In 1990, the President of Finland declared that citizens of USSR with Finnish origin should be legally considered as expatriate Finns with the right to migrate to Finland as returnees. By 1998, some 25,000 remigrants and their family members mostly from Karelian Republic, Leningrad area and Estonia had moved to Finland, and further 20,000 remigrants were waiting for positive immigration decision.1

In her dissertation, Being a Finn, a Russian or Something In-between – Ethnicity Discourses in Transnational Space, Olga Davydova has taken the group of people who have moved from former USSR and today's Russia to Finland as the empirical case for her study. For the research, she has interviewed both people with Finnish origin who are waiting in Russia for a positive migration decision and persons who have already migrated to Finland. Additionally, she interviewed and observed authorities that were involved in the migration processes of Russian citizens to Finland. The book, comprised of a large introduction and several articles, deals with the interplay and switching of cultural and linguistic codes in the everyday life of migrants in Finland. The research concentrates on questions such as how did the Finnish identity discourse develop in Finnish and Russian contexts and what kinds of subject positions is it producing. The theoretical frame of the study is based on poststructuralist theories of identity and transnational theories of migration. This doctoral dissertation is a truly interdisciplinary study combining sociological, cultural studies, folkloristic and philological approaches.

The book consists of a large summary of the study, written in Finnish, and additionally six published articles. Three of the articles are published in Finnish, two in English and one in Russian. The research was conducted between 2000 and 2008. In order to complete the dissertation study, Olga Davydova was involved in several research projects, which is clearly visible in the articles. One could criticize the project and the publication for being rather scattered and repetitive as many articles rely on similar empirical material and literature. At the same time, one must recognize that the years have helped Davydova to dig deeper into her topic and especially in the summary she is able to provide the reader as an intense self-reflection on the fact as she is one of the remigrants and to show how this has influenced her research during the course of years.

Especially the summary part, which describes the “making of” the book, is worth of mentioning. The way in which Davydova discusses the effects of having remigrated from Petrozavodsk in 1991 to Finland, and having ever since moved for professional reasons more or less back and forth between Finland and Russia, is remarkable. She has clearly been in the position to critically question some of the main concepts used in transnational movement studies and research on ethnic markers in which people are expected to share a unified identity. The names such as Ingrain Finns, remigrants, descendants of Finnish citizens, Russian, and Finnish get all mixed up and intermingled to something that can be called transnational identity. The transnational identity tends to change depending on place and time, and also the identity discourse is influenced by the motivations of persons. For some remigrants, the Finnishness is something that has to be emphasized in order to stabilize ones being, whereas others rather keep on seeing themselves as hybrids (p. 18).

In the first article entitled Identity’s Interactive Game – Observing Remigration to Finland (published in 2002 in Finnish and title translated by Olga Davydova), Davydova’s main asset is the way in which she is able to discuss the ambiguity of being a Russian-speaking Finn arriving to Finland. Here, the fact that Olga Davydova has personal experience that she shares with her interview partners and leveled the way for a deep and interesting analysis. The second article, Bridges to Finland (2002 in Russian and title translated by Olga Davydova) studies the discourse of “Finnishness” – what makes a person Finnish enough. The third article, Produced Finnishness in the Context of Remigration (2002) is co-authored together with Kaija Heikkinen and presents the results of a joint research project. This article coherently depictures how Finnish identity is constructed in the process of remigration influenced both by Finnish nationalism and by intergenerational “dreaming” on Finnishness. The fourth article, Ritual, Identity and Transnationality (2005 in Finnish and title translated by Olga Davydova) uses funeral rituals as a site and context for discussing the transnational identities.

The last article, Bronze Soldier Goes Transnational: Mediascapes and the Formation of Identities in Internet Discussion (2008) is an analysis of internet forum conversations of Russian-
speaking inhabitants in Finland (www.suomi.ru). It examines the transnational movement of discourses on national symbols and belongings by analyzing the debate surrounding the removal of the monument to the fallen of World War II soldiers, with a special importance for Russians, in the city centre of Tallinn, Estonia. This article shows how the Russian-speakers in Finland follow the Russian, Estonian, and Finnish media and form their discourse in the transnational mediascapes in taking an active role in using and producing media. While Davydova’s implementation of the concepts “fan media” and “activated public” is confusing, one cannot but agree with her statement that there should be more research on transnational mediascapes.

As pointed out earlier, the weaknesses of the book are tied to the fact that the articles are produced over a long-time period and yet largely rely on the same empirical material, leading to repetitions and incoherence. In addition, the choice of using three different languages in the book is not very reader-friendly. At the same time, the summary shows that the author is able to bring the individual articles together and give them meaning in the whole of the book. Davydova’s dissertation provides space for voices that are not so often heard in the Finnish public debate, namely, the voices of those who are in the process of integrating to the Finnish society and even more interestingly, people who arrive to the country as Finns but end up realizing that being a Finn in the eyes of other Finns means something more than just speaking the same language. The remigrants clearly begin the process of integration already when waiting for the immigration decision and continue with it after they have settled in Finland. The ambivalence of being a Finn in Russia and Russian in Finland continues to color their identity formation decades after being settled in the new country.

In addition to the interviews and participatory observation, Davydova has followed closely the internet discussion sites for Russians in Finland. She has interpreted the results of her research together with the persons under study by participating in the discussions and thus bringing her own person into the research field. This methodology has, in my view, brought about a “thick” description not only of the process of telling how identity discourses are formed in internet but also about the experience of everyday lives of persons who inhabit a transnational “place”. Her knowledge and in-depth understanding of the Russian context brings a new and fresh perspective and point of view to the Finnish research that has traditionally approached migrants with a focus on their integration to the Finnish society without paying very much attention to the personal history of the persons before they migrated or their transnational belongings.

Reetta Toivanen
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1. It should be noted that Olga Davydova’s numbers are estimates from year 1998.


Citizenship is often understood from purely theoretical or philosophical angle, with focus on the rights and duties of ideal, ethically homogenous citizenry of a nation-state. What become disregarded in such approaches are the complex intersectional processes – concrete practices of concrete individuals – that transform the very meanings of the notion of citizenship. In these discourses, the agency of migrants and particularly that of migrant women is largely marginalised. In her book *Migrant Women Transforming Citizenship: Life-stories from Britain and Germany*, Umut Erel successfully argues that such “theoretical debates on citizenship” are not enough, but “should be combined with an empirical grounding in the lived experiences of everyday life with its hybrid cultures” (p. 23). In the book, Erel shows how migrant women can and do challenge and shape the meanings of citizenship in their daily lives; relentlessly transforming the concept in its very margins.

Analysing the life-stories of 10 “migrant women from Turkey” living in Germany and Britain, Erel provides a complex yet potentially more inclusive understanding of citizenship in a world shaped by gendered migration. This is an understanding that defies strict categorical boundaries around citizenship, while recognising it as a “momentum concept” that must be constantly reworked so as to make it more egalitarian and inclusive (pp. 39, 196). Indeed, Erel’s research on particular migrant women’s life stories shows that the meanings of citizenship are constantly reworked in places and spaces that more traditional analyses would regard as meaningless – in the lived experiences of gendered and ethnicised girl children as citizens, for example (chapter 3); in female migrant professionals’ negotiations with racialised labels such as “skilled/unskilled,” and in experiences of institutionalised racism that these struggles involve (chapter 4); in transnational mothering and negotiations of sexual subjectivity, and the intimate impact of these on migration decisions (chapter 5); and on the various levels of civil society where political activism of noncitizens and citizens continues to construct the meanings that citizenship takes at any one moment of time (chapter 6).

For her research, Erel interviewed 10 women altogether, six in a German city and four in London, between January 1998 and April 1999. In addition, Erel mentions that she “makes limited use of some material from interviews conducted in the German city in 1996”. The interviewees were found via personal contacts and snowballing (p. 18), and while all the women were from Turkey, their ethnic backgrounds varied. The book focuses on a group of migrants largely neglected in migration studies (p. 2), namely highly educated and skilled women from Turkey. Thus, the particular women interviewed were chosen because of them “being skilled or professional as well as [...] useful informants about exercising agency, and presenting a variety of experiences” (p. 18). Erel’s sample thus does not aim at statistical representativity (p. 8). However, because her interest is in the complexity of the ways in which “moments of agency” (ibid.) surface in migrant women’s life stories, the relatively small sample is more than adequate for her purposes. And indeed, the value of Erel’s life-story methodology can be located in its potential to uncover the intersectional power relations, which in “statistically representative” samples are overshadowed by the foregrounding of common patterns.

Erel defines her intersectional perspective as viewing “gender, ethnicity and class as intermeshing social divisions” so that “these social relations and discourses on gendered ethnicization and class form the conditions of women’s lives but also inform the ways they make sense of their experience” (pp. 2–3). As a whole, the book provides the reader with strong examples of intersectionality in various contexts of citizenship. However, given
that intersectionality is the most central methodological device of the book. Erel’s argumentation would have benefited from a more in-depth introduction of the concept, its origins, and meanings than is presently given (Davis 2008). At least, it could have been more explicitly underlined, already in the beginning of the book, that intersectionality for the author is not merely a methodical perspective, but an ontological assumption that perceives the multiple axes of social differentiation — such as gender, ethnicity, and class — so deeply intertwined in people’s lives that they cannot be “separated out into discrete and pure strands” (Brah and Phoenix 2004: 76). This at least seems to be the case, and I am convinced that such explicitness would have strengthened Erel’s theorisation throughout. This, however, does not reduce the value of Erel’s critical contribution to citizenship studies.

She argues that in dominant representations of migrant communities, the rich and varying experiences of women are easily neglected. Here, maleness is presented as the norm, and women are represented — and treated — as passive and victimised. Thereby, migrant women from Turkey are constantly reified as “Other Others” in both policy and research — essentialised figures denoting the gendered and ethnicised assumptions of oppressed Muslim women; fundamentally different from the emancipated and agentive “native” women (p. 7, 33).

Life story being an “important vantage point for exploring the links between subjectivity and social structures” (p. 5), Erel’s method allows her to deconstruct these kinds of monolithic cultural assumptions. Uneasy with the tendency of perceiving a life story either as an example of exceptionality and individuality — as in humanities — or as expressive of communal experiences — as in social sciences — Erel refutes the dichotomisation between the individual and collective/mass, hence questioning the neat typologies on which much of modern citizenship discourse relies (pp. 7–8).

In Erel’s account, the “migrant woman from Turkey” is thus not merely a gendered representative of her racialised community, but a historical agent on her own right. Certainly, the migrant woman’s agency is limited by the discursive structures representing her as the “Other Other.” However, Erel’s denial of neat typologies also means a refusal to accept victimisation as the opposite of agency (e.g. p. 185). In the life stories, it is several times shown how victimisation and agency should rather be understood as “dynamically related” (ibid.): Being victimised does not mean being passive, but often leads one to search for agency in the most innovative ways. And similarly, one’s agency (as well as passivity) can lead to situations of victimisation. Thus, the migrant women in Erel’s book are not only structurally constrained but also simultaneously historical agents capable of negotiating their positions within the very structures that confine — thereby transforming the structures including the discourses of citizenship. This, in itself, is a theoretically valuable argument capable of expanding our understanding of citizenship.

Erel’s deconstructive analysis requires a nuanced understanding of the power relations at play, and through her strong intersectional perspective Erel is capable of foregrounding not only similarities in the interviews but also controversies by which to disillusion the group as culturally monolithic. However, although the intersectional perspective carries Erel’s analysis forward throughout the book, it is only on the very last pages (pp. 193–196) where the author reveals the central theoretical claim of the book — namely that intersectionality should be understood as “an epistemology for citizenship practices.” It is surprising that such an enabling and theoretical statement is brought in only at the end. This is another example of how stating one’s understanding of intersectionality more explicitly already in the beginning of the book would have helped the author to make the work theoretically stronger throughout.

The strong intersectional gaze has, however, also informed Erel’s choice of presenting the interview material in thematic order rather than as individual stories. This is analytically enabling, but makes the text sometimes difficult to follow. As a reader, one gets easily interested in the particular lives of the interviewees intrigued by their destinies — but when the story jumps from Nilüfer’s life to that of Dilek, Birgül, Pınar, Selin, and back again, one gets easily confused who was who, and eventually distanced from the subjects of the story. Such dilution of subjectivities is, of course, what often happens when a lived experience is made to bend under a socio-scientific analysis; it is almost impossible to avoid.

However, in this book Erel could have perhaps even more courageously broken the socio-scientific conventions of writing. Namely, while acknowledging her powerful role as the analyst of the life stories (p. 5), and reflecting her own positioning as a second generation Turkish migrant born in Germany and living in the UK (pp. 20–21), in the actual analysis (chapters 3–6) her own situatedness deserves surprisingly little attention (see however p. 172, fn. 1). While this does not make the book any less worthy of reading, the analysis would have benefited from the author’s more explicit investment of her own voice, experience, and situatedness. After all, Erel draws attention to the intersectional power relations that produce change in mundane practices, deconstructing many dichotomies that reign in migration studies and policies. In such a framework, there is no need to distance the science-making Self from the intersectional layers of power in which one conducts one’s research. Indeed, explicit autobiographical investments might have further strengthened Erel’s argumentation, which — without a doubt — already is argumentation worth reading.

Tiina Vaittinen
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1. Erel refers to her interviewees as “migrant women from Turkey.” While recognising the risk of diluting the diversity of ethnic backgrounds (Azeri, Kurdish, Zaza, Cherkness, Macedonian, Yörük, and Turkish) with this term, Erel emphasises that it is meant to “encompass the multiple forms of identification of migrant women with their countries of residence, such as ‘British,’ ‘German-Turkish,’ ‘bi-cultural,’ or ‘migrant’” (p. 3).
2. It needs to be noted, however, that the lack of clear discussion in the book regarding the existing definitions of citizenship
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Many national governments are faced with the challenge of meeting the needs of their increasingly diverse populations. As a result, careful efforts have been made to define citizens’ relationship to the state. In public policy terms, historically this has led to, among other things, discussions about gender roles, and what constitutes gender equality. More recently, however, due to increasing levels of migration, governments must now also address the issue of racial and ethnic equality. The book Changing Relations of Welfare: Family, Gender and Migration in Britain and Scandinavia has much to say on this topic. The authors ambitiously investigate the intersections of family, gender, race, and ethnicity, and explore how these intersections play out in family policy in the specific national contexts of Britain, Sweden, and Denmark. The focus of the book is on family policy, and particularly how governments have regulated relationships within families, and between families and the state. As such, the book presents a cutting edge account of a relatively understudied issue.

According to the books editors Janet Fink and Åsa Lundqvist, the aim of the book is to investigate the relationship between the welfare state and the family. The book does this by considering who is included or excluded from the welfare state in given times and places, and how this inclusion/exclusion is regulated through the monitoring of family life. As such, the work has a strong focus on the meaning of belonging and citizenship. This book consists of an introduction, seven contributing chapters, and a conclusion. It is divided into two clearly defined parts. The first part looks at how gender regimes overlap with welfare regimes, whereas the second part keeps gender in focus while simultaneously addressing migration regimes and the impact of diversity on welfare states.

Part one of the book, Family, Gender Relations and the Welfare State, introduces us to the gendered regimes of Denmark, Sweden, and Britain by looking at how population growth and social reproduction were monitored by each respective state from the early 20th century. Part one is mainly focused on the regulation of gender relations, and particularly the role of women in family policy in each of the states under study. The shifting and sometimes even contradictory ways in which equality between men and women has been defined is explored. In all three countries, men were recognized as the primary breadwinner, despite prevailing discourses about gender equality in other aspects of life. Hilary Land’s chapter, Overshadowed by the Male Breadwinner: Care in 20th Century Britain, argues that in 20th century Britain, for example, marriage was a clear contract between husband and wife, who had separate roles to perform. According to Land, the male breadwinner model emerged due to economic and social trends in Britain, but it continues to play a pervasive role in the regulation of British family law. While British women have entered the labor force in greater numbers, they also continue to perform the bulk of the domestic work, much of which is undervalued. Land views this as a legacy of the 20th century breadwinner model in which women were depicted as dependents of men. Fink and Holden’s chapter Paradoxes of Gender and Marital Status in Mid-20th Century British Welfare also addresses the British case. The authors argue that in Britain, the pervasive notion of a male-breadwinner model in the 1920s and 1930s had profound implications particularly for single women, who did not live their lives within the nuclear family framework. The authors argue that because tax allowances, benefit rates, and national insurance schemes were regulated with respect to a nuclear family model, those outside of this model had difficulties securing benefits. Although modern British society is more open to alternatives to the nuclear family model, there is still a great deal of discussion over single motherhood in policy debates, and for good reason. Inaccessibility of childcare, lower wages for women, and the burden of working both inside and outside of the home have made it difficult for women to raise children without supporting male partners.

The two contributions on Britain in part one are accompanied by two chapters focused on the Scandinavian context. In their chapter titled Competing Meanings of Gender Equality: Family, Marriage and Tax Law in 20th Century Denmark, Anna-Birte Ravn and Bente Rosenbeck argue that although gender equality was an important value in Danish law from the 1920s, men were recognized as household heads, and therefore primary earners and tax payers, until the 1970s. The authors argue that the definition of gender equality has changed over time, and that the Danish government has redefined the relationship among family, gender, and the state to meet its changing needs over time. While policy was concerned with reproduction and population in the 1920s, Denmark’s current policy puts a higher priority on managing the labor market participation of its citizens. While Denmark may be viewed as “woman-friendly,” therefore, the authors warn that a dual-income model does not necessitate full gender equality, and in fact Danish women have faced significant challenges to their full inclusion and citizenship, as in other welfare states. Åsa Lundqvist and Christine Romans chapter The Institutionalization of Family and Gender Equality Policies in the Swedish Welfare State, similarly discusses the welfare state in Sweden, a state sharing many of Denmark’s policies and approaches to welfare. Like in Denmark, state intervention in family life has traditionally been quite strong, thereby affecting labor market participation, and the regulation of family life and childcare depending on the state’s needs at the time.

The second part of the book, Gender, Migration and Social Inequalities, builds on the issues raised in the first part of the book, but takes things a step further by bringing in the issue of migration and ethnic diversity. The authors show how gender intersects with ethnicity and migrant status when it comes to negotiating access to the welfare state, often leading to the exclusion of migrants. Kaveri Harriss and Alison Shaw, in their chapter Migration, Family and British Social Policy in the Late 20th Century: British Pakistani Perspectives, for example, illustrate how family life is monitored through state control of immigration and settlement. By focusing on the case of Pakistani migrants in the UK, they show how the government has framed migration policy with the view that male migrants are breadwinners who are accompanied by female dependents. This reduces the agency of female migrants and reinforces patriarchal power relations. Furthermore, marriage migrants, and those moving to live near relatives or even to receive care from British-based relatives are treated with suspicion. The authors therefore argue that British policy has shown a lack of sensitivity for family structures and practices that do not fit the British nuclear family norm. Instead, Harriss and Shaw argue that welfare policies are based on normative ideas of the family, and when different ethnic groups do not fit the expected family mould, they may face difficulties in accessing the welfare state.
Birte Siim and Anette Borchorst’s chapter, *The Multicultural Challenge to the Danish Welfare State: Tensions between Gender Equality and Diversity*, looks at how migration in Denmark has, like in the British case, similarly challenged the prevailing welfare regime and gender norms. The chapter argues that while Scandinavian countries are “women-friendly” in a number of ways, their ability to recognize cultural difference and integrate women from different ethnic backgrounds has been limited. Denmark’s current migration policy, which regulates the welfare benefits and family reunification rights of migrants, is highly restrictive and clashes with an otherwise very liberal family policy. The authors therefore call for a reconsideration of the Scandinavian welfare model in a time of growing multiculturalism and diversity.

The book finishes with Diana Muliniari’s chapter, titled *Postcolonial Encounters: Migrant Women and Swedish Midwives*. Muliniari takes us into Sweden’s hospital delivery rooms to see how minority women and their families experience Sweden’s medical system during their pregnancy and labor. Muliniari’s argument is that the process of giving birth is racialized; women from non-western backgrounds are often viewed as traditional and oppressed, and are therefore treated differently than Swedish women would be when accessing the same services. She therefore calls us to pay more attention to the role of ethnic and racial discrimination in Swedish welfare institutions.

I think this book is courageous in its attempt to bring gender and migration studies together, while all the while keeping the welfare state in clear focus. The contributors of this work should be commended for moving forward many debates in both fields, and for providing a more nuanced perspective on the issues they take up. It is perhaps the book’s interdisciplinary approach that has made it so dynamic. The edited collection includes contributions from the fields of political science, sociology, history, anthropology, and social policy. Rather than addressing the issue from one perspective, therefore, the chapters synthesize different perspectives, and contribute to the debate on welfare states and equality more generally.

A second strength of the book is that it deliberately adopts a historical perspective. Rather than focusing on current dilemmas and policy disputes, the book’s historical approach allows us to see how things have developed over time in each of the relevant states. While the chapters look at different time periods, between them, they cover the period from the early 20th century to the present, and all show a special sensitivity to historical context.

The book takes up different national contexts, different time periods, and is interdisciplinary in focus. Despite this, the chapters fit surprisingly well together, with one flowing into the next. The book reads as a cohesive work, and it seems that the authors have been working in collaboration and in dialogue with one another. It is perhaps for this reason that they have been able to deliver a comparative approach. Despite being written by different authors with different disciplinary backgrounds, the book succeeds to compare the welfare regimes of Britain, Denmark, and Sweden in a relatively short number of pages. Although there is no comprehensive overview of the welfare regimes, many of the contributors nevertheless make reference to all three of the welfare states, and – in addressing similar concerns in each chapter – succeed at delivering a comparative perspective. This is an important contribution at a time when efforts toward European Union integration have led to a growing interest in comparative studies that assess different welfare models within the Union.

This is an ambitious work that covers a great deal of ground. Some may find that it cannot fully develop and discuss all of the aspects it touches on – the legal, the economic, and the social dimensions of welfare in each of the given contexts. More time and space would be necessary to analyze the welfare context in each state on a deeper level. The book is perhaps better seen as offering an exciting and fresh overview of the states under study. More importantly, however, this book provides an innovative way of understanding welfare states more generally, and their corresponding gender and migration regimes. This, in my view, is a true achievement, and I highly recommend this book to anyone interested in gender, family, or migration studies, as well as those with a more general interest in welfare states.

Melissa Kelly
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Care giving and care work is an increasingly important service in graying postindustrial societies. The “sandwich generation” (people with young children and elder parents to care for) is finding the stress associated with the demanding, fast paced, and insecure contemporary working world is making meeting the needs of children and parents unmanageable. Care work, which often used to be considered part and parcel of the unionized public sector, is also going gray as the demand for cheap migrant caregivers grows. The book, *Global Care Work: Gender and Migration in Nordic Societies*, explores how Nordic countries have increasingly looked to resolve the contradictions and strains of multiple care giving roles in society and the family through outsourcing care. Nordic countries have had a situation distinct from that of many other western industrialized/postindustrial nations due to their extensive welfare states, which have sought to mitigate the impact of care giving by ensuring the public provision of services. The 10 chapters in this collection attempt to capture the complexity of current social realities related to labor, migration, and care work in 21st century Nordic societies. The book uses the term “global care work,” a relatively new phrase, which is somewhat vague and generic as most things “global” are, though it is hard to conceive a better expression. As global care work is a concept in motion, early books like this will be important trailblazers in examining the implications of this growing social phenomenon locally and, indeed, globally.

Women’s roles in western family structures have been changing since the start of deindustrialization in the 1970s. The nuclear family, which arguably came about due to modern industrialization, made dependence on the extended family unnecessary. Through better wages and social conditions, many western-working families in the 20th century were able to buy their own homes, have increased leisure time, and become more educated. Public schools and day care centers offered child care and education during working hours. People were also able to retire in financial and health security due to the provisions of the modern welfare state. In some western countries, a substantial number of women were able to stay at home as housewives and mothers rather than to take care of a farm or work as wage laborers. While the second wave of women’s liberation may have paved the way for women’s more equitable entrance in the labor market, the forces of globalization and neo-liberalism have brought a radically different set of circumstances for working women at the turn of the millennium. Far from being a “choice” to work, most western women must work to...
Keep their families afloat, often at wages that are far from a living wage, and during hours outside of regular business schedules. The dilemma that many women face as the often primary caregivers for spouses, children, disabled, and elder relatives, is how to manage it all: work, kids, parents, spouses, work demands, and stress. The move toward gender equality in western societies can thus be seen in many ways as stalled.

Unlike the state of California, which was able to outsource the construction of 5,300 tons of steel segments for the repair of the San Francisco Bay Bridge to China, where the $12 daily wage is significantly less than in the USA, care work requires the physical presence of the laborer performing the task. This fact raises a myriad of issues, such as the prospect of the arrival of care work immigrants to countries where working class people fears newcomers as job stealers, and the outsourcing of traditional public sector jobs in health and social care as medical tourism increases. Migrant labor has been a staple of U.S. care work among middle class households (e.g., the excellent Domestica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence by Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo) since the birth of the nation. The USA, however, has long been a heterogeneous society with a history of ethnic enslavement and servitude that has led to a tacit social acceptance of waged care work relations in the private sector (in addition to resistance against such relations). Nordic societies, on the other hand, have constructed care as a social right for all residents to be handled by the social and health sector of the welfare state. Global Care Work thus opens an important window into a rapidly changing neo-liberal northern landscape that is doing its part to contribute to the unequal global division of labor.

Among the many interesting chapters that comprise this book is a discussion of the changing role of au pairs in Norway by Mariya Bikova, a former au pair there herself. Traditionally, the notion of an au pair was that of cultural exchange by (usually) young western women and the opportunity to learn a new language. Many women of my generation ventured out to England and France to be a temporary part of a family and experience living in a new country while minding children and performing light housework. As Bikova points out this is no longer the case. Norway renowned for its generous child benefit payments, day care provision, and extended parental leave has seen a 10-fold rise in the amount of generous child benefit payments, day care provision, and extended parental leave. Increasingly, au pairs are less from other European or North American countries than from developing countries. Through rich interview data, Bikova draws out the fiction of au pair care work as family incorporation from the perspective of the family employers. As Bikova demonstrates in this case study, au pair care work in Norway tends to reinforce unequal gender roles and add to global and local disparities by activating global care chains of power and privilege.

Finnish researcher Minna Zechner’s chapter focuses on the welfare state social policies that drive this globalization of care. This is a refreshing starting point rather than the predominant emphasis on migrant labor itself. Zechner raises many interesting socio-cultural points about Finnish care policy that may not be known to outsiders. She mentions the fact that taking leave for the care of a child is covered, but leave for care of an elder is not institutionalized in the system. Residency requirements militate against newcomers and asylum seekers. Though all Finnish children have a subjective right to day care, they are cared for the longest at home of all of the Nordic countries. Hence, most care policies in Finland are geared more toward the meeting the needs of child carers than elder carers.

Two recent cases in Finland where the grandmothers of immigrant families were denied visas to be cared for by their children show the complex intersection between migration and care policies, ageism, and unequal global chains of care labor. These cases exemplify the inequalities driven by national policies that resonate on both global and local levels.

Lise Lotte Hansen of Roskilde University considers global domestic workers in Denmark amidst the complex interaction between labor market regulation, union representation, and solidarity strategies. This macro exploration of the policy and practice contexts of global care chains provides an important local perspective on how such relations create further inequality in host societies.

This important book outlines how care work has become increasingly commodified and embedded in relations of power and privilege in a Nordic-global context. As Zechner points out, care migration and medical tourism clearly runs on a rich to poor country trajectory, whereas care provision increasingly runs in the opposite direction from poor to rich nation. The “housewifization” of educated women from developing countries (in Bikova’s words) undermines global gender equality. This book richly details how care systems and policies have emerged from the various Nordic societies out of the specific historical and socio-cultural circumstances of the each nation. As global neo-liberalism continues to have a big impact on Nordic welfare societies in multifarious ways, it will be interesting to see how gender and ethnic equality, care provision policies, and labor conditions develop in the future. In this volume, the connection between the personal and political is made abundantly clear.

Kris Clarke, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work Education, California State University, Fresno, USA


Does equal opportunity legislation, and diversity management as a concept, exist in different country contexts? And if so, can diversity management be seen as a break from equal opportunity work? These are the central questions the 39 contributors to the *International Handbook on Diversity Management at Work: Country Perspectives on Diversity and Equal Treatment* are set out to examine.

The questions are highly relevant. Diversity management is a managerial approach to identities in the sphere of work that emerged in the USA for more than twenty years ago. In the USA, diversity management was made meaningful as a distinct approach from affirmative action (AA) and equal opportunity (EO). Whereever AA and EO approaches had been legally regulated and motivated by human rights questions, diversity management was presented as a totally voluntary initiative and primarily driven by business interests. (*Thomas 1990*). From the USA the trend has then spread globally, but little is still known about the contextualized meanings of diversity management (*Calâs et al. 2009*). The *International Handbook on Diversity Management at Work*, edited by Professor Alain Klarsfeld, is a timely contribution that addresses this lack. The book consists of a short introduction by the editor and 15 country-specific chapters. One chapter treats two countries, amounting to 16 the number of countries covered. These are Austria, Belgium,
Canada, France, Germany, India, Italy, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Singapore, South-Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the UK, and the USA.

In the short introduction, Klarsfeld outlines the origins of the project and the structure of the book. He explains that at the outset of the project authors were provided with a set of guidelines. They were asked to cover at least existing legislation related to equality, and if such legislation did not exist, to discuss the public debate about diversity. The authors were also asked to describe the status of empirical research related to diversity and to discuss the relationship between equal opportunity legislation and diversity management. Thereon, the authors were recommended to privilege empirical material over theoretical approaches.

Covering all these questions in a sole book chapter is a real challenge. A typical chapter starts by over-viewing the demographic profile of the country, and especially going through the situation of a selection of diversity dimensions such as gender, ethnicity, age, and disability. Then the legislative framework is described, after which many of the authors turn to diversity research and/or diversity practice. It has to be recognized that most authors succeed in meeting the challenge of treating the many areas in one sole chapter. However, at times the reader can sense that the authors’ urge to cover the required questions lead to a lot of description at the expense of a more reflective approach that would have been welcomed.

In the book, the chapters are arranged in alphabetical order along the country under focus. Since it is impossible to here review each chapter separately, I will focus on the main themes, similarities, and differences between the chapters.

The chapters focusing on European countries highlight the importance the European Union has had on national antidiscrimination legislations. Switzerland as the only European non-EU member state has not modified its legislation along the EU directives on antidiscrimination, even though Julia Nentwich, Chris Steyaert, and Brigitte Liebig in their chapter explain that Switzerland closely follows legislative developments in the EU and may choose to adopt similar changes. All other European countries have developed their often already existing equality and antidiscrimination legislative frameworks in the years 2000 to correspond to the EU directives.

The European Union is also described as an influential actor in promoting diversity. This has lead diversity to be lifted up on the national business or social policy agendas. Here, a clear distinction, however, emerges among the European countries. Verena Bruchhagen, Jürgen Grieger, Iris Koall, Michael Meuser, Renate Ortlieb, and Barbara Sieben, for instance, explain how diversity was introduced to the German context by the private sector and discussed within managerial circles, while Viktoria Kalonaityte, Pushkala Prasad, and Adiam Tedros describe how diversity management in Sweden precisely was not taken up by business actors and how diversity there is associated with the public sector and social policies. Which differences diversity refers to also differs between countries. For Italy, Annalisa Murgia and Barbara Poggio depict diversity as a new phenomenon that has not yet received a lot of attention, and that the existing diversity work mainly has focused on gender differences. At the same time in Belgium diversity mainly refers to migrants, according to Annie Cornet and Patrizia Zanoni. There are several potential explanations for why diversity in different contexts is more attached to the private or the public sector, or why diversity comes to refer to some dimension rather than to another.

The authors for each separate chapter explain the development around diversity in their respective countries, but there is no explicit attempt to explain the variations between countries, which could have been done in a now missing concluding chapter.

Lize Booyisen and Stella Nkomo, writing about the South-African context, show that diversity management is not solely a North-American or a European issue. South-African companies are described to work with diversity strategies on a daily basis. The South-African context where the diversity work aims to improve the work opportunities of the majority population is highly interesting for anyone working with equality and diversity questions.

Also the chapters on India (by Rana Haq and Abhoy Ojha) and the chapter on Singapore (by Audrey Chia and Angeline Lim) are a highly interesting read. In India, the focus of workplace equality has been on quotas or “reservations” for three different groups: the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes, and the Other Backward Classes. In Singapore, there exists no antidiscrimination legislation at all. Instead a Tripartite Alliance for Fair Employment Practices, composed of the Ministry of Manpower and employer and employee federations, work together to ensure fair employment. Chia and Lim also explain that equality and racial harmony are central concepts of Singapore’s nation building project, and efforts in different areas of societal life are put on ensuring racial harmony.

Diversity management thus is not the privileged approach to deal with differences in India or Singapore nor in Pakistan or Turkey as described by Mustafa Özbilgin, Jawad Syed, and Beliz Dereli. These chapters not only provide information on alternative models but also show us how the choice of terminology and approach highlights certain issues and silences others. While diversity management approaches make gender, ethnicity, or age visible and often present them as taken-for-granted identities, the model based on quotas in India makes no distinction in gender or age.

The country contexts where diversity management has a long history – the USA, the UK, and Canada – provide interesting insights into the second central question of the book project – is diversity management a break from equal opportunity? It is especially in the USA and in the UK that diversity has been framed as different from equal opportunity. But the contributors to this volume give a more nuanced picture. Waheeda Lillevik, Gwendolyn Combs, and Cheryl Wyrick explain that in the USA diversity management practices are still often found to replicate the content of Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action work. Ahu Tatli is on the same lines and states that in the UK the discourse has changed, but the practices to a large extent resemble those of equal opportunity work. Only for Canada, Rana Haq and Eddy Ng maintain that diversity management is a clearly distinct approach as instead of legal compliance business advantages of diversity are privileged. The overall conclusion one can draw from the different contributions of the book, is that diversity and equal opportunity in work are intertwined, albeit in different ways. Diversity management is described as a break from equal opportunity, as a separate policy approach existing parallel to equality legislation, and an approach to promote equality work altogether.

Overall the different chapters provide rich descriptions of diversity in context and depict the complexity of questions related to equality and diversity at work. The reader of the handbook should keep in mind that the angle of approach that was chosen in this volume, the legislative frame, is only one relevant angle when looking into equality and diversity in work. The current volume of the International Handbook on Diversity Management at Work provides a valuable contribution, but there certainly is need for future volumes approaching these questions from other angles.
In addition to calling for more research in the area of contextualized diversity and equality work, one has to underline the importance of practical diversity and equality work. All the different contributions clearly depict inequality between different groups as a pervasive problem despite the amount of progress made so far. The International Handbook on Diversity Management at Work can be warmly recommended to anyone working to address these problems, be it academics, policy makers, or activists.

Jonna Louvrier
Doctoral Student, Hanken School of Economics
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There is an inescapable asymmetry between rights of movement of human beings and the world composed of sovereign states controlling more or less zealously their borders. It is around this asymmetry that the edited book, containing 14 main chapters, is based. The primary focus is on the nexus between (im-)migration and (in-)security, recently a rather common topic across disciplines such as politics, international relations, and sociology. Although the back cover of the book states that the articles explore the concerns of states with regard to migration, the opposite largely prevails – the main emphasis is on the concerns of migrants with regard to states, as well as other controlling and intervening agents and mechanisms. The book distances itself from state-centric aspects and leans strongly, both normatively and empirically, on human security and inherent rights of human beings to seek and attain safety and well being. The securitization of migration is approached through perspectives focusing on the construction of migrants as threats by various actors, such as states, the European Union, markets, and media.

The conclusions of the book are not very promising. In the words of Annie Phizacklea (p. 291), “given the record of practice over the last forty years, [a real commitment to a rights based regime] amounts to a very uphill struggle.” Linking this pessimism to the weakened ability to control migration (p. 24) further clouds possible scenarios concerning the issue of global migration. On the other hand, there are few instances where concrete – and indeed realistic; a word ignored in the book – improvements or policy innovations are presented. However, as is argued below, this is more likely to result from inevitable determinants of the rigid international system than particular cynicism of the scholars as such.

The book covers a large variety of themes ranging from the dilemmas involved in policy making on immigration to racism and xenophobia. It also balances neatly between theoretical and empirical matters, offering both conceptual rigor and highly interesting and useful real-world insights. However, the methodological and meta-theoretical variation is also considerable. Poststructuralist affinities with ever so abstract conceptions of right bearers, duties, and obligations as well as more rational and straightforward formulations of security are found side by side in the book. It depends on the preferences of the reader, if this is regarded as a problem or not. As the book has resulted from an interdisciplinary conference session organized by the editor, its eclectic character is understandable, if not desired.

The opening chapter of Georgios Karyotis can be regarded implicitly as a theoretical basis which the subsequent formulations of human security mostly rest on. The chapter builds on a distinction between a realist conception of security based on the framework of a national state and a “liberal” frame of human security focusing on individuals. It is claimed that the main reason for states to control migration in a deeply restrictive manner is the conviction that migration poses threats to states. This conviction is then proved false, arguing that both state citizens and migrants are worse off when securitization takes place.

All chapters more or less focus on the construction and redefinition of the fundamental distinction between state and human rights. Kees Nagtegaal redefines the double character of security and focuses on the asymmetries and controversies, both inherent and more factitious, of immigration policies in the case of the Netherlands. He rightly acknowledges that even “a hospitable country for refugees” (p. 119) gives more emphasis to the security of the nation state and its original citizens than to that of immigrants. Like Bernd Parusel in his following chapter on unaccompanied minors, Nagtegaal stresses the difficulty of authorities to balance between the “real-politik” of the state and the commitments of international treaties concerning the rights of human beings. Again, it is recognized that the domination of national interests on immigration and refugee policies results in insecurity for immigrants. Parusel’s chapter, proceeding from a wider study carried out by the European Migration Network, is based on extensive comparative data and draws attention to the policies of “Fortress Europe” with regard to the most vulnerable of the vulnerable, child immigrants.

Another asymmetry well reflected in the book, oftentimes implicitly though, evolves in relation to the juxtaposition of real and ideal. Mojca Pajnik, for example, points to normatively and practically significant differences between de jure and de facto citizenships of used-to-be-immigrants, and to other informal variations in their status positions. Furthermore, unsurprisingly, in many of the chapters of the book the appeal of ideal “rights speech” is found to conflict with actual policies taking place in the real-world of harsh inequalities and minimal political commitment to resolve the problems of immigration.

Empirically most influential chapters are those by Mark Maguire focusing on biometric security, and extremely timely chapters on the economic and financial crisis with regard to migration by Khalid Koser, and to a lesser extent by Branka Likic-Brboric. With a more subjectivist research methodology, Liza Schuster’s chapter focusing on the abysmal experiences of Afghan male migrants also brings relevant insights into the general theme of migration in Europe. For readers interested in discursive and constitutive elements of immigration, racism, and gender, chapters of Giovanna Campani, Anastassia Tsoukala, Anna Krasteva, and Burcu Tögral may turn out to be fruitful. Linguistically even more poetic, offering a host of metaphors, is the chapter by Natalia Ribas-Mateos dealing with the “metamorphosis of borders.” Particularly in these chapters, the view of the duality of security is approached in a more imaginative (often Foucauldian) manner or, methodologically speaking, more critically. In general, the securitarian discourse or paradigm seems to conflict in a severe way with any human or humanitarian motives or ideas. The last chapter by Gabriella Lazaridis and Anna Maria Konsta concentrating on a “plastic citizenship” can be situated...
somewhere in the middle – while drawing both on citizenship studies and contemporary critical theory focusing on “abjectification,” the chapter also serves strongly as an empirical case study on marginalized immigrant women in Greece.

In spite of the fact that in practice there is a deep asymmetry between state-centric determinants and human-based rights with regard to immigration, pervasive critique against the state actor in general is over-represented in the book. Originating from the distinction between realist and liberal framings of security, the idea of substitutive and exclusionary rights of humans as well as states is widened and deepened in many of the chapters of the book. Fearsome sovereignty is seen only as containing elements of rights in conflict with those of human beings, thus amounting to freedom from responsibility. What is ignored in the Arendtian conception of “rights to have rights” combined with an adversarial view with regard to states, however, is the fact that without restricted communities (i.e. states) there would be no guarantors of any human rights. The relevant point to start with is to recognize that there are differences between states in relation to their solidaristic capability. In the realm of the European Union, the main concern should be on the far-reaching inequality between its member states to receive immigrants, be it for strategic reasons, and political will or geographical realities. However, determining and controlling who belongs to a community is a minimal prerequisite for organizing well-being of human beings and that is why “a certain degree of realism is embedded into the execution of refugee policies” (p. 122). This inherent and primordial feature of state causes dichotomies of “us versus them” or “in versus out,” which are significant both normatively and practically. Nevertheless, (some) states and interstate institutions are ever more important to secure human rights and freedom of immigrants in actu as well. Freedom and security should be seen as two sides of the same coin. The fact that this coin is relevant only in the framework of states may, from a humanitarian point of view, be a moral flaw, but for the time being, there is no better alternative.

Human security, as a normatively desirable but empirically problematic concept, has been extremely popular in many fields of research outside the realist legacy of international relations. Fruitful elements of human security in terms of research are, however, lost if we want the concept to include everything it conceptually promises; that is, all ills and threats humans may encounter. Even if we employ an emancipatory methodology, which certainly is justified in the context of immigration, we should refrain from the short-cut option of “us versus them” or “in versus out,” which are significant both normatively and practically. Nevertheless, (some) states and interstate institutions are ever more important to secure human rights and freedom of immigrants in actu as well. Freedom and security should be seen as two sides of the same coin. The fact that this coin is relevant only in the framework of states may, from a humanitarian point of view, be a moral flaw, but for the time being, there is no better alternative.

What follows are three chapters that provide rich ethnographic and survey data on the political, social, and economic dynamics surrounding migration and remittances in the Somali context. The third chapter focuses on Hargeysa, the capital of the secessionist Republic of Somaliland, and outlines the significance of receiving money first, at the family level, and second, at the regional or national (Somaliland) level. Diaspora money and influence have helped the rebuilding of Hargeysa (and other places) from the ruins, the survival of family members, and the development of private businesses as well as the health care and educational infrastructure. This illustrates that remittances, as Lindley repeatedly emphasizes, are more than money. They have a social, cultural, and also political dimension.

Chapter four shows how remittances help Somalis in Kenyan refugee camps and in Eastleigh, a quarter of Nairobi mainly inhabited by Somalis. While remittances play similar roles there as in Hargeysa, at least with regard to family survival and kick-starting private businesses, life of Somalis in Kenya seems generally more constraint. They mostly lack legal status and have to make a living at the margins of society, vulnerable to abuse, and attacks by Kenyan authorities. While some Somalis travel back and forth between Kenya and Somalia, hoping for the betterment of the situation “back home,” others try to find their way into Europe or North America. Arranging to be smuggled into a richer country where one can achieve a secure status as refugee is seen as entirely legitimate option by Somali actors.

Following the outward path of Somali migration (which is running counter to the direction the money usually flows), chapter five provides a view from London. It is Lindley’s most original contribution to the literature on migration and remittance-sending in which she looks carefully at who is sending the money, what are the social micro-dynamics underlying the remittance relationships and what are the repercussions of remitting for the senders. Lindley convincingly underpins her observations about remittance behavior of her interlocutors in London with Sahlin’s concept of “generalized reciprocity.” She also masterfully discerns the various motivations
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Anna Lindley’s book provides a theoretically informed and empirically grounded perspective on dynamics and patterns of Somali migration and transnationalism. Methodologically, her account combines qualitative ethnographic data with smaller surveys. This, in combination with larger quantitative data sets produced by United Nations Development Programme and others, allows for more general conclusions. Lindley’s concise book comprises five densely written chapters and a brief conclusion.

Throughout the book, Lindley concentrates on migration, conflict, and the livelihoods of refugees. In the introductory chapter, the author insightfully summarizes the current debates on each of these topics and criticizes the generalizations (re-)produced in policy-driven discourses. Studying Somali refugees’ remittances, she argues, promises new insights into local–global connections related to the mentioned key topics.

In chapter two, Lindley takes the reader to a tour de force through Somali political history. It is one of Lindley’s strengths that she never loses track of her main topics. She outlines how migration was since long part of the Somali cultural repertoire, and how innovation and adaptation helped Somalis to cope with economic and political hardship. Simultaneously, Lindley cautions against undue generalizations and emphasizes how people’s reactions to political or economic dynamics varied at different times in different locations. Her account of the emergence of the hawala (Somali: xawaala) money transfer system is very helpful. One wonders, however, why Lindley does not say more about the Islamic culture and ethics underlying this system.

What follows are three chapters that provide rich ethnographic and survey data on the political, social, and economic dynamics surrounding migration and remittances in the Somali context. The third chapter focuses on Hargeysa, the capital of the secessionist Republic of Somaliland, and outlines the significance of receiving money first, at the family level, and second, at the regional or national (Somaliland) level. Diaspora money and influence have helped the rebuilding of Hargeysa (and other places) from the ruins, the survival of family members, and the development of private businesses as well as the health care and educational infrastructure. This illustrates that remittances, as Lindley repeatedly emphasizes, are more than money. They have a social, cultural, and also political dimension.

Chapter four shows how remittances help Somalis in Kenyan refugee camps and in Eastleigh, a quarter of Nairobi mainly inhabited by Somalis. While remittances play similar roles there as in Hargeysa, at least with regard to family survival and kick-starting private businesses, life of Somalis in Kenya seems generally more constraint. They mostly lack legal status and have to make a living at the margins of society, vulnerable to abuse, and attacks by Kenyan authorities. While some Somalis travel back and forth between Kenya and Somalia, hoping for the betterment of the situation “back home,” others try to find their way into Europe or North America. Arranging to be smuggled into a richer country where one can achieve a secure status as refugee is seen as entirely legitimate option by Somali actors.

Following the outward path of Somali migration (which is running counter to the direction the money usually flows), chapter five provides a view from London. It is Lindley’s most original contribution to the literature on migration and remittance-sending in which she looks carefully at who is sending the money, what are the social micro-dynamics underlying the remittance relationships and what are the repercussions of remitting for the senders. Lindley convincingly underpins her observations about remittance behavior of her interlocutors in London with Sahlin’s concept of “generalized reciprocity.” She also masterfully discerns the various motivations
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and problems involved with remitting. It is clear that Somali refugees’ remittances are embedded in a whole micro-cosmos comprising affective, social, political, and economic factors.

The concluding section of just six pages summarizes the theoretical insights provided by the study. It criticizes and qualifies some of the assumptions and perspectives of the New Economics of Labor Migration. It finally provides recommendations for policy makers and others dealing with the topics of migration and remittances. Clearly, Somali refugees’ remittances are neither “good” nor “bad” and of course not all either “development-friendly” or involved with “terrorism,” to mention some of the dichotomies circulating in parts of the literature and the policy debates.

The only criticism toward this otherwise extremely well-written book is that in the opening chapter a more detailed reflection on methodology is missing. It would have been interesting to know how Lindley selected informants, how many people participated in the qualitative part of her study, and what role gender played in studying Somali migrant remittances.

_The early morning phone call_ should be read by any academic or policy maker interested in migration, transnationalism, and financial remittances involving conflict settings such as Somalia. Besides, and for all students of social anthropology, it is a wonderful example of a multi-sited ethnography in George Marcus’ sense and shows how to study a phenomenon such as remittances in transnational space.

Markus Virgil Hoehne
Post Doctoral Researcher, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology
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