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readers as sound and logical, his grasp of history is less so. Kaye often neglects or plays down the ambiguities of the FDR era. For instance, Roosevelt proved more conservative, pragmatic, and fallible than this author suggests. The president was inclined to balance the budget, and when he curtailed federal spending during his second term, he helped spark the Recession of 1937–1938. Roosevelt also deferred to southern segregationists, and he failed to endorse anti-lynching legislation. He approved internment for Japanese-Americans and did little for European Jews during the Holocaust—a topic largely ignored in this book. The idea of FDR as a “radical”\(^{11}\) and the New Deal as a “revolution”\(^{12}\) revisits a dated historiographical argument, and strains one’s imagination since this president saved, as well as tempered, capitalism. Further, Roosevelt’s foot-soldiers were less-than-committed revolutionaries. After supporting the New Deal and joining unions, working people gained material benefits and a measure of security, settled in suburbia, and opposed the excesses of the social movements of the 1960s, few of them led by veterans of World War II. Although there was synergy between Roosevelt and men and women of the Greatest Generation on behalf of liberal reform, it was not as strong and deep as Kaye sometimes contends.

Overall, Kaye has written a provocative book that merits a wide audience. It is engaging, well-written, and well-researched, especially in the most recent secondary sources. *The Fight for the Four Freedoms* demonstrates that much of the New Deal, and it ideals, continued into World War II and are waiting to be revived. Kaye’s study provides abundant food for thought while making a valuable contribution to the literature on human rights.
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Modern day sanctuary practices, diverse ways to resist detention and deportation in order to stay together, have resonance both across time and geographic space. First it is seen as a response to our turbulent contemporary world, which places the asylum regime under constant pressure and has devastating consequences for the people who are forced to flee from their home countries. Second, it is an expression of autonomous migration, where human agency is essential, in the sense that despite which regime is in con-
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trol, people keep migrating and organize themselves outside of inter-state planning. Third, sanctuary is an illustration of rights-claiming, the enactment of a right to have rights, to borrow Hannah Arendt's famous statement in the 1950s. The truth of Arendt's argument is that there is one fundamentally important right: the right to have rights. This is obvious given that there are as many refugees in the world today as there were during the time of her writing: 51 million people according to the UN high commissioner for refugees. In the aftermath of World War II, the political conditions at hand provided a basis for a system of real human rights, i.e. rights respected and implemented in collaboration between states. Through political ambitions of the world community, barbarous acts which had, “outraged the conscience of mankind,” as it is described in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, would never be allowed to happen again. In order to solve the refugee problem in the world, which the international community deemed temporary, the UN Refugee Convention was adopted in 1951. Ever since that time, the supervision of compliance with human rights has been associated with the nation-states’ obligation to respect and protect human rights, mainly for their own nationals. The problem with people who do not have their own state’s protection remains, while the likelihood for refugees to enjoy a safe haven from war and persecution has become limited.

The current situation makes the book *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migration, Citizenship and Social Movements* (now in paper back) a welcome contribution. In this edited volume, scholars from across the world explore places and practices of sanctuary, from an international, theoretical, and historical perspective. Karl Shoemaker, who describes medieval sanctuary documents on the protection of persons having committed criminal acts, gives a historical perspective. For kings in medieval England sanctuary was a way to show their strength. Furthermore, the rational of sanctuary and its abandonment are presented as an institutionalization of religion into the state, combined with better administration of laws and fair trials: “The triumph of the rule of law was thought to have rendered sanctuary detrimental to the public good.”1 This relation between safe havens on one hand and lack of objectivity, impartiality, and legitimacy of the nation state on the other hand, was revived during the renewal of church sanctuary in the 1970s and 1980s. During this time, sanctuary practices emerged as a necessary response to the management of migration regimes with its differing means, including arrest and deportation of individuals to places where it was highly uncertain that they could enjoy protection of their fundamental rights. The role of the church as a political actor independent of the state was now strengthened anew.

Within the framework of the US New Sanctuary Movement in the 1980s, sanctuary developed from being a provision of physical protection, to include strategically telling a broader public of the effects of contemporary deportation regimes. Compared to the sanctuary movement in the 1980s, the actors involved since the beginning of this century developed approaches that Grace Yukich describes

as “radical accompaniment.” These differ from ideas of church-based physical sanctuary in the sense that practices of inclusion rather than places of sanctuary constitute the basis of the movement. At times, these most recent activities also take a transnational conformation. This dimension is explored by Hector Perla and Susan Bibler Coutin in their study of the US-Central American sanctuary movement, and by Marta Caminero-Santangelo in her study of sanctuary in relation to the effects of US deportations of persons to countries where they might get killed. Furthermore, in a chapter about cooperation between organizations on each side of the Detroit River on the US-Canadian border, Julie Young’s use of sanctuary as a cross-national practice is examined.

Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives contains several empirically oriented case studies of faith-based sanctuary practices in the US, Canada, and the UK. A comparison between Nordic countries by Jill Loga, Miikka Pyykkönen, and Hanne Stenvaag concludes that in Sweden and Denmark, “it is clearly more risky to take sanctuary” than in Norway and Finland. The authors also expand on the tension between state and church, where a close relationship simultaneously constitutes a basis for more effective protection of persons seeking sanctuary and promotes a relationship where the church does not want to offend the state.

The last, and, as I see it, the most urgent theme of the book, allocates evolving realms and practices of sanctuary. Jennifer Ridgley presents the shift of sanctuary as a faith-based practice to one of politics, through events in Berkeley, California in 1971 when the city declared itself a sanctuary for US deserters from the Vietnam War. Jonathan Darling and Vicki Squire in their chapter on everyday enactments give readers a perspective of rights holders themselves through examples of articulating claims to rightful presence, networks of solidarity as an investment in the city, and volunteer work as a way of replacing pending the asylum decisions with meaningful everyday activities.

In the last chapter, as yet another way of pointing to the diverse meanings of the concept of sanctuary, Michael Innes discusses sanctuaries as the illegitimate off-spring of the current state of international politics. Developments in Iraq and Afghanistan are covered as well as sanctuary as a broader movement. One of Innes’ main arguments is the need for self-questioning of epistemological issues before making uncritical assumptions about the nature of sanctuary.

Visibility and agency is one highly interesting theme discussed in several chapters of the book. It is very difficult for a person who is deportable to come to the forefront of the resistances because visibility always implies a risk of deportation. The deportability makes itself constantly reminded and also reproduces an asymmetry. While research on sanctuary movements tends to focus on formal representation and hospitality, the latter embedding asymmetry through its guest-host relation, undocumented persons’ enactments are under-researched.
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Another common question is sanctuary practices' relation to law. As Caroline Patsias and Nastassia Williams discuss in their chapter, to help someone in secret is not necessarily a violation of law, nor is it civil disobedience. Rather than civil disobedience, sanctuary is a question of resistance to authority or political obligation. The main argument is that a closer look into sanctuary as a religious practice may shed light on broader political obligations and their limitations. Religious practices in the contemporary world are less about Divine laws and more about human rights; perception of what is good, resistance to power, and the relation of subordinations between the Global South and the Global North.

Hilary Cunningham introduces an understanding of sanctuary as a practice to uphold the law in the face of unlawful state actions, a so-called “civil initiative.” To initiate sanctuary practices, as an undocumented person or on behalf of undocumented persons, is thus a way to claim agency through universal human rights; or, in Arendt’s words, to claim that one has a right to have rights. This is a question of credibility of the constitution, as Hiroshi Oda discusses in his chapter on the German sanctuary movement. Unless the government manages to maintain the rule of law the congregations have to do so. In his chapter about grassroots sanctuary practices in San Francisco, Peter Mancina explores how such rights-claiming comes about and is institutionalized as a governance apparatus.

Sanctuary practices are a delicate balancing act. Agnes Czajka asks if such practices tend to reproduce state discourses and technologies instead of possessing critical potential. However, the political potential of the refugee is embedded in sanctuary practices, as these put into question the state’s “monopoly on the political.” Czajka notes the absolutely crucial question of “why sanctuary,” a perspective that is most often overshadowed by discussions on strategies and effects of sanctuary initiatives.

A more thorough discussion on how, whether, and why sanctuary could and ought to remain under the confines of law, as well as a presentation of struggles over its humanitarian and political dimensions, is unfortunately lacking in the book. The book would be better able to provide a deeper discussion on how sanctuary practices can and ought to be understood, if it gave more space to exploring events where the practices through which the state exercises its sovereignty are usurped and where definitions of who is included and who is excluded are contested.

This edited volume certainly exposes sanctuary as a more international, institutionally-flexible, and theoretically-rich set of practices closely linked to the management of migration. However, the book fails to consider what follows the sanctuary practices it reveals, and to what extent they are part of a much more radical movement against contemporary political regimes. A sentiment that remains after reading is that sanctuary as a practice will probably continue to develop more meanings, as more people become aware of the consequences of the management.
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of migration. In the continuous discussion around sanctuaries of today, the fact that virtually anything has come to be accepted, or to refer back to Arendt, all means have become possible, to find an end to contemporary migration flows. In the context of universal human rights, practices of sanctuary has the potential to make a contribution not only for pointing to the migration control regimes but also in relation to the broader problem of modernism. Its broader political effects remaining to be seen, the book leads the reader to believe that sanctuary—as both enactment and place—possesses the potential to disrupt the state’s attempt to monopolize territorial sovereignty and ways of being political.
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Human Rights and Disability Advocacy is a fascinating account of the involvement of civil society in the drafting of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). The focus on process is situated within a larger discussion of the role of the “new diplomacy” within the United Nations (UN) and other international bodies in which civil society organizations work alongside states as valued and active participants in human rights advocacy and monitoring.

The authors of the fifteen chapter book bring out in rich detail the struggles and debates within the international disability community that came together to achieve the common goal of a treaty that reflects the diversity of that community. The book’s introduction provides a very concise and useful historical account of how a disability-specific human rights treaty came about and the process through which civil society became involved in its negotiation. The Ad-Hoc Committee (AHC) responsible for drafting the convention was established by a UN resolution in 2001 and met eight times over three years. The process by which civil society was involved was elaborated through a series of resolutions which