation, that is in the vanguard of sociological theory.

*Difference and Modernity* is not easy reading. The book reads more like a series of essays than a single monograph and the overall argument is often opaque, at times almost contradictory. The problem is exacerbated by an unacceptable number of typographical errors which, at points, make passages virtually unintelligible. This is a shame, since if one perseveres one discovers that the volume offers an invigorating and exciting way forward from many of the moribund debates about the social theory of Japan that have characterized the past fifteen years.

Roger Goodman  
Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology  
University of Oxford

Rainer Bauböck, **TRANSNATIONAL CITIZENSHIP: MEMBERSHIP AND RIGHTS IN INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION**, Aldershot, Hants [U.K.]: Edward Elgar, 1994, x + 348 pp., £39.95.

Citizenship is a Janus-faced institution. Its internal face, seen from within a single polity, is inclusive, universalist, egalitarian. Its external face, seen from the perspective of the global state system or of humanity as a whole, is exclusive, particularist, inegalitarian. Diverging economic, political, ecological and epidemiological conditions of life between rich and poor countries, densening global networks of communication and transportation, and mounting global migration pressures have made the exclusive external workings of citizenship more visible and more problematic in recent years. For individuals, the possession of a particular citizenship, automatically governed (in the vast majority of instances) by the morally arbitrary circumstances of birthplace and parentage, profoundly shapes life chances. For prosperous and peaceful states, citizenship is a powerful counter-entropic barrier, to borrow an image from the late Ernest Gellner, helping to maintain vast interstate disparities in living conditions by protecting favoured labour markets, welfare institutions and other public and private spaces against the migrant poor.

This picture of the external exclusiveness of citizenship, to be sure, is in certain respects overdrawn. Imagine two ideal-typical modes of organizing membership in a world of territorial polities. In the first model, rights in territorial polities, as well as the right to enter such polities, are reserved exclusively for their citizens. If non-citizens are admitted to such polities (to work, for example), their legal status remains sharply distinct from that of citizens, and they have no right to acquire citizenship themselves, or even to remain in the polity. Now imagine a radically contrasting model. Any person could enter any territorial polity at will; and all residents would enjoy the same rights. In the first, radically statist, model citizenship is maximally exclusive externally. In the second, radically cosmopolitan, model citizenship as bounded membership would cease to exist.

Our world displays features of both models. In some states (paradigmatically the labour-importing states of the Persian Gulf), the organization of membership approximates the first model; in some restricted regions (paradigmatically the European Union) it approximates the second. But how *should* membership be organized in an increasingly mobile and transnationally structured world? In particular, what implications do liberal and democratic commitments have for the organization of membership? Liberal and democratic theory have traditionally been internalist, implicitly or explicitly taking as their frame of reference a single political community as an already bounded legal, social, cultural and

moral space. In what ways can their scope be extended to address and problematize the very boundaries they traditionally presuppose?

It is these questions that animate and inform Rainer Bauböck's *Transnational Citizenship*. This wide-ranging and closely-argued book is the most impressive attempt to date to confront the challenge posed by international migration to the traditional theory and practice of citizenship. While rejecting radically cosmopolitan calls for a global citizenship that would supersede citizenship of particular states, Bauböck argues that a truly liberal and democratic citizenship must become transnational, that substantive citizenship rights must extend beyond the boundaries of formal legal citizenship and beyond the territorial frontiers of the state. Although they may remain nominal citizens of their states of origin, for example, immigrants must (by virtue of their social membership) be accorded substantive citizenship rights in the state in which they reside (as well as the optional right to acquire the formal citizenship of that state). This particular point has been argued often enough before. What is distinctive and valuable about this book is less this overall thesis than the sustained, thoughtful, detailed engagement of a whole series of thorny issues connected with citizenship, membership and rights, including (and this list is by no means exhaustive) the principles that ought to govern the attribution of citizenship at birth, its acquisition through naturalization, and its loss through expatriation and denaturalization; the impossibility of democratic self-determination in questions of the separation and fusion of political units; the connection between citizenship and human rights; the tension between individual citizenship and collective rights; and the vexed question of whether there should be a global right of free movement. Bauböck's densely presented arguments on these and other issues defy brief summary, and they will not be easygoing for a reader without some interest and grounding in normative political theory. But the arguments are always clear and cogent, drawing in an illuminating manner on both classical and contemporary liberal and democratic theory, and bringing these to bear on problems of migration and membership. For this reason, *Transnational Citizenship* is likely to become a standard point of reference for ongoing debates about these increasingly urgent political and moral problems.

Rogers Brubaker

Department of Sociology  
University of California, Los Angeles

Z. Syed, Abedin and Ziaddin Sardar (eds), **MUSLIM MINORITIES IN THE WEST**, London: Grey Seal Books, 1995, £25.00.

Studies on Islam in the past have been critical of Orientalist constructions of Muslims. This book suffers from a different form of centrism by constructing an Occident and simultaneously essentializes Muslims. It is Occidental in that it constructs a unified West, which demonizes Islam in the post Cold War world; essentialist in that while conceding ethnic, political, social and economic diversities of Muslims, it subsumes these differences within an Islamic perspective.

This unified, undifferentiated Occident's antipathy to Islam influenced its response to the rise of militant xenophobic Serbian nationalism and the breakup of Yugoslavia. The chapters on the Balkans accuse the West of turning a blind eye to Serbian policies of ethnic cleansing and to the expulsion of the Turkish-speaking population from Bulgaria. The editors conclude that if Bosnians, who are white, secular, Western and who have lived there for centuries, are allowed to be subjected to pogroms, then there are ominous implications for Muslims settled elsewhere in the West. This argument is a gross over-simplification that has been partially disproved by the Dayton accord and by the UN war-crime trials taking place in The Hague. However, it has to be conceded that developments in the Balkans have created a genuine and deep sense of unease and insecurity, particularly among the diaspora.

Within this hostile Occidental framework Muslim minorities elsewhere in the West are