

Schildkraut builds her analysis on an original random digit-dial national survey of 2,800 residents funded by the Russell Sage Foundation and carried out in 2004. She is admirably conscious of the shortcomings of most of the surveys monitoring opinion on immigration. Her survey instrument is designed to exploit the opportunities available in extant survey data—hence, she draws many items from a range of earlier polls. Moving beyond existing data, however, her survey oversamples Asians, Latinos, and blacks and inserts many questions designed to provide a fuller picture of the attitudes of different groups toward national identity, membership, and citizenship. In short, this is the most comprehensive survey of attitudes toward immigrants, national identity, and citizenship yet undertaken.

*Americanism in the Twenty-First Century* is a strongly empirical and analytical study, but it is motivated by normative impulses, namely, a concern with claims that many recent migrants, especially but not only those from Mexico, are failing to embrace an American national identity. Schildkraut worries that such beliefs, founded on misinformation and lacking empirical grounding, can lead to discriminatory, bigoted, and ill-conceived public policy. She rises to the challenge laid down by such diverse voices as Patrick J. Buchanan, Lou Dobbs, and the late Samuel P. Huntington. Her empirical research seeks to measure the degree of consensus there is on the content of American national identity and then to explore the attachment Americans have to their group membership. But, as she puts it, “This book is about more than just showing that many of Huntington’s claims . . . are unfounded . . . It is about understanding the roots of that [immigrant] resentment and, more broadly, the impact of national identity on both the majority and minority” (p. 13).

Schildkraut writes from the multiple-traditions school on American identity and draws on major intellectual approaches in the literature that try to capture that identity: liberalism, ethno-culturalism, civic republicanism, and incorporationism (the idea that America is a nation of immigrants). Factor analysis of items related to each of these ideas reveals just three dimensions related to identity: ethno-culturalism and two types of civic republicanism (action and identity). Obtaining this result, Schildkraut launches a detailed analysis of linkages between ethnic groups and conceptions of identity. No stone is left unturned.

Given the impossibility of summarizing her findings in a short review, I will simply highlight some of her more important conclusions. First, she finds “little support for concerns that different ethnic and immigrant groups define what being American means differently” (p. 55). She notes that the increasing diversity of the US population with respect to ethnicity, race, nativity, and ancestry has little effect on American national identity (p. 60). She reports that there is a broad consensus as to what constitutes national identity that belies the often inflammatory rhet-

oric of political debate (p. 61). “What people seem to want,” she continues, “is a common American identity, not necessarily a white, Christian identity” (p. 93). But do recent immigrants or minority group members reject an American self-identification? Again, Schildkraut finds these fears exaggerated. A majority of respondents chose American as their primary identity (Table 5.1).

Next the author asks if a non-American identity attachment affects one’s relationship with American political institutions and other Americans? The survey data are mixed and show that where there is perception of discrimination, feelings of alienation follow (Table 6.5). Schildkraut devotes a long chapter to the measurement of resentment by whites of immigrants, racial groups, and ethno-cultural groups. Her data indicate that only small minorities of whites embrace ethno-cultural resentments. Racial resentment is, oddly in my view, measured by questions about immigrants with no reference to race. Apart from the belief that other groups have “made it” and so today’s immigrants could as well (a sentiment which 80% of whites endorsed), the two items gaining the most adherence were positive statements about immigrants. The key items measuring immigrant resentment had to do with the belief that immigrants are not trying to fit in (Table 7.1). Finally, Schildkraut finds, not surprisingly, that “immigrant resentment is a consistent and powerful predictor of anti-immigration preferences” (p. 189). I think it might have been useful to take the measure of immigrant resentment of whites, of other immigrant groups, and one’s ethnic kin. Some evidence suggests that just as dominant groups have a tendency to prefer earlier migrants to current ones, already-settled immigrants can be critical of their late-arriving brethren.

*Americanism in the Twenty-First Century* is a major achievement. The author goes toe to toe with many of the leading critics of US immigration policy and challenges alarmist accounts of the dangers posed by mass immigration for American society. If I find any serious fault with the book, it is that the author is perhaps too assiduous in her account. A shorter, less detailed presentation might have been more accessible without sacrificing important aspects of the argument. As it is, the book is essential for scholars and appropriate for graduate seminars; undergraduates, on the other hand, will find this monograph tough sledding.

**Europe’s Indians: Producing Racial Difference, 1500–1900.** By Vanita Seth. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010. 312p. \$84.95 cloth, \$23.95 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592711001988

— Kevin Bruyneel, *Babson College*

In this excellent book, Vanita Seth provides this story: “In November 1726, news had reached London that the wife of Joshua Toft, a poor cloth worker residing in

Godalming, had a month earlier given birth to a rabbit” (p. 190). Got that? Seth mobilizes the legend of Mary Toft and her *litter* of 17 rabbits to illuminate the transition from the Renaissance era (the so-called Age of Discovery, from the fifteenth to the sixteenth centuries) to the Classical period (roughly seventeenth to eighteenth centuries), when the emergence of the Age of Reason came at the expense of the epistemic value of the body itself. The question of whether a woman could give birth to a rabbit was available for thinking at this time, though not for long. Toft’s story is just one of the effective ways in which Seth engages the fundamental concern of this book, which is the history and construction of the self–other relationship in European discourse, culture, and politics from 1500 to 1900. More pertinent figures to this study are the likes of Las Casas, Vitorio, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Hegel, Herder, and Foucault. In all, Seth has synthesized an impressive range of materials to generate a wide-ranging, compelling, and important analysis.

To Seth, the “self” in her story is that of the European and the “other” is that of indigenous people of the Americas and the people of India under British colonial rule. Prior to the eighteenth century, she asks, “who precisely is the self being posited in relation to the American other?” (p. 28). While the subtitle of the book might lead one to think that the pursuit of this question is fundamentally about tracing the production of “racial difference,” the author notes that her investigation is “only ostensibly about race” (p. 174). Indeed, at base, this book is about epistemology—colonialist epistemology—and the political implications for the production of difference(s) entailed therein. Undoubtedly, race and racial difference are critical concerns for Seth, but she rightly argues that we can know *how* we know and think about race today only by unpacking the history of the construction of the modern self, which occurred fundamentally in European meaning making necessitated by colonial conquests, encounters, and governance in and of the Americas and India.

The starting point of the study is nicely signaled in the title of Chapter 1, “Self and Similitude.” Seth claims here that European political actors of the Renaissance era sought to make knowable the identity of the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas not through othering and differentiation but, rather, via a genealogical effort to locate—read *construct*—similar origins between the New and Old World. Chapter 2 takes us into the Classical era when “Europe’s Indians” are those that define the “state of nature” in the works of Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau. Seth looks to them “as conduits for exploring the changing face of European representations of difference” (p. 65). This differentiation begins to appear with the emergence of the modern, individuated European subject. Without naming it as such, what she traces here is the Promethean turn in European political and cultural discourse, where, for example, in

Hobbes’s “moment of contract” man “creates history out of nothing. He creates time as the God of Genesis created man” (p. 72).

Scholars of these three canonical theorists may not find much new in the textual analyses offered here if assessed on their own, but Seth’s larger point is more profound than the sum of its parts. As she walks us from Hobbes to Locke to Rousseau, she deftly argues that the construction of indigeneity as a marker of *pre-* or *anti*political conditions was a central and irreplaceable constituent—and not at all a marginal by-product—of European subjectivity and how it moved further down the path of knowing itself, and speaking in the language of self. Key to this development is the way in which the mutually constitutive placement of indigenous and European identity in history became an increasing marker of differentiation rather than similitude. Indigenous people came to represent those who “cannot be agents of history” so that Europeans can imagine themselves being so (p. 100). This discursive move is prevalent in our time, as settler-colonial discourse in contexts such as the United States and Canada locates indigenous people out of history, presumptively undermining contemporary indigenous claims to political agency, sovereignty, and land rights.

The temporal displacement of colonized others is not limited to the Americas, as Seth demonstrates in Chapter 3 by shifting the analytical focus to British colonial India in the nineteenth century. Here, the politics of epistemology and history *writing* come to the forefront through such contrived distinctions as that between a “traditional people” and a “people of history.” The inhabitants of India are seemingly trapped in traditions, such as the caste system, that leave them in “natural” time, unable to progress in “secular” time, their villages embodying “historical inertness” (p. 167). The emergent disciplines of history and anthropology play a vital role here as Europe finds, by creating, its colonial other in the archives and labs where social science practices of textual, bodily, and comparative examination produce the knowledge of self by the production of the other. The European self bespeaks *itself* in academic theses and treaties on the *other*.

Moving logically forward in this narrative, biopolitics and racialization then become the central focus of Chapter 4. The body is back! In particular, Seth offers a fascinating discussion of the development of the sciences of anthropometry and fingerprinting, the latter first applied comprehensively by the British in India in the late nineteenth century. By that time, the body stands literally and metaphorically as a stable, fixed form of evidence—evidence for crimes, evidence of race, and evidence for the imbrication of the two—in the European self–other imaginary and colonialist epistemology.

Overall, what is compelling about the arc of Seth’s narrative is that while she ends with a distinct focus on the “body as/of evidence” in the nineteenth century, her claim

is that we cannot begin there. Rather, we must trace and deconstruct the way in which the body and self became historical and political subjects, making and being made by history, in order to grasp the ways of thinking and knowing that are the roots of racial and colonial differentiation and hierarchies that we live with to this day. The only way to challenge these constructions is to see them as made, and thus capable of being unmade.

I expect that readers will find places to quibble, possibly even quarrel, with Seth's specific readings of some of the political theorists she deploys in this argument, but I would recommend keeping her larger argument and aim in mind. She demands that we interrogate our presumptions about what we make available to thinking in the same way that cynics of yore raised an eyebrow at the idea of a woman giving birth to a rabbit. After all, the latter notion is no crazier epistemologically than the racial construction of the human body that today is so readily available for thought. Oh, and what was the deal with Mary Toft's litter of rabbits? For that you will just have to read the book. I highly recommend it.

**Citizenship, Borders, and Human Needs.** Edited by Rogers M. Smith. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011. 472p. \$65.00.  
doi:10.1017/S153759271100199X

— Lisa García Bedolla, *University of California at Berkeley*

In *Citizenship, Borders, and Human Needs*, editor Rogers Smith brings together an international group of scholars from a variety of disciplines—political science, sociology, law, history, and economics—to engage in a conversation about the many issues associated with global migration. In framing their essays, contributors were asked to consider one of four questions: (1) whose and what economic needs are helped and harmed by current patterns of immigration flows and immigration regulations? (2) What should we make of the much-discussed cultural dimensions of current immigration issues, in regard to the cultures of members of sending countries, receiving countries, and the immigrants themselves, in all their diversity? (3) What are the political choices in terms of institutions and policies faced by both immigration-receiving and immigration-sending nations? (4) What, in the end, are the normative precepts that should guide policy making on immigration in the twenty-first century around the globe? In response to these questions, the contributors explore the migration question from the standpoint of economic, cultural, and political needs, and then consider the normative controversies that are raised by the mass movement of people across state boundaries. This remarkably comprehensive volume moves beyond traditional foci within the immigration debate and forces readers to consider the very real world impacts,

for sending and receiving states, that arise from these migratory flows.

The book begins with an overview essay by economist Demetrios Papademetriou. Providing a historical and empirical reflection on the size and location of international migratory flows since the 1960s, Papademetriou demonstrates that the number of migrants internationally has not changed dramatically since 1960 and that migration is a global phenomenon affecting a diverse set of countries across the developed and developing worlds. Papademetriou points out the many contradictions inherent in these flows, particularly receiving countries' failure to acknowledge their complicity in driving migration and therefore the interdependence that exists between sending and receiving states: "The facts are not in dispute. Migration ties sending, transit, and receiving countries—as well as immigrants, their families, and their employers—into often reinforcing and always intricate systems of complex interdependence. It takes the cooperation of virtually all these actors—as well as smart policy decisions, thoughtful regulation, and sustained enforcement—to make real progress in limiting the effects of migrations challenges sufficiently to draw out more of its benefits" (p. 34).

Anyone paying attention to immigration debates in the United States and Europe can see that this vision of immigration—as a collective, multilateral problem in need of complex, cooperative solutions—is not the dominant one in current policy debates. Yet, clearly, the essays in this volume show us that the challenges immigration raises cannot be solved unilaterally or by burying our heads in the sand. Only by acknowledging their complicity in creating immigration problems will receiving states be able to begin to ensure that migratory flows are as beneficial as possible to all actors.

Papademetriou's piece, along with others in the volume, also discusses the mismatch between demand for immigrant labor and its acceptance by receiving countries, particularly in terms of allowing the entrance of low-skilled migrants. Papademetriou points out the degree to which the mismatch between labor market needs for low-skilled workers and receiving country desires for their restriction results in unauthorized migration. Antonio Yúñez-Naude shows that because foreign workers tend to be concentrated in particular sectors, they most often complement the native workforce rather than displace it, a finding that contradicts much popular wisdom about the impact of migration on workers. In his essay, Howard Chang, in contrast, accepts that low-wage workers have a net negative impact and considers how liberal democracies should conceptualize their admittance.

One possible reformulation of the cost-benefit analysis underlying Chang's essay is Saskia Sassen's emphasis on the key economic roles these low-skilled immigrant workers play in supporting the lifestyles of high-skilled professionals. Sassen points out how the growth of a high-paid