

THE MYTH OF SELF-RELIANCE: Economic Lives Inside a Liberian Refugee Camp.

Naohiko Omata. New York: Berghahn Books, 2017. 194 pages, ISBN 9781785335648 (hardback).

The Myth of Self-Reliance by Naohiko Omata is an engaging and clearly written monograph. It primarily questions the humanitarian prophecy of refugee self-reliance, and the current tendency to overburden refugees with the responsibility to cope in hardship. After offering a comprehensive introduction, Omata structures his book into seven chapters and a final epilogue that flow together very logically from one to the next. In the introduction, the reader is already likely to imagine the author sharing life with his field companions. Drawing upon a 13 month period of fieldwork between 2008 and 2009 in the Liberian refugee camp of Buduburam in Ghana, he follows the evolution of some of his interlocutors' livelihood trajectories back in Liberia. This is an extraordinary and unusual research effort, and it allowed Omata to make consistent and well-informed statements regarding the everyday decision-making processes of long-term refugees across borders.

In chapter 1, Omata approaches the refugee camp at a point in time when the number of Liberian refugees is on the decline (19): it shrank from 42,000 in 2003 to 18,000 in 2008. The camp is situated in the poor suburban Gomoa District, where some of the refugees are living with local villagers who are also

deemed economically vulnerable. In Buduburam, essential services like education, electricity, and water need to be purchased privately. The camp includes branches of political parties, as well as 78 churches and a mosque.

Chapter 2 explains the economic activities taking place in the camp; running internet cafes is particularly lucrative. Mobility across the camp-city boundaries has allowed some refugees to purchase goods on the outside and resell them inside the camp. However, competition is fierce in the camp, which limits the profits that these refugee mobile entrepreneurs can make. Consequently, those who are better off are not the camp business runners but the refugee remittance recipients. The author describes the long queues in front of the Western Union offices, where some refugees are able to receive financial support from their relatives abroad. Thanks to the particular individuals' accounts, the reader fully understands the implicit rules of the "remittance clusters." Interestingly, remittances are not romanticized as a spontaneous cultural value among Liberians—they also involve human pressure, sacrifices, and the burden of sharing resources. Through the stories of Victoria, Richard, James, and many others, Omata shows the economic interdependence that enables Liberian refugees to make a living. He also captures the violence of UN repatriation programs, which disrupt some of these remittance clusters by engendering economic hardship.

Chapter 3 provides an insightful description of the household economy, which includes

the acquisition and sharing of food and cash, as well as nonfood expenditures. Omata underscores the incoherence of the UNHCR, whose failure to provide some of the refugees with ID cards prevented them from accessing food rations. In this scenario, sustainability and empowerment mostly come from outside sources. In turn, remittances are classified as sparse and unreliable versus robust; they range from access to hairdressing on a weekly basis to the impossibility of benefiting from health care. Although Omata's decision to exclude his participants' expenditure self-accounts is understandable, I would suggest that engaging with people's omissions and perceptions of expenses would have further informed their economy of coping. Nonetheless, I empathize with the author's attempt to prioritize bare empirical experience over academic overtheorizations.

Chapter 4 emphasizes how the genealogy of family migration patterns and relatives' professional occupations inform the present privileges and economic sustainability of some refugees in the camp. At this point, the author advances two important arguments. First, refugee self-reliance cannot be framed in technical terms because it mostly relies on human capital, which, in turn, varies according to a changing physical and political camp geography. Second, inequality is historical.

Chapter 5 consistently de-idealizes repatriation by reconfiguring it as what I would term a new "forced" migration flow resulting from decreasing assistance and livelihood deterioration; it is also a quick exit strategy for the humanitarian system to face budget shortfalls, dismantle camps, and eliminate poverty and instability in receiving states. Implying "significant decisions within a short period of time under strong pressure" (104), repatriation can be neither fully voluntary nor a "homecoming." Moreover, it shakes the local economy that surrounds the camp (107). Indeed, self-reliance is not an exportable process but rather provisional and contextual, at times unable to cross state boundaries. The new hardships of Liberian returnees often

lead them to return to Buduburam in the hope of rebuilding their lost livelihoods. Successful repatriations also depend on social class and wealth, which often produce "failed repatriates" (121).

If repatriation is not a durable solution, neither is the local integration of the remaining refugees in Ghana, as chapter 6 shows. It is a "black box" (128) containing refugees who either were unable to access the UNHCR repatriation package or feared persecution back in Liberia. Deprived of refugee status and UNHCR assistance, re-refugees risk becoming invisible in the eyes of the international community. I would have been interested to know more about the way in which remaining refugees received re-returnees in Buduburam.

Chapter 7 powerfully smashes the myth of self-reliance by reminding us of the danger of self-help and entrepreneurialism discourses in protracted displacement. UNHCR cannot be held responsible in a limited fashion: once humanitarian concern produces its victims, there is no justification for withdrawing aid and protection. Although he deromanticizes "communal solidarity" (152), Omata doesn't forget to provide a nuanced account of the refugees' everyday coping mechanisms of interdependence. The author's condemnation of the humanitarian system's deresponsibilization culminates in the epilogue, as the refugee journey does not end with programming cycles or policy changes.

Using plain but trenchant and engaging language, the author incisively makes humanitarianism uncomfortable and leads the reader to identify new research areas, such as the need for a deeper understanding of humanitarian gain vis-à-vis ineffective livelihood programs and blind repatriation strategies. The book is a welcome contribution to forced migration studies and humanitarian studies, as well as for those engaging with the political economy and history of refugee livelihoods.

Estella Carpi
University College London

**DIASPORA'S HOMELAND:
Modern China in the Age of
Global Migration.**

Shelly Chan. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018. 280 pages, ISBN 9780822370420 (hardback), 9780822370543 (paperback).

Since the early 1990s, the field of diaspora studies has undergone an unprecedented growth, marked by the proliferation of interest within the academy and beyond. This has resulted in an ever-expanding definition of “diaspora,” which has at times come to encompass the dispersion of *any* migrant population. “The universalization of diaspora,” Rogers Brubaker (2005: 3) observed, “paradoxically, means the disappearance of diaspora.” If applied too capaciously, the term risks losing its analytical rigor. In Sinophone studies, prominent scholars have echoed a similar precaution, arguing that diaspora perpetuates the myth of homogeneity among the Chinese overseas. Even more problematic is its assumption of a timeless political, economic, and cultural allegiance to the Chinese nation.

Shelly Chan’s debut monograph, *Diaspora’s Homeland: Modern China in the Age of Global Migration*, marks a key intervention in these diaspora debates. Seeking to recuperate the analytic utility of the term, she deftly demonstrates how the histories of modern China and the Chinese overseas are inextricably connected. The latter, she argues, was instrumental to the project of Chinese modernity and nation building. Bridging the fields of global Chinese history, overseas Chinese studies, and Asian American studies, Chan reexamines the diaspora-homeland dynamic through five significant moments, between the 1890s and 1950s, which altered the course of modern China.

The book’s central theoretical contribution is its emphasis on the temporality of diaspora histories. While scholars tend to view diasporic communities through the lens of spatiality, highlighting their geographic dis-

persion, Chan proposes instead the notion of “diaspora time” and “diaspora moment.” The former alludes to a “slow-moving and silent condition” that captures the realities of family-based survival strategies and patterns of accumulation that characterized the lives of Chinese migrants in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (13). The latter describes a rupture in “diaspora time”; it gestures to a vital encounter between the diaspora and the Chinese state, whereby Chinese emigrants were propelled to national prominence.

The first chapter revisits the final decades of the Qing dynasty, when an international crisis over the Chinese “coolie” trade signaled China’s emergence as a sovereign state in the global system. Contrary to conventional histories, Chan argues that it was the indentured laborers—not merchants—who were the first beneficiaries of overseas protection from the Qing state. Concerns about the rampant abuses of overseas Chinese laborers catapulted the Qing government into a complex web of international diplomacy, where it belatedly assumed its place in the “family of nations.”

Shifting the focus away from coolies to intellectuals, chapter 2, “Colonists in the South Seas,” examines the activities of scholars in Shanghai’s Jinan University who pioneered Nanyang (South Seas) studies during the Republican era. Drawing on the writings of prominent intellectuals like Liu Shimu, Chan considers how these scholars consulted European and Japanese colonial thought to rearticulate ideas about Chinese overseas identity and settler colonialism in Southeast Asia. Expanding on this fraught history of race relations and Chinese settlement in the Nanyang region, chapter 3 focuses on the hybridity of Lim Boon Keng, a Straits-born and British-educated Chinese reformer. It delves into the predicament of being Chinese in an era of Western dominance in Asia. This predicament was particularly evident in the intellectual rivalry between Lim and Lu Xun, a leading May Fourth writer, as they disputed the role of Confucian revivalism. Together,

the two chapters highlight how the Chinese overseas contributed to new political and cultural ideals of citizenship in China.

Next, Chan brings a much-needed gendered analysis to the history of *huaqiao* (overseas Chinese) families in the aftermath of the Communist Revolution. The myriad land and marriage reforms enacted in South China in the 1950s reveal that far from being a “closed” socialist system, post-1949 China maintained a keen political and economic interest in the Chinese overseas. As such, *huaqiao* emerged as a privileged social category, and *qiaofu* (the wives of migrant men) became important intermediaries between the state and emigrant men. The final chapter, “Homecomings,” explores the history of the “returning” Chinese diaspora in the 1950s and 1960s, and the complex space they occupied in the People’s Republic of China (PRC). Between 1950 and 1966, close to half a million Chinese overseas “remigrated” to the “homeland” as anti-Chinese sentiments and anticommunist activities loomed in Southeast Asia. With astute insights, Chan narrates the tensions surrounding the returnees’ reintegration into socialist China, as they confronted the disparity between their idealized homeland and the realities of life during the Great Leap Forward.

Diaspora’s Homeland is a bold, engaging, and innovative examination of the Chinese overseas and their entangled histories with modern China. Navigating vast and disparate fields of literature, Chan offers a fresh look at how mass emigration during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries ultimately reshaped China. While Chinese migration studies frequently emphasize migrants’ adaptation and contributions to the “host” societies, Chan asks instead how their mobility altered China. Not only has she succeeded in making a compelling case for the necessity of the diaspora paradigm, her emphasis on the temporality of diaspora histories has propelled conversations in the field forward. The book is a must-read for scholars interested in Asian migrations, modern China, and diaspora studies.

■ REFERENCE

Brubaker, Rogers. 2005. “The ‘Diaspora’ Diaspora.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (1): 1–19.

Sandy F. Chang
University of Texas at Austin

NONCITIZENISM: Recognising Noncitizen Capabilities in a World of Citizens.

Tendayi Bloom. New York: Routledge, 2018. 222 pages, ISBN 9781138049185 (hardback).

Citizenship and migration studies, as well as the emerging literature on statelessness, often portray “noncitizenship” as a lack of formal membership in a particular state. In *Noncitizenism*, Tendayi Bloom challenges the assumption that citizenship is the only individual-state relationship wherein people have rights, make claims, or are political agents. Instead, she argues that noncitizenship is an important individual-state relationship in its own right. To make this argument, Bloom engages with the literatures on liberal political theory, global justice, noncitizenship, and feminism, using examples from various noncitizen populations to illustrate how noncitizenism is activated and becomes politicized, how it generates state obligations, and how it challenges the structure of the international state system.

Chapters 1 through 3 expose the theoretical and real-world problems that are produced by a focus on “citizenship” as the defining individual-state relationship. We learn that noncitizenship is activated when a person, regardless of where they are located, is made vulnerable to the state. Vulnerability ensues when an individual’s capabilities are compromised such that s/he can no longer flourish or carry out life projects in a way that s/he would otherwise have done.

Chapters 4 through 7 provide concrete examples of the different ways in which non-

citizenship is activated and experienced by groups as varied as irregular migrants, the stateless, denied asylum seekers, indigenous peoples, nomads (or “highly skilled” “business migrants” [97]), and formally recognized citizens. Bloom makes clear that individuals who fall within these groups differently experience noncitizenship, but they all share the same relationship of vulnerability to a state in that the latter hinders them from being flourishing agents. In several of the examples given, we see how citizenship and noncitizenship inform and interact with each other and cannot, therefore, be clearly separated either as analytical categories or as lived realities.

Chapters 8 and 9 delve further into the concepts of “activated noncitizenship” and “dynamic capabilities.” Whereas earlier in the work, we learn that noncitizenship is activated when no structural mitigation exists and/or when vulnerability is not distributed fairly (77), chapter 8 elaborates on how it is activated when the state does not recognize that a noncitizen relationship exists, or when an individual’s capabilities are impaired and/or projects “frustrated” (121) because of the state. The chapter details how vulnerability can be produced within, at, and far away from the borders of a particular state. Chapter 9 describes the three types of noncitizen capabilities, positing that the concrete capabilities that fall within each of these types must be “dynamic,” allowing “for flexibility and change in how individuals understand their capabilities” to allow for full human flourishing (151).

Chapter 10, which would have fit nicely in the introductory section of the book, explains the role feminism plays in Bloom’s development of noncitizenship, especially in the areas of exclusion, equality, and the creation of just institutions. The final chapter illustrates how activated noncitizenship, especially among migrants and domestic workers, manifests in social movements and activism. It demonstrates the agency of the activated noncitizen and emphasizes the importance of focusing on people as individuals entitled to live the good life.

As any good book must, *Noncitizenship* raises several questions. Do the obligations generated by activated noncitizenship only apply to the “liberal” state or to all states within the international state system? At times we read about the “state” and the “state system,” whereas at others it is the “liberal state” and the “liberal state system” to which the arguments apply. Also, who determines who is “vulnerable,” such that noncitizenship is activated? Bloom states that “someone whose noncitizenship is activated may well live what s/he considers to be a flourishing and fully human life despite a State” (131), but if we consider capabilities “dynamic” such that individuals have a say in what their human flourishing looks like, why is someone who considers her life “to be a flourishing and fully human” one “vulnerable” such that noncitizenship becomes activated and state obligations ensue?

Also, how does noncitizenship function as an analytical category when vulnerability no longer plays a role in a noncitizen’s relationship with a state? What if, for example, a state’s actions foment an individual’s capabilities instead of inhibits them? What if a state cleans up a river and reintroduces local flora and fauna such that people’s capabilities in another state “downriver” improve? Does a relationship of “noncitizenship” then cease to exist?

These questions notwithstanding, *Noncitizenship* is a valuable addition to a variety of fields: from global justice, migration, human rights, and citizenship studies to political theory and social movement scholarship. Its core argument that the state has obligations toward individuals (not just “citizens”) when it impairs their ability to be fully flourishing agents is one that resonates with anyone who believes in the equal treatment of, and the provision of conditions of autonomy for, people regardless of who and where they are.

Kristy A. Belton
 Director of Professional Development,
 International Studies Association

**PROTECTING STATELESS PERSONS:
The Implementation of the
Convention Relating to the Status of
Stateless Persons across EU States.**

Katia Bianchini. Brill Nijhof: Leiden,
2018. 382 pages, ISBN 9789004362901
(hardback).

Protecting Stateless Persons is a thorough investigation of how the 1954 Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons is implemented in practice. The research relies on classical legal methods supported by gathering and analyzing original empirical data to provide a much-needed deeper insight into how exactly statelessness determination procedures function in reality. The author sets out to analyze factors that influence how this specific human rights treaty is actually implemented and applied in 10 countries, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, Spain, France, Hungary, Sweden, Greece, the Netherlands, and the Czech Republic.

The book is structured as follows. Chapters 1–3 are dedicated to outlining a rather detailed background, introducing the reader into the research field of statelessness—the author discusses relevant international laws, influential policy guidance, scholarly commentary, and current debates. Chapters 4–9 contain the comparative analysis of the empirical data gathered by the author in the course of her research, and chapters 10–12 are devoted to reflections, conclusions, and recommendations.

In my opinion the main strength of the book is its use of original empirical data to analyze what actually happens to individuals who wish to have their statelessness status determined and want to claim protection on that basis. This study is the first systematic attempt to map out not only the presence or absence of dedicated statelessness determination procedures in national legal systems, but also what they entail for individuals who are meant to benefit from such procedures.

It is noteworthy that states that lack statelessness determination procedures are also

included in the study. Studying laws that aren't there is particularly challenging for legal scholars, as the research methods we usually rely on do not equip us well enough to investigate the effects of a lack of specific laws and regulations. Due to her mixed and diversified methodology, Bianchini is able to ask a daring question of what happens to a person whose statelessness cannot be formally established but who is entitled to protection on the basis of the 1954 convention.

The 10 countries under investigation are categorized into three groups: (1) those with specific incorporating legislation for the determination of statelessness; (2) those with only a few provisions to determine statelessness; and (3) those with no incorporating legislation to determine statelessness. Such categorization is unusual for the field of statelessness research, where national systems are often divided into those that have a procedure and those that do not. The introduction of a third category in the middle, of countries that have some sort of rules for determining statelessness but not quite enough to call it a proper procedure that implements the 1954 convention, helps to think of statelessness determination as a process and a scale, rather than something that either exists or doesn't. It creates space for a normative analysis of an array of different scenarios, where a state may have a very well-developed, elaborate procedure, or a less developed procedure, or a set of sporadic rules that are relied on by decision makers to determine statelessness status, or a proactive judiciary that develops a consistent practice of statelessness determination through courts. It also sends an important message that merely having a procedure is not necessarily a great achievement in itself, and that the details of the procedure need to be investigated to place it on a scale of how well it gives effect to the 1954 convention.

I will not go into detail regarding all the substantive findings of the book, but will merely point out a few highlights that might be of interest to a reader. The comparative chapters are very thorough and systematic,

answering a set of questions for each country about the functioning of statelessness determination procedures, including the deciding authority, issues of proof, possibility of appeal, and available statistics. The author also compares the implementation of the definition of a stateless person across the national contexts, as well as the statuses and rights granted to recognized stateless persons. At the end of each comparative chapter there are very helpful tables giving clear visual representation of the main findings. Among other issues, the study devotes special attention to the position of stateless Palestinians, and the role of the relevant exclusion clause in the 1954 convention. Moreover, the author engages with the question of what happens when a foreign embassy does not reply to official requests of confirming a nationality status of an applicant in a statelessness determination procedure. This is done through the example of individuals with unclear nationality who come from the Ethiopia/Eritrea region.

One of the aspects of the book that I experienced as a shortcoming is the unclear relation between purely descriptive sections and sudden normative evaluations. Sometimes a normative standard would be mentioned, but it remained unclear whether the author subscribes to it or not, such as, for example, that adversarial proceedings are not optimal in the context of statelessness determination. I was missing an explicitly developed and substantiated normative framework of what a good and effective statelessness determination procedure is, which could serve as a clear reference point for all the normative conclusions and comments throughout the study.

Overall, the book is an extremely valuable and innovative contribution to the scholarship on nationality and statelessness, which can wholeheartedly be recommended to everyone working on the questions of statelessness in a variety of contexts, including policy, legal practice, civil society activism, and also academic research. Readers with an interest in how international human rights treaties in general get implemented in prac-

tice will also find this book to be a useful resource. Moreover, the innovative methodology that combines classical legal research with empirical elements makes it a great example and hopefully a source of inspiration for legal scholars who are curious to diversify their approaches. I hope this study can contribute to wider acceptance of the notion that empirical data has an important role to play in legal research.

Katja Swider
University of Amsterdam

HOPE AND UNCERTAINTY IN CONTEMPORARY AFRICAN MIGRATION.

Nauja Kleist, and Thorsen Dorte, eds.
New York: Routledge, 2017. 200 pages,
ISBN 9781138961210 (hardback).

This book is a thought-provoking intervention at a time in the world when the mobility and migration of Africans is increasingly referenced and politicized as a problem. The title captures one's attention because it highlights normative discourses that repeat the "what do they hope to gain . . ." mantra of uncertainty and risk that accompanies visuals of Africans auctioned as slaves, stranded in makeshift camps, or forever immortalized in the anonymous statistics of those dead in the desert or drowned at sea. These discourses hint at the unspoken that accompanies these media images, that there is a faulty logic undergirding the aspirations of Africans who view migration and mobility as a search for a better life, when successful outcomes are open to only a select few. The strength of this volume is that it directly confronts these assumptions by operationalizing hope as an analytical framework. Nauja Kleist, in her detailed introduction, draws on a range of sources spanning philosophy, the humanities, and the social sciences to propose a framework that examines hope as anticipated potential and uncertainty, within a global political econ-

omy of deep structural inequality, which both feeds aspirations and crisis.

At the heart of this proposed framework is a recognition of a mobility paradox that characterizes migration, mobility, and immobility in this neoliberal contemporary moment. Increasingly there is a hardening of borders in the Global North and an exportation of the logics of highly restrictive mobility regimes to impact intra-Africa movements and for those beyond who increasingly seek newer destinations in Latin America and Asia. Simultaneously, there is a growing normalization of precarious livelihoods, crisis, and conflict for millions of Africans who, in seeking remedy through mobility strategies, find these aspirations frustrated as access to movement shrinks to ever-decreasing circuits, even for those seeking protection. There is a widening disjuncture within a politicized global order that espouses a rights-based environment as the cure for all ills and denies the right to mobility and its future potentiality for many Africans. Inequality manifests not only at the hard edge of hunger, lack of resources, development, and peace, but in the restricting of agency through border regimes that assume to curtail and define the limits of social imaginaries imbued with belief that the good life is attainable and will surely come. Kleist and Thorsen's use of the concept of societal hope reveals the socioeconomic, political dynamics that intersect the nation-state with the individual's level.

The relationship between time, near and distant futures, the repositories and pathways of hope, and its potential and realized manifestations is key to this analytical framework. The empirical chapters in this volume draw on these overarching themes as they consider the outcomes of migration, mobility, and immobility. Heike Drotbohm focuses on the collective, institutional, and affective dimensions of hope as young Cape Verdeans perform pathways to mobility in their quest for papers. Brokerage remains a theme in the chapter by Ida Marie Vammen, whose work on Senegalese migration to Argentina high-

lights futurity invested in religious belief for material breakthrough in the quest for mobility. Jesper Bjarnesen, in his innovative work with youth in urban Burkina Faso, explores the role of public culture in Zouglou music as the displacement and social performance of hope. The chapter by Stephen Lubkemann examines the spatial and temporal orientations of hope in a two-centuries-old diasporicity between Liberia and America. Heide Østbø Haugen, in her work with Nigerians in China, embraces as method the alternative ontology of time that Pentecostalism promulgates, to reveal the paradox of hope as practices, assigned moral values that constrain as well as impact the outcomes and possibilities of migration.

Social networks are key to María Hernández-Carretero's chapter that considers the circuits of hope and uncertainty haunting Senegalese migrants in Spain and their decisions to wait, be patient, or take a chance on return migration. Social networks are also pertinent to Sylvie Bredeloup's longitudinal field research with migrants from West Africa as she focuses on the links between adventure, employment, hope, and faith as moral compass within a dialectics of dignity and shame. This moral and existential dimension of mobility and immobility is also highlighted by Hans Lucht and the final chapter by Nauja Kleist. Lucht contemplates the symbolic continuities of hope for Ghanaian migrants and deportees stranded in Niamey, Niger, a renowned migration hub. Kleist focuses on life after deportation to poignantly outline ambivalent topographies for deportees returned to Ghana. In all these varied, insightful chapters, the fruitful potential of hope as an analytical concept comes to the fore. This book comes highly recommended as a valuable approach for unpacking the complexity of contemporary migration in a world stratified by inequality and crisis, where restrictive policies fail to halt mobility and increase vulnerabilities for many of Africa's migrants.

Naluwembe Binaisa
University College London

THE IMPACT OF MIGRATION ON POLAND: EU Mobility and Social Change.

Anne White, Izabela Grabowska, Paweł Kaczmarczyk, and Krystyna Slany. London: UCL University Press, 2018. 276 pages, ISBN 9781787350687 (open access PDF).

In the last few decades, the growing global mobility of people has sparked a lively debate, both in the political arena and in society at large in countries experiencing actual migration as well as in general by societies simply observing the phenomenon. Although numerous studies and publications conclusively prove that migrations of people across borders bring socioeconomic benefits of varying intensity and dimension to host and origin countries, emotions still sneak into the discussion. The book, which I had the pleasure of reviewing, is extraordinary in title as well as the respondents' stories, exceptional case studies illustrating the complexity of the issues surrounding the impact of migration processes on the society of the country of origin. As the authors point out, this book represents the only publication that directly studies migration's impact on social change in a specific country of origin, an assertion backed up by this reviewer's own study of both the Polish and Anglophone literature. The authors chose migration and the impact of mobility within the EU on social change in the origin country as their research topic. The research subject is Polish society, 2.6 million members of which, according to population statistics, had lived abroad by the end of 2016. However, this study does not take a standard approach to research, which purports to render migrants visible by documenting their life and experiences and reveals the social changes occurring in a country of origin in a historic narrative. Rather, this book represents an ambitious approach focused on exploring the way in which contemporary Poland has changed in the face of migration. It is an ambitious attempt to shed light on the experiences of a group of participants affected

by the processes of migration who remain in the country of origin and on the margin of migration studies.

The Impact of Migration on Poland: EU Mobility and Social Change represents a group effort. Its four authors, Anne White, Izabela Grabowska, Paweł Kaczmarczyk, and Krystyna Slany, contributed equally to its writing, whether individually or as coauthors of specific chapters. The particular choice of coauthors resulted in an original work composed of eleven chapters of which two chapters, 1 and 11, bracket the topic. In chapter 1, Anne White sketches the basic premise of the book. The final chapter, written by the same author, concludes the text and reflects on a new "inside-out" approach innovated by the book's authors to understanding the impact of migration on the countries of origin. In the second chapter, titled "The Impact of Migration from and to Poland since EU Accession," the authors introduce the issues surrounding contemporary migration trends following the entry of Poland into the EU and the social changes it provoked. This is an effective rhetorical move, since in this chapter the authors successfully introduce the research problems, motivating the reader to continue.

In chapter 3, the authors (Anne White, Izabela Grabowska, and Krystyna Slany) present the current state of migration literature and the implications of the phenomenon to the countries of origin, especially the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. They continue the "inside-out" approach in their research, analyzing the relationship between migrations and social trends. In the following chapter, White, Grabowska, and Slany survey and explain the contemporary mechanisms and dependences of the process of social remitting, the types of social remittances, and the causes of their diffusion in Poland. In chapter 5, Paweł Kaczmarczyk analyzes the impact of migration from Poland after 2004 on the domestic labour market and the effect of these migrations in the country. He presents the research conclusions in the context of three time frames: short-, mid-, and long-

term. The latter time frame can have lasting effects. In the next chapter, “Family Relations and Gender Equality in the Context of Migration,” Krystyna Slany chronicles family relations. She examines the impact of migration in Poland on the characteristics of the family model and gender roles in Poland before considering the changes in “Polish society abroad.” The chapter explores the values Polish people ascribe to family life in Poland and its meaning for Polish migrants, as well as the slow changes in the structures of family roles of specific members under the influence of migration.

The following four chapters (7–10), authored by Anne White, present a coherent conclusion to the previous chapters, focusing among other themes on: changes in life style, culture, and identity in Polish society as a result of migration despite the strong dependence of some groups in society on informal networks based on mutual trust; the concept of “Polish society abroad”; and the impact of foreign migration to Poland on its society.

Experiences of migration, exemplified through the respondents’ statements found throughout this interesting book, place the person at the center. It is the person who is directly or indirectly subject to social changes as a result of mobility, with their strengths and weaknesses, their ability to handle difficulties and adapt to the changes in their environment as well as innovate new ones. The book numbers 266 pages, 34 of which include the bibliography of Polish authors and Anglophone studies. This exemplifies the plethora of migration literature in which the reviewed book fulfills an important gap identified by the authors.

The subject of this study is Polish society understood as the product of mobilities within the borders of the EU. The case studies contained herein are set in the context of Poland or refer to Polish migrants who chose to try their luck abroad. These represent an undeniable strength of this publication. In their analysis, the authors of the chapters making up the work search for cause-and-effect

relationships, reserving their judgment, and reveal the broad context of Polish everyday life in the era of mobile societies. In the specific chapters, the authors’ care and discerning eye for research is palpable. Another one of the achievements of this publication is a diagnosis of contemporary trends and social practices in Poland and the contemporary region of East-Central Europe in an age of mobility. Moreover, the authors probe further in their analysis to changes occurring deeper in society: changes in norms, views, beliefs, and even values. The authors then do not stop with simple answers to the relevant questions, but attempt to expand on their sources.

In conclusion, the reviewed book possesses a great scholarly and didactical value. It encourages the reader to reflect on and exercise research problems described within and exercise critical judgment, which is at the core of an academic education. Both academic teachers and students of specific disciplines, such as sociology, geography, economics, and anyone interested in the issues and the effects of intra-EU mobility, can turn to this book.

Magdalena Kubal-Czerwińska
Jagiellonian University, Kraków

UNLEASHING THE FORCE OF LAW: Legal Mobilization, National Security, and Basic Freedoms.

Devyani Prabhat. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. 225 pages, ISBN 9781137455741 (hardback), ISBN 9781349928118 (paperback).

Who engages in legal mobilization to protect basic freedoms? How? And why? These are the questions addressed by Devyani Prabhat in *Unleashing the Force of Law: Legal Mobilization, National Security, and Basic Freedoms*. Drawing on more than 75 interviews with lawyers from civil society, academia, the legal profession, and the judiciary, as well as archival and documentary sources, the book is an impressive work of sociolegal research.

It cuts across three jurisdictions—England, Northern Ireland, and the United States—to gauge the extent of legal mobilization in three periods of national security “exception”: the Northern Ireland conflict from the late 1960s to late 1990s; the Puerto Rican independence movement of the 1980s; and post-9/11. Prabhat adopts the UK and US as comparable case studies not just because of their shared legal and political history and traditions, but because both states have faced political violence (both recently and historically) and because both states make claims to uphold liberal democracy, the rule of law, and human rights. In a rather damning critique, however, Prabhat notes that “it is hard to take a decisive stand on which jurisdiction has put in place more restrictive measures on basic freedoms” (29).

It is these restrictive measures—and law’s ability to challenge them—that provide the rich subject matter for this book. Prabhat highlights a number of concerns that the normalization of such exceptional powers raises for legal mobilization to protect basic freedoms. The most important is that the process of normalization affects the internal processes of the juridical field (141): “by the very act of continued participation in the processes legal professionals could arguably be said to normalize the application of exceptional rules and legitimize the exceptional processes” (55). This can be seen in the legal challenges to the detention of “noncombatants” at the Guantánamo Bay detention camp and of suspected terrorists in the UK. Lawyers’ participation in exceptional legal processes, such as the military trials at Guantánamo Bay and in UK closed material proceedings, means that through routinization, what once was exceptional becomes not just normalized, but “normal” (185). The ground has shifted in favor of the exception.

What, then, is the impact of this normalization of the exceptional on the strategies lawyers adopt when they mobilize to protect basic freedoms?

Prabhat’s study of legal mobilization provides a rich answer to this question; however,

three main points can be made. First, that adherence to legal formalism is insufficient in times of exception to protect basic freedoms. It is not enough to challenge process; rights-based challenges are essential (184). In each of the case studies—with the exception of the Puerto Rican independence movement’s lawyers in Chicago, who put forth substantive rights claims—legal formalism has dominated proceedings. This seems to reflect the view within the legal profession that narrow points of process are more likely to succeed than broad-brush rights-based arguments. While this might produce beneficial outcomes for the individuals involved (in terms of, for example, securing their release from detention), “the overall justificatory discourse for limiting rights remains intact” (188). The exceptional remains normalized and—in the long run—human rights lose out. Prabhat rather pessimistically concludes: “As exceptionalism in emergency laws becomes normalized, it may no longer be possible to safeguard basic freedoms through formal legal argumentation strategies. This is demonstrated time and again in numerous court victories that do not lead to substantive gains for basic freedoms” (194).

Second, Prabhat notes that the institutionalization of rights affects the way in which law is mobilized. Where institutionalized rights protections—referred to by Prabhat as the “background conditions of neutrality”—are absent, lawyers may have to distance themselves from work for basic freedoms by advancing reasons of professional neutrality. Prabhat uses the murders of prominent human rights lawyers Pat Finucane and Rosemary Nelson to demonstrate why professional neutrality may have been a necessary strategy to reduce personal risk in Northern Ireland. However, it “has the effect of disabling rights work as it separates law from politics and removes layers from morally engaged argumentation. Its effect is to prevent legal mobilization” (193). The enactment of the Human Rights Act of 1998 in the UK has institutionalized rights, and has made a difference to the

potential of legal mobilization to challenge inroads into basic freedoms. Here Prabhat is perhaps overly optimistic of law's capacity to protect rights. While the Human Rights Act of 1998 may confer an "inbuilt supportive neutrality, which legitimizes the actions of rights-oriented lawyers" (125), the examples provided in the book, on detention and citizenship stripping in the UK, reveal that the dominance of legal formalism has meant that this potential has not been realized.

The third point is more optimistic. This is that heterogeneity, that is, the participation of lawyers from a range of legal backgrounds including military lawyers, commercial law firms engaging in pro bono work, individuals and activists, academic lawyers, and law clinic students, may facilitate legal mobilization. This is because heterogeneity minimizes the personal risks to lawyers, such as those faced by those who engaged in human rights work in Northern Ireland during the conflict. Heterogeneity has been a distinct feature of the legal mobilization at the Guantánamo Bay detention camp, creating a division of labor between those who want merely to undertake procedural aspects of the cases—which Prabhat refers to as "thin mobiliza-

tion"—and those whose concern is with substantive human rights claims—or "thick mobilization" (74). However, while this heterogeneity has facilitated the legal mobilization at Guantánamo Bay and has, by extension, provided those detained in the camp increased opportunities to challenge their detention, it must not be forgotten that more than 15 years after the first detainees arrived, the camp remains open. While it is no longer a legal black hole, its continued existence demonstrates just how normalized the exceptional has become.

Unleashing the Force of Law provides a critique of legal mobilization in times of exception and offers a way forward to protect basic freedoms. It requires the institutionalization of rights, heterogeneity, and a rejection of legal formalism. As Prabhat concludes (195): "Unless the work lawyers do goes past the form of the law into substantive claims for basic freedoms, they are yet to unleash the force of law."

Jessie Blackburn

University of Oxford

University of Western Australia Law School