

nur) als Opfer zu Subjekten machen - eine „Gouvernementalität der (klandestinen) Subjektivierung“ (242), die MigrantInnen gleichzeitig zu Objekten degradiert. Sowohl in den Herkunfts- als auch in den Zielländern „ermöglicht Trafficking, Migrationsstrategien zu dethematisieren und [...] den komplexen sozialen Prozess innerhalb dessen Frauen zu der Entscheidung gelangen, als Prostituierte zu migrieren, auf die manichäische Formel von victims und villains zu bringen.“ (248).

Anhand dieser Verweise wird die Einbettung der dem Buch zugrunde liegenden Arbeit in einen spezifischen Forschungskontext zum Problem der „Autonomie der Migration“ (siehe v.a. das Forschungsprojekt „Transit Migration“) deutlich. Karakayali führt aus, was er unter dem Konzept „Autonomie der Migration“ versteht, geht dabei auf Kritiken ein und löst einige Missverständnisse auf. „Autonomie“ sei in diesem Fall nicht als Freiheit oder Unabhängigkeit von Strukturen oder Machtverhältnissen zu verstehen. Die „Autonomie der Migration“ als Untersuchungsperspektive nehme vielmehr die der Migration eigenen Konfliktfelder und Praktiken in den Blick. Damit könne das exzessive Moment der Migration - anders als in Normalisierungsdiskursen - konzeptualisiert werden, ohne es - wie im Anti-Immigrationsdiskurs - zu verabsolutieren (258).

„Gespenster der Migration“ ist dreifach lesenswert: durch die aufbereitete Materialfülle in der erhellenden historisch-genealogischen Darstellung; als Beitrag zu einer Migrationsforschung, die ihr Verhältnis zu staats- und demokratietheoretischen Fragestellungen reflektiert; und als Appell für eine Restrukturierung des Migrationsdiskurses, die es erlaubt, transnationale migratorische Praxis jenseits von Viktimisierung und Kriminalisierung politisch zu artikulieren.

Elena Buck

Reina, Leticia; Servín, Elisa; Tutino, John (eds.): Cycles of Conflict, Centuries of Change: Crisis, Reform, and Revolution in Mexico. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2007.

At the beginning of the 19th century New Spain¹ underwent a series of riots in order to gain independence from Spain. These riots went on for 11 years and finally ended in 1821 when the goal of autonomy from Spain was reached. Exactly 100 years later, in 1910, another revolution began which also lasted about ten years. Both these revolutionary periods were preceded by systemic political crises and accompanied by socioeconomic problems which affected large parts of the population. At the end of the 20th century the Mexican political system entered another crisis at the same time that liberal economic measures caused diverging socioeconomic effects for the population. In 2000, the Mexican people voted for the first time in more than seventy years for a change in the governing party at the federal level. Today, after more than one *sexenio*² since voting out the Party of Institutionalized Revolution (PRI) after 70 years of uninterrupted political rule, numerous dilemmas persist in Mexican society as well as in the political sphere. The editors of the book under review here originally organized a discussion in 1999 debating the probability of a new insurgency in Mexico for the year 2010. An initial version of this

1 The viceroyalty of New Spain included the today Southwestern United States, Mexico, Central America the Caribbean, and the Philippines.

2 A *sexenio* refers to a term of governance which lasts six years.

discussion was published in 2002 in Spanish³. It was followed by the present revised version in English.

The aim of this anthology was to analyze comparatively the conditions and indications that led to the extended insurgencies which took place at the beginning of the previous two centuries respectively, and the contemporary developments that may or may not lead to another in the next few years. Taking this as its task, the anthology proceeds by aggregating various aspects of, and theoretical approaches to, the question.

The book is divided into three parts. The first part focuses on municipal communities and their role in historical events. Eric van Young pleads for the deconstruction of the concept of crisis. According to van Young, crises are experienced on a local or community level “driven by local historical memory, local religious sensibility, local conflicts and local actors” (p. 27). Leticia Reina, as well as Antonio Annino, emphasizes the growing importance of communities as key sites for the negotiation of regime power and popular participation (p. 93). Annino speaks of the ambiguities created by the 1812 Cadiz Constitution which did not clearly anchor sovereignty on any specific political level. The *pueblos* interpreted liberal freedom as a recognition of their ancient freedoms and ancient land rights (p. 86). Only the presidents Benito Juárez (1858-1872) and Porfirio Díaz (1877-1880/1884-1911) were able to cope with this problem (p. 88).

In these first articles it already becomes evident that the land question has always been central in conflict situations in Mexico. External factors have also been an issue in this matter, as Friedrich Katz illustrates in the second part of the book. This part deals with the political, social, and economic circumstances favoring or impeding the start of general insurrection in the past and whether or not they could play the same role again.

François-Xavier Guerra focuses on the problem of sovereignty that impeded a unitarian political structure in 19th century Mexico. Mexico was, he says, “a conglomerate of pueblos, states, cities, and villages of varying importance but with equal rights [...]” (p. 134). According to him the Porfiriato⁴ was successful due to its highly personalistic nature based on corporations and clientelism. Díaz tried to “domesticate warlords” not only by “means of physical elimination, [but] often through state governorships or other sinecures, and always through the freedom to enrich themselves” (p. 140). In the end, however, Guerra says, it was the personalistic nature of the Porfiriato that caused its demise and created so many problems to the revolutionary forces that tried to establish a strong central authority after Porfirio Díaz was gone. This argument can also be found in the contribution of Alan Knight. Comparing the Porfiriato and its demise with the post-

3 Reina, Leticia; Servín, Elisa (eds.), *Crisis, reforma y revolución*. México: Historias de fin de siglo, México, 2002.

4 Luis Medina speaks of Porfirio Díaz, who governed Mexico between 1876 and 1911, as as a star whose rays established a link between everything and himself. These rays had little or no relation between themselves. Medina, Luis, *Invencción del sistema político mexicano – Forma de gobierno y gobernabilidad en México en el siglo XIX*, 2nd edition, México 2007, p. 334.

revolutionary regime of the PRI, as Knight does, brings out a lot of common indicators and developments. The PRI-regime was also based on corporativism and clientelism. Knight, however, concedes to the contemporary political system more flexibility than it had a hundred years ago. Unlike what happened with the Porfirian regime, the capacity of the PRI-regime to adapt to changing circumstances will be tested, according to Knight, in a fairly stable context of competitive elections (p. 171). For Lorenzo Meyer the flexibility of the contemporary political system arises from the fact that, while in the Porfiriato power was linked to the person, the PRI linked it to the office (p. 295).

John Tutino argues that a lack of ecological autonomy for most present communities will impede the reemergence of insurgencies. According to him the revolutionary potential grows with the “ability of rural communities to sustain themselves and insurgent fighters independently of the structures of power and production they seek to transform” (p. 214). It is not clear how Tutino would explain the power of the workers class in Europe at the end of the 19th century, who lived in cities and were far from being ecological autonomous. On the other hand, he correlates the problem of lacking ecological autonomy with the dilemma of international migration and national citizenship. That addresses a highly actual problem involving people that do not have the benefit of citizen rights in the place where they work and often live.

The third part of the book analyses the contemporary political and social structures and the nature of the post-revolutionary regime. Guillermo de la Peña sees a crucial valve for discontent in the growing civil society. Since the 1980s the spreading social movements and non-governmental organizations have been frequently more responsive and effective than political institutions. Meanwhile, Enrique Semo laments the weakness of the Mexican Left. During the 1970s a lot of Marxists and socialists supported the official revolutionary nationalism and therefore the PRI-regime. Today the Left emphasizes a glorious past but lacks substantial programs for the future as well as a utopia. Elisa Servín is hopeful because the replacement of the single party system for a multiparty system, the rising importance of the Congress as a “forum for discussion and confrontation among political fractions”, and the growing power of local and regional powers, which, together with the Congress, created a “counterweight to presidential centralism” (p. 382). At the same time Servín stresses the new conflicts and uncertainties that arose from these changes and laments that the “political alternation has not resolved the most urgent social demands” (p. 387). She is not sure at all that the country will not fall into violence again.

The confusing and long title already reflects the vast expanse of the analyses provided. Some of the articles offer excellent theory-based analysis while others are rather just informative in the sense of being descriptive – which at least can be fruitful for the reader not deeply involved in the topic. The differences in the analytical approaches and the theoretical backgrounds of the contributors makes the anthology in the whole a profound and controversial work analyzing the signs for probable insurgencies in the political, social and legal field. It is at the same time a historical analysis and an analysis of the contemporary developments in Mexico. The long term scope of the project stresses the enduring socioeconomic and political dilemmas not yet solved under the first non-PRI government. It is the persistence of these dilemmas that demand continuing analyses.

Kristin Seffer