

Koskeniemi provides an excellent review of the common themes and raises insightful questions about sovereignty.

The volume establishes that sovereignty has been and will continue to be an integral part of the evolution of legal and political systems. Rather than having a grand theory, it advocates that we need to understand how sovereignty functions in a variety of contexts and how it interacts with other concepts central to politics and the political imagination. Sovereignty is a highly adaptive concept, varying by time periods, locales, and debates, all important points. The volume's attempt at a cross- and multidisciplinary fertilization has the potential to expand the frontiers of scholarship on sovereignty. However, the book would have benefited from the inclusion of non-European issues, concerns, and ideas in order to expand this frontier even further.

**Diaspora Development and Democracy: The Domestic Impact of International Migration from India.** By Devesh Kapur. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010. 344p. \$35.00.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592711004774

— Gabriel (Gabi) Sheffer, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

Migration and diasporic phenomena have become major factors in today's international and domestic systems. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, these two phenomena deserve and are receiving more attention by publics, politicians, media persons, and academics than ever before. In this context, the people of India serve as a useful example of a population whose many migrations have created a worldwide diaspora. The Indian diaspora is one of the largest in history, and has been quite active in exerting its influence both in India and in its host lands abroad. From the ethnic, cultural, religious, economic, and political perspectives, it is a highly heterogeneous entity, like most other established diasporas. Despite various basic similarities to other diasporas, it has its own uniqueness. Its size, scope, and complexity make the Indian diaspora a noteworthy subject for academic research.

The present volume by Devesh Kapur is an impressive attempt to provide a fuller description, a deeper examination, and a more precise analysis of the Indian diaspora. A main focus is on the diaspora's involvement both in its country of origin—where its influence is strongest—and its host lands, especially the United States. The author seeks to use the Indian case to draw some general analytical and theoretical conclusions about migratory and diasporic phenomena.

One of the significant points that Kapur emphasizes initially is that while academic studies of migration and diasporas have focused on the host lands, there are relatively few profound examinations of the implications of migration and diasporism for the countries of origin. More specifically, he asserts that the discussion of the political

and economic consequences of migration and diasporism for the countries of origin is extremely deficient. He suggests that the main reason for this lack of knowledge is a shortage of available data on migrants and diasporas, a shortage that exists in the Indian case among others.

One of the main purposes of this book is to combine quantitative and qualitative analyses of diasporic communities in an attempt to better elucidate their political and economic relevance. To overcome what he regards as a shortage of understanding of these two phenomena, Kapur has collected, presented, and analyzed a substantial amount of data on the Indian case and others, and on their backgrounds and activities. Thus, in this book that focuses on Indian migrants and diasporans, he uses five special data sets from which he draws his conclusions: a survey of emigrants from India; a large survey of the Indian diaspora in the United States; a phone survey of 2,200 Indian households in the United States; data about the Indian political, administrative, business, and scientific elites; and a survey of Indian diaspora nongovernmental organizations in America.

The main chapters deal with the following: first, an analysis of what Kapur calls “The Missing Leg of the Globalization Triad,” that is, why it is so important to understand the significance of migration and diasporism for the homeland; second, the impacts of the various characteristics of diasporans on both their country of origin and host lands; third, the meanings and influences of three economic mechanisms—financial flows to India, global economic networks, and intermediary activities; fourth, the impacts of the flows of social and political ideas from the diaspora on the reshaping of the understanding, expectations, and norms of the political elites in the homeland; fifth, the impacts of the migration and diaspora on Indian politics and democracy; sixth, the impacts on India's foreign policy and relations with host lands, especially the United States; and seventh, the differences in the intensity of nationalism among Indian migrants and diaspora members.

Inasmuch as the book offers too many findings and conclusions to be discussed here, I will mention only a few. Kapur is right in emphasizing the fact that the Indian diaspora is not a new phenomenon resulting from recent migration, but one with deep historical roots, similar to those of other diasporas, such as the Chinese, Jewish, and Armenian. His implicit argument is that the historical developments of a diaspora should be studied at length in order to construct a prudent explanation and categorical conclusions. He admits, however, that his findings are not so straightforward about the impact of history on the present situation of the diaspora.

Through his analytical framework, his empirical analysis, and the assessment of the comparison between the empirical findings and the existing theories, the author reaches some significant insights about diasporas' influence on their homelands. For example, Kapur argues that

the influence of diasporas in general and the Indian diaspora in particular depends to a large extent on the policies of the homeland, which change over time. Since the Indian diaspora is heterogeneous and connected to various ethnic-religious segments in India, and since its activities are multi-functional, it is difficult to give an accurate assessment of these connections and impacts on its country of origin.

When the various spheres that Kapur examines are looked at in depth, it turns out that the migration of less-skilled workers has had positive effects, mainly as a result of the inflow of remittances to their families. The influence of skilled labor has more ambiguous results: On the positive side, it increases political stability in the homeland. This has been due to the good reputation of skilled workers and their erection of cross-national networks. On the other hand, the more negative consequences include the loss to India of large numbers of skilled and talented persons, the limitations on diasporans' investments in India, and a certain decline in the quality of research and teaching in India's universities and educational system.

From the political perspective, Kapur also concludes that there have been both positive and negative consequences to migration and diasporism. The positive side of the coin has been a favorable influence on the commitment of homeland elites to liberal democracy. The negative effects are the support for extremist nationalism and separatism exhibited by certain diasporans. Kapur admits, however, that these developments have not been major threats to India's democracy. Nevertheless, the diaspora has also contributed to the strengthening of ethnic tensions in India's general citizenship.

Kapur also found that in the international arena, the diaspora contributed to India's connection with certain host lands that have not opposed the Indian government's policies and activities and that have provided members of the diaspora with citizenship privileges. Thus, globalization provides both opportunities and risks for many Indians.

Finally, Kapur emphasizes the fact that the political impact of all diasporas, including the Indian, depends on the internal social and political situation in the homeland. According to the author, the ethnic heterogeneity of the domestic society, and also of the political system there, which is reflected in the lack of homogeneity of the diaspora, makes it difficult to recruit the support of the entire diaspora for the homeland. Thus, he points out, for example, that the ethnic divisions in the Indian diaspora in the United States created great difficulties for India's foreign relations with America. And this is despite the efforts of the government to establish close relations with the various segments of the diaspora.

From the general theoretical perspective, this impressive book has not suggested many new ideas. Its main theoretical and analytical assertions concerning the entire phenomenon are very similar to what the relevant literature has argued for some time. The book also shows that

despite their unique features, many diasporas are similar in certain respects—their historical backgrounds, their heterogeneous composition, their ethnic origin, and their sense of identity, as well as the social, political, and even economic factors that surround them, the connections they have with their homelands, their level of influence, and so on. Nevertheless, the vast data and surveys that Kapur has collected and analyzed, the numerous references and notes, and the clearness of its presentation make *Diaspora Development and Democracy* a significant addition to the vastly growing academic literature on diasporas. Both the politicians in the diaspora and in India should read this book and pay attention to its findings in order to improve their homeland–diaspora relations.

**In War's Wake: International Conflict and the Fate of Liberal Democracy.** Edited by Elizabeth Kier and Ronald R. Krebs. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 314p. \$95.00 cloth, \$29.99 paper.

**The Casualty Gap: The Causes and Consequences of American Wartime Inequalities.** By Douglas L. Kriner and Francis X. Shen. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010, 302p. \$29.95.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592711004786

— Giacomo Chiozza, *Vanderbilt University*

The study of war and democracy is replete with paradoxes: Often denigrated as irresolute and weak, democracies are skilled at war and at managing their reciprocal relations peacefully. Similarly, while war often leads democracies to compromise their principles and curtail the freedom of their citizens, in its aftermath war as often leads to an expansion of political and civil rights. The books under review here, while different in style, format, scope, and argumentation, directly engage these paradoxes by investigating the impact of war on democratic institutions and democratic political processes. The premise of both books is that the question of the consequences of war for democracy has not received the attention it deserves. Seminal contributions to the topic have been made by Otto Hintze, Harold Lasswell, Charles Tilly, Peter Gourevitch, Arthur Stein, and Mary Dudziak. But theoretically and empirically, the field is understudied.

For a phenomenon that endangers the survival of individuals, societies, and institutions, such as war, we would expect its consequences to be profound, pervasive, and easily detectable. The examples that promptly come to mind when we think of the subject, from the extension of electoral suffrage to the increase in taxation, would lend prima facie credence to that supposition. But in the very first chapter of *In War's Wake*, Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder deliver a startling null finding: In their large-n analysis of the impact of war on democratic transition, they fail to find any systematic pattern whereby war can be seen as a cause of democratization. In their view, “[b]ackground factors like economic development, the character