Book Review/Compte rendu

Natacha Gagné et **Catherine Neveu**, dir., « Citoyennetés », *Anthropologie et sociétés*, 33 (2), 2009, 282 p., 25 $ CAN, ISSN 0702-8997.

Citizenship as a field of study is not often associated with anthropology, although an anthropological perspective has recently emerged in the literature on citizenship. This special issue gives an overview of current anthropological research on citizenship, making it available to a Francophone social science audience. "*Citoyennetés*" brings together ten articles with a holistic understanding of citizenship, laying out both the theoretical and empirical components of an emerging anthropological approach to citizenship. This approach views citizenship as a process of "manufacturing" and production, empirical in nature, methodologically and theoretically dynamic. Articles are mainly centred on a redefinition of the "contractual" relationship of citizenship to include new and emerging individual and collective actors, including Latina immigrants in San Francisco (Coll), the Kanak community in New Zealand (Salaün and Vernaudon), or village cooperatives in Québec (Campeau). According to its editors, the main objective of the special issue is not to create a new field of study for the discipline but to stimulate the ongoing critical debates about how citizenship is deployed and constructed. Citizenship emerges here as a contextual process of "recognition," "reconciliation," "reparation," "reception," "negotiation," "resistance," "rupture," and "self-determination." Each contribution sheds light on ways in which anthropology contributes to this growing body of literature. The articles are set in a variety of contexts such as: New Caledonia, Québec, New Zealand, French Polynesia, Canada, Australia, Brazil, and San Francisco. The authors adopt a variety of approaches to citizenship. For example, while Neveu engages in a theoretical discussion of the dominant republican understanding of citizenship in France, describing the challenges of expanding its boundaries to include cultural dimensions, Clarke conducts a discourse analysis examining the proliferation of "citizenship talk" of governmental and vernacular discourses in Great Britain.

This special issue is of particular interest because it presents a variety of innovative empirical works that deal with the problem of the boundaries of citizenship in contexts of colonization and decolonization. Poirier, for instance, studies the Aborigines of the Australian Western

Desert, and elaborates on some of the tensions between their "cosmological" understanding of the social and the fact that they are expected to become responsible Australian citizens (p. 101). How can these populations negotiate the expectations expressed by the Australian state? Poirier points to the paradox of requiring aboriginal communities to adopt nonaboriginal administrative and political structures in order for them to acquire a deeper understanding of their own affairs (p. 103). Salaün and Vernaudon examine the transformation of the educational system in contemporary New Caledonia within the framework of the current "almost experimental" process of decolonization. Such a process envisions the creation of a "New Caledonian citizenship" that aims to overcome ethnic divisions reinforced by colonization. The authors try to understand whether the introduction of plurilingualism and the recognition of the Kanak identity as a new basis for citizenship represent an alternative to the dominant French state model. These empirically grounded texts suggest that a desirable citizenship concept should allow for the coexistence of different value systems rather than subsume the values of indigenous populations into hegemonic value systems. Is this enough, though? If coexistence of different value systems seems desirable in some contexts, it is not unproblematic. Gagné's comparative analysis of the Māori of New Zealand and the Tahitians of French Polynesia shows how different colonial histories produce distinctive ways of conceiving citizenship. Discussion of these cases highlights the ambiguity that is intrinsic to "bicultural" regimes: they aim to protect a culture from the hegemony of the other but, simultaneously, reinforce ideas of ethnic difference and, thereby, legitimize the presence of separated spheres of life. Can we consider national minorities in the aforementioned contexts as a part of the *universal* project of citizenship?

Another interesting aspect of this special issue is that it stimulates critical reflections about the nation-state and how states deal with minorities within their own borders. If, on the one hand, states' borders are being challenged by an increasingly connected world, this volume reminds us that states are not vague, symbolic institutions. Their exclusionary effects are "real." They are felt especially in contexts of colonization and decolonization, where minority populations are often excluded to different degrees from citizenship and are given a status that is "privileged," "special," or simply "different," but which remains outside the framework of what is considered to be *universal*. Along these lines, the Canadian Indian experience of double citizenship in 1965 (Schwimmer) suggests that "double citizenship" does not necessarily lead to "full citizenship," a full political and economic integration into the national community. This article is of special interest for scholars studying con-

temporary cases of double and multiple citizenships. Other authors investigate the possible political outcomes when exogenous (e.g. "heterogeneous" for Campeau) understandings of citizenship and of the political in general are imposed on, negotiated with, or conceded to national minorities. Studying the cooperatives of Minville, Québec, Campeau's article shows that it is not possible to produce an unambiguous break with the colonial state and to create an oppositional public space that is able to transform the colonial relationship. Schwimmer, who is equally critical of assimilation policies and of "bicultural regimes" elaborates on the ways "out" from the colonial relationship, the only possibility being that of "final ruptures."

More than definite answers, these contributions stimulate other new questions. The fact that most of these articles focus primarily on the "minority populations of the periphery" in contexts of colonization and decolonization is, in my view, the main contribution of this issue. Here, I believe, anthropologists have a privileged standpoint derived from their historical familiarity with such contexts. Their methodological expertise can help other social scientists who face the challenges of conducting empirical research on citizenship in similar contexts. This being said, I also feel that contemporary debates on citizenship cannot ignore that we live in a highly connected world. It is true, as Gagné and Neveu argue, that the "margins" may allow us to better understand the "centre" (p. 16). However, that immigration, a key dimension in contemporary debates on citizenship, is discussed only marginally (in the article by Gagné and in one by Coll — studying immigrant Latina immigrants in San Francisco) is, in my view, the weakest aspect of the issue. Addressing migrations from the "centre" to the "margins" and vice versa would have been desirable. Having done so, migrations could have been directly linked to outcomes of colonization and decolonization — a topic where anthropologists have a particular expertise to share with other social scientists.

University of Ottawa Anabel Paulos

Anabel Paulos is a PhD student in Sociology at the University of Ottawa. Her main research interests include women's and feminist movements, transnational movements, social network analysis, social inequalities, and critical approaches to development.
lpaul042@uottawa.ca