

being, the management of Japanese MNCs can pursue market share and long-run profits rather than dividends in the short term.

As this brief exposition of the argument underscores, the book extends and updates earlier findings in comparative political economy and economic history. Earlier studies had clarified how financial systems varied and why this had consequences for firms' operations, as well as for public policy issues. In addition, the research builds on economists' studies of why corporations go abroad in the first place.

The book ties together a broad set of concerns from disparate fields in the social sciences, and from specific subfields in political science. Its informative findings should be appealing to a broad audience. The clarity in prose and excellent use of graphs should make it easy for students and experts from a variety of fields to grasp the arguments here, and to appreciate the weight of the evidence.

Of course, concerns about globalization go beyond the idea that MNCs have "gone global." Many popular fears concerning globalization are attempts to grapple with amorphous issues associated with identity. Demonstrating that corporate behaviour varies by country is not the same thing as denying that a homogenization of products and services may be occurring. (To their credit, the authors suggest that one of the reasons some research and development occurs overseas is precisely because products have to be altered to meet local standards or desires.) It would be hard to fault the authors for failing to come to grips with this facet of globalization, however, since globalization itself is such an indistinct and contested concept. In that sense, they are right to say the term does little to illuminate our understanding of the international economic processes currently under way. The authors have done us a service by reminding us that states can and do control aspects of these economic processes.

MARK BRAWLEY *McGill University*

Gender and Nation

Nira Yuval-Davis

London: Sage Publications, 1997, pp. x, 157

Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives

Ruth Lister

New York: New York University Press, 1997, pp. xii, 284

Citizenship and nationalism have (re)emerged as central theoretical and research concerns across the social sciences, although much new work still fails to address gender systematically. These two books are major contributions to the discipline of political science, and to the social sciences.

Nira Yuval-Davis, a pioneer in the study of nationalism and gender, expands her earlier writings in *Gender and Nation*. This book addresses how national projects and ethnic processes reciprocally affect gender relations. As Yuval-Davis articulates it, "constructed notions of nationhood usually involve specific notions of 'manhood' and 'womanhood'" (1). The first chapter provides an overview of contested concepts like "nation" and "state." Chapter 2 is devoted to the relationship between biology and nation (or *Volknation*), and demonstrates the unique ways in which women are cajoled into being biological reproducers of nations. Yuval-Davis, in one of her many memorable examples, cites a contemporary Japanese television advertisement, produced in the name of the national interest in stemming a plummeting birthrate, that exhorts, "Get a brother (or sister) [*sic*] for your child" (29).

Chapter 3 analyzes culture and nation (or *Kulturnation*). Here, Yuval-Davis shows how women are charged with culturally reproducing the nation, typically by socializing children, maintaining a home or dressing in a certain way. Chapter 4 explores state citizenship and its connection with nation (or *Staatnation*), and looks at difference, as defined by membership in either dominant or subordinate groups relating to gender, race, class, residence and stage of the life cycle. Yuval-Davis presents citizenship as a “multi-tier construct which applies to peoples’ membership in a variety of collectivities—local, ethnic, national and transnational” (68). In this way, she seeks to develop a citizenship theory which is “also flexible enough to deal with the far-reaching changes in the global (dis)order” (91).

Chapter 5 examines military service as a traditional duty of citizenship and effectively shows the evolving nature of the formal domain of male citizens and masculinity construction. Finally, in chapter 6, Yuval-Davis calls for “transversal politics,” to replace essentialized identity politics. With transversal politics “perceived unity and homogeneity are replaced by dialogues which give recognition to the specific positionings of those who participate in them as well as to the ‘unfinished knowledge’ that each such situationed positioning can offer” (131). Accordingly, ongoing dialogue takes place in order to achieve solidarity, although not necessarily common political projects.

Clearly written with lively examples, *Gender and Nation* tackles nationalism in a way that is sensitive to gender, ethnicity and other forms of diversity. It is an important research reference and can be equally well used in graduate and undergraduate courses.

Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives also offers a handy research reference and would be an appropriate graduate-course text. However, Ruth Lister’s detailed accounting of the literature makes this book less attractive for undergraduates. Beginning with the argument that citizenship is a Janus-faced mechanism for inclusion and exclusion, Lister asks a twofold question in structuring her book. First, can citizenship that was originally predicated on the exclusion of women be reformulated actually to include women? Second, can citizenship give full recognition to the multiplicity and even shifting identities that women hold (including those based on class, race, location, disability and life cycle).

In the first half of the book Lister examines traditional and contemporary theoretical literature on citizenship. She begins with an analysis of citizenship and argues that citizenship is both about rights (or status) and participation (or practice). Lister suggests that agency can link citizenship as status and practice, and indeed, this squares with her observation that “some of the most disadvantaged women act as citizens and are not simply passive in their exclusion from the panoply of citizenship rights” (x). The next two chapters address the exclusions of citizenship by looking outside the state (especially migration processes), and within the state (at women and minority groups who experience exclusion). This national and global focus upon theorizing citizenship accords with Yuval-Davis’ perspective. Chapter 4 argues for a more inclusive citizenship that bridges gender-neutral and gender-differentiated models of citizenship.

In the second half of the book, Lister examines policy and politics, addressing the significance of the “public/private” distinction for women’s citizenship and the importance of linking women’s formal politics (for example, in legislatures) with women’s informal politics (for example, the women’s movement and community action). Lister then turns her attention to the relevance of social policy to women’s citizenship and the significance of the work women do as mothers and caregivers, arguing for a greater “balance of responsibilities for care between both women and men and individual families and the state” (194). In the final chapter Lister attempts to link feminist theory

and praxis, concluding that “it is possible to conceive of a women-friendly conceptualization of citizenship at both the theoretical and policy level” (195; emphasis in original). Lister argues that feminist praxis needs “to be rooted in a politics of solidarity in difference or what Yuval-Davis calls ‘transversal’ politics” (200; emphasis in the original).

Clearly, these books complement one another. Both deal with diversity in relation to gender, address the state and global developments in theorizing citizenship and conclude that feminist praxis must incorporate continuous dialogue around difference in a way that is non-essentialist. These similarities are instructive for illuminating the state of feminist politics and theorizing at the end of the millennium, which increasingly registers a recognition of the multiple and complex forms identity takes.

Yuval-Davis’s call for a transversal politics raises practical and policy issues of feasibility. Indeed, as Yuval-Davis herself acknowledges, transversal politics requires *time* for extensive continuous dialogue. The agreement between Yuval-Davis and Lister that citizenship must be theorized beyond the state may not accord with how many ordinary women and men still see citizenship (that is, as state membership). Finally, at a theoretical level, the points of convergence between these books imply that citizenship cannot be adequately theorized in the absence of a focus on nation, and vice versa, which some may still debate.

YASMEEN ABU-LABAN *University of Alberta*

La modernité de Karl Polanyi

Jean-Michel Servet, Jérôme Maucourant et André Tiran, sous la direction de Paris : L’Harmattan, 1998, 419 p.

Né à Budapest en 1886, mort à Toronto en 1964, après avoir longtemps vécu aux États-Unis, Karl Polanyi occupe une place singulière dans la pensée sociale du 20^e siècle. C’est un auteur difficile à classer. Son oeuvre se situe à la frontière de plusieurs disciplines : l’économie, mais aussi l’histoire, l’anthropologie, la science politique, la sociologie. Sa pensée, à bien des égards iconoclaste, ne peut être casée dans un des grands courants contemporains, que ce soit le marxisme, le keynésianisme ou le libéralisme. C’est pourquoi il est mal connu dans un univers académique cloisonné, tout en exerçant une influence importante sur certains de ceux qui, justement, cherchent à sortir des sentiers battus et des dogmatismes pour analyser les grands problèmes de notre temps.

Publiée en 1944, alors que Karl Polanyi approchait de la soixantaine, la *Grande transformation* (New York : Rinehart; Paris : Gallimard, 1983) a mis beaucoup de temps à s’imposer comme l’une des oeuvres majeures de notre siècle. Son auteur y affirmait que le marché autorégulateur, né au début du 19^e siècle avec la transformation de la terre, du travail et de l’argent en marchandises, était une illusion destructrice contre laquelle la société s’est défendue, entre autres par la mise en place de la régulation étatique et de l’État-providence. Le fascisme et le bolchevisme sont d’autres formes de réaction au marché dominant et « désencastré » de la société. Dans *Les systèmes économiques dans l’histoire et dans la théorie* (New York : Free Press, 1957; Paris : Larousse, 1975), Polanyi et ses collaborateurs de l’Université Columbia étudiaient les logiques économiques et sociales à l’oeuvre dans des sociétés anciennes, y montrant l’absence de cette propension à l’échange qu’Adam Smith estimait universelle et éternelle.

Plusieurs autres travaux ont été publiés, dont certains découverts récemment et conservés à l’Institut d’économie politique Karl Polanyi établi à