

not totally be ignored even here - within our short and narrow review. Its repercussion upon the nature of geography is tremendous, and it is becoming even more intensified as long as philosophy and physics fail to resolve it.

Shaul Tsionit

The Open University, Israel

SPACES OF DEMOCRACY: GEOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVES ON CITIZENSHIP, PARTICIPATION AND REPRESENTATION By Clive Barnett and Murray Low (Eds.). London: Sage, 2004.

Human geography has been playing a central role in the debates about globalization, neo-liberalism, anti-capitalism and multi-culturalism. Yet, the debate over democracy, as an idea arguing that politics should be in the hands of ordinary people, is relatively absent from human geography. It is not that the field of human geography has nothing to add to democracy: concepts such as deliberative policy or public participation are rooted in democratic processes, and both have emerged by planners and environmentalists – two fields which are nourished by geography. Geographers, on the other hands, usually ignore applied policy, i.e. the processes of decision making which are rooted in interests, political bureaucracy and institutions. They have also ignored closer examination and detailed analysis of political philosophy and its relation to applied fields. Consequently, geographers, and mainly radical geographers, have underpinned the normative presuppositions of democratic politics, as well as its ideas of what is just, what is good, and how best to bring good, without bringing these ideas into question.

This claim sets the rationale behind the volume on Spaces of Democracy, which grew out of sessions at annual meetings of American and British geographers at the University of Sussex and at Pittsburgh, both in 2000. In these meetings an attempt was made to explain the disconnection of critical human geography from the concerns of political philosophy and democratic theory. Barnett and Low, the editors of the volume, identified three points that separate between geographers and democratic theory: first, *liberalism*, a concept which is central in democratic theory and democratic institutions in the West, has a problematic status in geography. Liberalism is currently identified with one tradition best presented by Hayek, which seeks to restrict the scope of decision-making for the performance of free markets and personal liberties. This understanding of liberalism, known as 'neo liberalism', sets the resource for left-critical discourse, in which radical geographers are engaged, over liberalism in general. Furthermore, geographers call to transcend state-centric views of politics and to think about possibilities of organizing politics differentially, while liberalism and democratic theory are rooted in state-centric views.

This problem leads to the second point which separates geographers from demo-

cratic theory: the *degree of divergence between geographical imaginations and political theory*. Geographers typically assume that the multiplicity of bounded territorial entities cannot be thematized in democratic theory. In this sense, the specialization of geographers in space, scale and place, as objects of analysis, serves as a barrier to democratic theory, which is established on sharp boundaries between political entities. Moreover, in recent years geographers' preferred scales of analysis are above and below the nation-state – which is the most obvious scale for democratic theory.

The third point of separation is *universalism*. How should we understand the value of universalism – a central concept in debates about democracy, which geographers find hard to assimilate to their discipline? The attraction of geographers to more complex understanding of space, place and scale, has been found to be affiliated with critiques about universalizing democratic theory, made in the name of difference, diversity and otherness. According to geographic critique, universalism and liberalism fail to address geographical variations in socio-cultural and political arrangements. Democracy, in this sense, is assumed to be a cultural formation with characteristics that are distinctively 'Western'.

'Spaces of democracy' challenges these points that separate geographers and democratic theory. It suggests that the meaning of democracy is not cut and dried. Rather it is a political form that is "open to contestation and revision... [I]t lies in degree to which definitions of the proper balance between imperatives and collective action and individual freedom, between conflicting interests, and between multiple and fluid identities remain open to contestation and challenge" (p. 16). This is the form of democracy into which geography is promised to be integrated by the chapters of this volume.

The volume is divided into three broad sections: the first addresses questions about the basic mechanism of democracy - elections and voting. It explores the diffusion of democratic elections worldwide since the 1980s, as part of the post-cold war globalization processes. The other chapters analyze the place of geography in voting models. It seems that this section faces some difficulties in moving beyond the cut and dried aspects of democratic theory, and paradoxically re-addresses liberalism and universalism – points that have separated geographers from democratic theory.

The second section is more related to the scope and aim of the volume – democracy, citizenship and scale. The section revolves around the tensions that contest the space within which democracy takes place, i.e. the state's power, such as immigration and citizenship or conflict between national-level politics and urban politics. It criticizes Marshall's conceptualization of citizenship, and, in its more radical critique, the section calls into question the moral legitimacy of the ('Western') state in excluding outsiders from full citizenship status, therefore defying the basic political unit of democracy.

The final section, 'Making Democratic Spaces', considers a broad range of informal types of politics, which can be related to concepts of 'public space' and Laclau

and Mouffe's radical democracy. The section explores the cultural and social aspects of emerging democratic subjectivities of civil activities, which are rooted in a range of spaces and scales.

The major contribution of the volume is the relocation of debates that radical geographers have been coping with recently within the broad scope of political theory in general, and democratic theory in particular. It does not suggest new debates for geography, rather a new-old frame of discussion, which can bring geography into mainstream critical social and political sciences. In this sense, the volume launches the bridges between geography and politics, which goes beyond the state-centric approach of political geography. This contribution should also be addressed to political philosophers and sociologists, as it emphasizes the contribution of space, scale and place in understanding the problematical characters of political activities.

However, and with great appreciation to the contribution of the volume to a serious examination of political issues from geographical perspective, there are two weaknesses that should be addressed: first, although the volume was published several years after September 11 and the new doctrine of the Bush administration of global democratization, mainly in countries from which terror emanates, there is a little attempt in the volume to reconsider the meaning of universalism in democratic theory. This new meaning underscores the fact that democracy is a cultural paradigm associated with the 'West'. It seems that the editors and contributors made insufficient efforts to update the papers, originally presented in meetings before September 11, to the 'new world order'. The second weakness is that the American and British geographers' perspective is dominant in the volume. It could be invigorating to bring more voices of non-Western points of view into the debates about democracy.

Erez Tzfadia
Sapir Academic College

URBAN TOURISM AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOCIALIST STATE,
HAVANA DURING THE "SPECIAL PERIOD" By Andrea Colantonio and
Robert B. Potter. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Urban Tourism and Development in the Socialist State is about the impact of urban tourism in Havana and the interrelations between urban tourism and the institutional reforms of the planning authorities and governance in Cuba. The main aim of the book in the authors' words is: "to examine the nature and the key characteristics of Cuba's transition and to assess the role played by tourism in the country's institutional and economic restructuring". A further object defined by the authors is to fill the gap that exists in the literature concerning Latin American cities.

The book is divided into three parts. The first one, the introduction, includes