

was no immediate urgency to leave. The migrants faced little difficulty adjusting to life in the Antipodes. For those who emigrated before the 1990s, an unwillingness to live in the apartheid regime, combined with a general uneasiness about the future of life in South Africa, was the most commonly given motive for departure. In the 1990s, the most commonly reported reasons were the prevalence of crime, uneasiness about the future, and, increasingly, family reunification.

The research is based on a small-scale non-random (“snowball”) survey, carried out via e-mail. Of 1,800 questionnaires sent out, 608 individual useful responses were received and comprise the base of the survey data. In addition, a broad range of secondary sources were consulted. In describing their methodology, the authors explicitly reject any attempt at chronological or narrative history. They equally reject the search for sociological analysis of human movements and the use of quantitative analysis. Rather, they seek a deeper understanding (*verstehen*) and interpretation of the lives of the migrants, by use of their unique methods. The authors claim the necessary empathy to carry out their analysis since they themselves are South African Jewish immigrants to Australia. They do not strive for the detached analytical approach commonly sought by most social scientists and historians. At various points in the presentation, they take strongly stated judgmental positions.

The authors discuss at some length what they refer to as contextual history. However, their attention is largely limited to a specific political matter – the relationships between the various minorities and what is taken to be the essentially homogenous white Christian majorities of South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.

In view of the book’s comparatively narrow substantive focus and distinctive methodology, it will be of limited use to most social scientists and historians. For those concerned with the Litvak experience as such, it will be of greater interest.

The Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership. By Linda Bosniak. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.

AMADA ARMENTA AND ROGER WALDINGER
Department of Sociology, UCLA

For the contemporary student of international migration, the central problem is how to manage two competing methodological temptations – of nationalism, on one hand, and transnationalism, on the other. Methodological nationalism is the more common sin, as the social sciences have long thought of the nation-state and society as one and the same. From that standpoint, the advent of foreigners is seen as a deviant event, making the issue of how and when they will fit into an otherwise integrated whole, whose limits extend to the national frontier and no further, the focal point of concern. More recently, however, the alternative approach seems more enticing: as the movements of goods, services, ideas, and people (though the latter to a notably lesser extent) appear to be sweeping across boundaries, the epiphenomenon seems to involve the nation-state. From this standpoint, social relations (if not societies) naturally extend across national boundaries; nation-states are so enfeebled, or so responsive to pressures from beyond their borders, that the line between citizens and aliens has been blurred, if not disappearing altogether.

For guidance, social science students of international migration trying to navigate between this particular Scylla and Charybdis can turn to legal scholar Linda Bosniak’s, thoughtful treatment of *The Citizen and the Alien*. The key to this beautifully written, deeply scholarly volume lies in the subtitle: namely, that the distinction between the citizen and the alien – ignored or downplayed by those committed to methodologically nationalist as well as transnationalist frames – is a dilemma of contemporary membership, from which no escape can be found.

Bosniak first finds that dilemma in the expanding world of citizenship theory. There, the trend is toward universalism: the subject –

or “who” – of citizenship is everyone; progressive and liberal theorists, in particular, call for an expansion of citizenship beyond the purely political and a deepening of citizenship within the purely political. “Everyone,” however, turns out to have an unnoticed limit: it goes right up to, and no further than, the edge of the national community. One can understand why, as without bounded national communities it would be hard, perhaps impossible, to generate a “we” that could represent and respond to its members.

The preference for those lucky enough to be part of the national community – a sort of “normative nationalism” – speaks volumes about the presuppositions of citizenship theory, while also implying a citizenship that Bosniak describes as “hard on the outside and soft on the inside” (4). This neat packaging, and the particularism it conceals, proves problematic when strangers spill over into the territory of the national community. A liberal society has no choice but to provide these social outsiders, who now reside inside its territory, with at least some rights. But the limits of what Bosniak calls “alien citizenship” are indeterminate; to some extent the power to control entry – which by delimiting one national community from another seems to be the condition of citizenship – can inevitably circumscribe the protections of resident aliens.

As Bosniak shows, moving from theory to law, and focusing on the United States, citizenship has been an engine both of universalism and of exclusion. Citizenship’s universalism can be seen when aliens flow across the state’s boundaries, whether doing so with or without legal authorization. Once present on American soil, aliens possess certain basic rights, to some extent, even regardless of legal status. Contrary to globalists and post-nationalists – who insist that the enhanced rights currently enjoyed by noncitizens reflect the exposure of contemporary states to international institutions and transnational processes – Bosniak shows that aliens’ legal personhood and rights to protection have been recognized by U.S. courts for well over a century. With the Supreme Court accepting that even undocumented immigrants are

protected by the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments, Bosniak concludes that “the law regulating membership has no bearing at all on aliens’ status as persons in a variety of spheres of national life” (p. 68).

Thus, membership concerns *can* be separated from internal status concerns; in the pattern that Bosniak describes as the separation model, citizenship entails rights, to be enjoyed by persons who are paradoxically not citizens. But in Bosniak’s view, the tendency toward the convergence model – in which the sphere of immigration overlaps with that of rights and where citizenship is conceptualized as status – is almost as strong. Thus, the Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that the U.S. government has few, if any constraints, in regulating national borders. In its eyes, moreover, discrimination against aliens *can* constitute a legitimate exercise of the state’s immigration power, almost always at the national level, though only sometimes at the state level. While the Court’s famous *Plyler v Doe* (1982) decision made schooling a right possessed by undocumented children with no right of residence in the United States, it drew the line against parents, to whom it ascribed no similar entitlement. Moreover, in linking status and rights, *Plyler* stood in continuity with the Court’s ongoing refusal to recognize alienage, unlike race, as a “suspect” class.

As a book of closely connected essays infused with a strong normative orientation, *Citizens and Aliens* addresses a number of themes. Bosniak highlights the complex, multidimensional nature of citizenship, demonstrating that citizenship status and citizenship rights do not align perfectly: on the one hand, rights are not an exclusive privilege of citizens; on the other hand, citizenship does not guarantee equal rights, a matter of particular concern to critics from the contemporary left. For these writers, noting that a variety of groups (minorities, women, the working poor) are disadvantaged despite citizenship’s promise of equality, second-class citizenship is the problem requiring remediation. While sympathetic, Bosniak notes the limitation of this approach: “inward-looking” (p. 135), its interest in promotion to

first-class citizenship goes no further than the national border. As she argues in a provocative chapter on “Domestic Work and the Ambiguities of Citizenship,” feminist theorists have seen women’s full citizenship as pivoting on their unimpeded axis for satisfying, fairly remunerated work. But the emphasis on paid labor as a condition of movement to first-class citizenship has been “unreflectively insular and nationalist” (p. 113) in its inattention to the people who increasingly make that shift possible, namely, the immigrant domestic workers deprived of status citizenship.

Bosniak similarly criticizes the separation model, to which she is otherwise sympathetic. While possibly the best that liberal democracies can do, it relies on the accrual of benefits based on geographic presence and the exclusion of those who – for no fault of their own – fall outside the national lines. Moreover, separation is a matter of degree, not kind: the split between the alienage – the

laws that affect immigrants – and the immigration domain – the laws affecting movement across state boundaries – is only partial, with borders existing both at the nation’s periphery and inside its territory.

The Citizen and the Alien may not offer definitive treatment of the dilemmas of citizenship and alienage in liberal democratic societies, but the author’s insistence on asking tough questions for which there may be no satisfying answer makes this a work of great value. Forcing the reader to grapple with questions that are at the forefront of national debates – who are we? and to whom are we responsible? – Bosniak has done social science students of immigration a great service. They would do well to heed her words: “Liberal democracy’s allegedly soft interior cannot be entirely insulated from its exclusionary edges; rather, through alienage, that exclusion routinely penetrates the interior as well” (p. 133).