



PROJECT MUSE®

*Citizenship in Transnational Perspective: Australia, Canada,
and New Zealand* ed. by Jatinder Mann (review)

Daniel R. Meister

The Canadian Historical Review, Volume 99, Number 2, June 2018, pp. 325-327
(Review)

Published by University of Toronto Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/696223>

order following the disasters. The book has a compelling image of a young militiaman in Salem standing guard, with extensive ruins in the background, his gun and uniform symbols of the attempt to re-establish order (73). For their part, residents wanted the freedom of their neighbourhoods. One of the strongest themes of the book is that those most affected by the disasters found ways to resist. Residents created their own moral economy and their own opportunities.

There are some asymmetries in the book. Remes is more successful bringing working people to life than the relief workers. The reader gets a real sense of Salem's diversity, but the north end of Halifax comes off as rather homogenous. Were the bonds of solidarity and mutual aid in Halifax informed by the diverse landscape of the north end, and did they cut across the various neighbourhoods? Remes also uses different terms throughout the book to describe solidarity, including "mutual," "self-help," and "informal." I kept wondering if all of these forms of solidarity were the same or whether they stemmed from different sources? But this is more a question of how working-class historians should develop and extend Remes's work rather than a criticism of it. The book obviously speaks to contemporary disasters, and the author's own journey in writing it was "bookended" by Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Sandy. I finished this review while much of Houston was experiencing a flood. To be sure, there are lessons in this book for humanitarian relief efforts that follow disasters. Remes reminds us that local communities have their own ways of getting things done. In addition to the rich empirical contribution that this book makes, with its careful use of evidence, the book also makes an important theoretical contribution and gives us new ways to think about working-class people and their various solidarities. This is a thoughtful, robust work of history, exactly the kind of study that we need to revitalize the history of working people.

PETER L. TWOHIG *Saint Mary's University*

Citizenship in Transnational Perspective: Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. Jatinder Mann, ed. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. Pp. xv + 322, \$129.00 cloth

Edited by Jatinder Mann, an assistant professor at Hong Kong Baptist University, this book contains fifteen chapters written by both established and emerging scholars from a variety of disciplines. It is divided into four sections, each of which deals with a specific topic: transnationalism, citizenship regimes in settler societies, settler-Indigenous citizenships,

and deep diversity and securitization. It is ostensibly “an important and unique contribution to the literature” – so claims the editor twice within its first eight pages – because of its transnational perspective and its dual focus on indigeneity and ethnicity. I came to the book with the understanding that “international” represented the study of a phenomenon across borders, whereas “transnational” represented the study of a phenomenon irrespective of borders. Given that citizenship is generally about belonging to a bounded area, I thought, how does one study it transnationally? Unfortunately, the book provided few examples of how this is possible; the section devoted to transnationalism is the shortest of the four, the index lists only three relevant pages under that heading, and few of the chapters have a discernably transnational focus.

Augie Fleras’s chapter, “Rethinking Citizenship through Transnational Lenses,” serves as a theoretical introduction. Heavily encumbered with jargon, it explains that there is not a single transnational perspective and that transnational can refer to a descriptive variable, an interpretive lens, or a lived reality, although its most narrow or common sense definition refers to how migrants “forge and maintain ties that span or transcend national borders” (15). However, Fleras then explodes this definition by stating that he uses “the prefix trans in transnational in the broadest possible way.” Transnational is about going across or beyond; it is about transcending, transpositioning, transversing, and ultimately transforming. A “trans perspective” is thus “a new discursive framework for rethinking the politics of citizenship in a world of posts, trans, and isms” (16). He concludes by inviting the reader to consider the possibility of a transnational citizenship, which paradoxically requires us to admit the incompatibility of contemporary models while also recognizing the need for strong national citizenship (28–9).

I remain sceptical of this broad vision for a number of reasons. Transnationalism seeks to be a global ideal, and, perhaps as a result, scholars using this type of approach can speculate in a way that is often homogenizing. Informing the idea of transnational citizenship is the concept of superdiversity (coined by Steven Vertovec, who is not cited in the volume), which is used to describe increasing global migration and the proliferation of ethnic diversity in European countries. However, the situation varies in other countries and within different regions of the same country. Talking about the challenge of diversity means something very different in reference to a relatively stable European nation than it does in reference to a country where one ethnic group is suppressing or killing another. Transnationalism,

as a discursive framework, can thus look suspiciously like the “Eurocentrism posing as universalism” (16) that it claims to be opposing, especially when it speaks of what is “desirable” (29). Likewise, super-diversity is not found everywhere. Certainly Auckland, New Zealand, is diverse, as Paul Spoonley discusses in his chapter, but what of the rest of the country? In Canada, if a scholar examines Vancouver or Toronto, it makes sense to talk of the “diversity of diversity,” but what about rural areas, much of the Maritimes, or the Territories? Generalizing about supposedly global trends can mean losing sight of the specific, lived reality of many who would comprise this utopian, post-citizenship, super-diverse world.

Studies following Fleras’s broad definition of transnationalism could take virtually any form. However, and in a wise move by the editor, Fleras’s chapter is followed by Daiva Stasiulis’s grounded study of Lebanese–Canadian and Lebanese–Australian dual citizens in the aftermath of the war in the summer of 2006. This chapter explores how these citizens construct social citizenship in two national spaces, and, in contrast to Fleras, Stasiulis expresses significant scepticism about the broader ideal of transnationalism yet demonstrates how citizenship can be studied from a transnational perspective (narrowly defined). Ironically, hers is perhaps the only truly transnational study; the collection as a whole is neither entirely transnational nor particularly comparative, as most chapters focus on a specific national context.

Despite its inaccurate billing, the book remains a valuable contribution. In particular, its second section offers an accessible overview of the citizenship regimes in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and the third insightfully examines citizenship in the context of settler–Indigenous relations. Joyce Greene’s chapter contends that, since the Canadian state subjugated and oppressed Indigenous peoples from its inception, denied them citizenship outrightly, and then offered it only in a transactional manner, citizenship is not an unalloyed good for them (nor can it adequately address the remedies the state owes them). She argues instead that a new conception of citizenship is required, one that recognizes Indigenous self-determination and sovereignty as *a priori* to Canadian citizenship and sovereignty. The chapters in the fourth section that deal with Canada are naturally of interest, but, for the historian, they seem somewhat premature. Read together, the book’s chapters reveal that the time is ripe for a comparative study that would more fully explore contemporary challenges to citizenship in these settler–colonial countries.

DANIEL R. MEISTER *Queen’s University*