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Existentialism as a philosophical outlook enjoyed a formidable presence in universities, literary circles and political associations in Europe for a good part of the previous century before it was replaced by post-modernism and post-structuralism. Kevin Aho’s book is a commendable effort to show why existentialism is still relevant today as a tool of understanding what it means to be a human being in the world. Drawing from the writings of the giants of existentialist thought, the author makes a compelling argument for the contemporary relevance of the philosophy and why it is useful as a critique of both the modern individual and society. In this, Aho’s book is not just an introduction to existentialism, but also its defence.

While the general accusation against existentialism has been that it is an amoral philosophy, Aho differs strongly. In a perspicuous chapter on ‘Ethics,’ he argues that while existentialism rejects ‘the possibility of moral absolutes because this puts universal principles above the concrete needs of the individual’ (p. 111), it offers in its place ‘a life that is free from self-deception, that owns up to the finitude and vulnerability of the human situation and accepts that our individual actions always impact the lives of others’ (p. 121). Thus, existentialism is not a rejection of morality, but proposes a different approach to morality. While covering different themes that form the core concerns of the philosophy, Aho, however, takes care to introduce to his readers the tensions between its proponents as crisply as possible. He also demonstrates his familiarity with non-Eurocentric approaches to the philosophy in his discussions about critical race theorists and Buddhism. Students of continental philosophy, epistemology and identity politics are all likely to find sections in Existentialism that cater to their specific interests.

With the wide array of sources that he deploys, Aho is effective in his aim (p. xiv) to expand the discussion beyond the ‘big four’ of existentialism – namely Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Heidegger and Sartre. However, one theme – the tension of existentialism with Marxism – could have been addressed in more detail. After all, this was the reason for the famous Sartre-Camus rift and, likewise, resolving the problems between the two supposedly contradictory approaches to society informed Sartre’s later project, culminating in the mammoth two volumes of Critique of Dialectical Reason. Apart from this gap, Aho’s work provides a lucid account of what needs to be known about existentialism and its protagonists.

Karthick Ram Manoharan
(University of Essex)


The coming of the digital age has given rise to two contrasting genres of studies in social science in recent times: one that celebrates the ever-increasing presence and emancipatory role of the digital in shaping our life in the ‘smart’ world; and the other which critically investigates its referents and the ways and means by which it impacts not just on the way we act, but also, more fundamentally, on the way we think. This book falls into the second category. It combines conceptual-theoretical and empirical richness in taking up a theme that admittedly generates agonising complexity for researchers.

The author clarifies at the outset that his task involves ‘questioning’ the digital/computal/computational. His motive emerges out of a concern for the changing relationship between knowledge and freedom, which in turn changes the equation between us and new digital technology – with a distinct priority and advantage for the latter. In developing the onto-
logical and epistemological orientations the author acknowledges his huge intellectual debt to the Frankfurt School. The masters of the School (with the exception of Habermas), despite not having experienced the digital grip of the latter-day world, could leave enough clues for those now existentially and intellectually disturbed by the process of the computational colonisation of life. The chapters of the book, which explicate the trajectory from culture industry to computational industry, the ‘softwarisation’ of society, and computational ontologies, aesthetics and critical praxis, bear testimony to the impact of the School, along with due attention to Heidegger, Mannheim and Foucault. However, in the challenging task of constructing a critical theory of the digital the author offers new theoretical insights vis-à-vis the existing order of things.

The crux of the matter is that transformative social change is inherently political, with human agency and subjectivity as its foundational forces. The digital mediation can at best be a facilitator to this process, and any attempt to accord it primacy is fraught with caution. The paradox, however, is that with the astonishing ascendance of new technology there is an attempt to construct and promote a kind of technorationality in which the ‘normal’ way to perceive and interpret the social world is to do so through the digital and computational lens. The most dangerous consequence of this perspective is the slow but steady negation of political praxis and the appropriation of alternative visions by ‘techno-social reality’. With millennial capitalism facilitating such processes by legitimating the accumulation of immaterial capital, it would have been more gratifying if the author could have addressed the state-market ‘collaboration’ in this regard. However, in demystifying the digital and bringing it into the realm of critical theory the book remains a timely and important work.

Dipankar Sinha
(Calcutta University)

Plato on the Limits of Human Life by Sara Brill.

For the last three decades, ancient concepts of the soul have caught the attention of philosophical discourse. Following this discussion, Sara Brill examines Plato’s psychology in order to re-evaluate the mainstream interpretations of his philosophy and, in particular, to reassess the relationship between the soul and politics.

The book is divided into three parts, each devoted to one of the dialogues Phaedo, Republic and Laws. According to Brill’s reading of Plato, the soul oscillates between timeless Being and mortal body. It is both plastic – i.e. ‘subject to a wide variety of transformations with respect to its condition’ (p. 3) – and at the same time unique because it sustains its entity throughout all fragmentation processes. Brill thinks that the plasticity of the soul is the main challenge Plato has to address in his political theory. Analysing his iconography of the soul leads her to three theses: (1) the plasticity of the soul is intertwined with the political community; (2) the afterlife myths rectify the short-term perspective of everyday life and therefore ‘have a prosthetic function’ (p. 7); and (3) given that philosophy requires certain attitudes and skills of the soul, an enquiry of the soul elucidates the conditions of philosophy itself.

Brill realises her ambitious programme in an able and consistent manner. However, her argument is not entirely compelling. First, the way in which the city forms the soul receives insufficient attention. Brill convincingly shows that the analysis of the tyrant in the Republic suggests the necessity of limiting psychic excess. In her view, the laws and myths of the city fulfil this prosthetic function, yet she barely speaks about education. Only four pages deal with philosophical training (pp. 128–31). This is surprising as laws and myths do not necessarily rely on the plasticity of the soul since they can be understood as mere external constraints. In contrast, education must assume the malleability of the soul and therefore might call for prior investigation. Second, Brill’s attempt to take the myths as part of the overall argument is innovative but raises a question. She supposes that the four reasons for the immortality of the soul in Phaedo are incomplete. But why would the philosopher revert to myths in order to remedy this deficiency? This claim seems unjustified as Socrates offers a rational way out (107 b–c). This seeming aporia invites further research. Like Brill’s challenging book, it promises to be ‘provocative and creative’ (p. 208).

Vanessa Jansche
(University of St Gallen)

Campos and André begin this edited collection by noting that political participation is conspicuous by its absence in much real-world democratic practice. Democracy therefore faces a set of theoretical crises, which, if left unaddressed, may materialise as real crises of legitimacy. These crises are the subject of their collected essays.

These essays are split into three sections, loosely covering anti-politics, deliberative democracy and pluralism. The first three essays are concerned with narratives of exclusion. Modern democracies, we see, exclude by way of elite control over practices of participation, leaving no room for resistance. Oligopolistic, unresponsive political parties, meanwhile, explain the recent surge in anti-political populism. And the monologic character of government leaves little space for the public, dialogic construction of new identities, ideas and beliefs. The performance of individual agency is thus pushed largely into the private sphere, where any opportunities for interpersonal learning are overshadowed by the need to represent a uniform, complete self.

A possible solution to each of these problems is outlined in the book's three essays on deliberative democracy. It is here that the book is at its best, as we see the ephemeral issue of political power presented in a more concrete form as institutional, organisational power. In an essay on truth-seeking deliberative democrats, for instance, we are reminded that the pursuit of political ‘truths’ threatens to shift political power to those whom the new political epistemologists call ‘technocracy’. The other two essays, by contrast, offer a useful contribution to the so-called ‘systemic turn’ in deliberative democracy, which is concerned with realising deliberation as an ongoing process. As these essays demonstrate, mini-publics offer a promising way of including citizens in real political decisions, but these benefits depend crucially on the decisions of organisers and administrators, who are thus given immense power to shape the formation and presentation of the democratic will.

The last two essays divert readers’ attention to the more immediate matter of engaging individuals in public reasoning. However, their discussions of the dilemma between patriotism and cosmopolitanism and historical dialogical practices in India have, at most, a peripheral importance to the wider question of engaging citizens in complex modern polities. In particular, the question of political elites, clearly identified in earlier essays, is left unaddressed. The absence of a clear editorial line is evident here; if elites are the principal obstacle to participation, then the question democrats face is not whether ordinary individuals can find the resources for public reasoning, but how they can make them meaningful. These essays help to demonstrate the scale of the challenge, but, ultimately, they fail to develop the book’s ambitions.

Paul Gunn
(Goldsmiths, University of London)


Are democracies prone to self-destruction? And if they are, what can democrats do about this? Both books under review here consider these two pertinent questions from two very different, but nevertheless overlapping perspectives.

In Theorising Democide, Mark Chou takes issue with the complacency many scholars seem to display when discussing the supposed triumph of democracy as a governmental system. Chou believes that democracy as a concept too often escapes real interrogation by committed democrats. Its champions, he says, instead prefer to lay the blame for democratic failures at the feet of forces external to the democratic system – including institutional defects that sabotage democracy, unfavourable socio-economic determinants that prevent democracy from consolidating and toxic political atmospheres within countries that are struggling with democratic problems – without adequately considering
the dynamics and processes inherent to democracy itself that can trigger democratic regimes’ self-destruction – or what Chou calls ‘democide’.

The first two chapters of the book are dedicated to critiquing the work of scholars Chou believes have committed this error. Although for the most part his criticism here is well-placed and convincing, there are nevertheless some glaring problems with his own analysis. For instance, Chou notes that around 40 per cent of democratic breakdowns between 1950 and 2004 were due to endogenous factors, and concludes from this that ‘[d]emocracies fail, and they do so not because of some extrinsic or exogenous factor. … [T]here is something intrinsic to democracy that makes it prone to self-destruct’ (p. 11). Chou’s conclusion, however, is not justified on the basis of these statistics; indeed, it seems more appropriate to conclude that those democratic breakdowns due to extrinsic factors (some 60 per cent) suggest that democracy, in fact, tends to die not by its own hand, but rather by that of some other.

The ensuing two chapters explore in more depth the endogenous factors of democracy that can lead to its self-destruction. Here, Theorising Democide really shines. Chou weaves his own original insights around the political thought of a wide variety of authors to create an engaging and thought-provoking argument. Especially interesting in this regard is Chou’s development of the link between hubris – here meaning the tendency of human beings to reach beyond their limits – and democracy and the tragedies in which democratic hubris often results; as a political system that lacks known limits, Chou says, democracy ‘lacks in and of itself any device or marker to stop citizens from going too far and instituting its antithesis’ (p. 45). It is only by recognising this fact and, in light of this recognition, by continually subverting all attempts at ‘going too far’ that Chou believes democracy can be preserved.

In Death to Tyrants!, on the other hand, David A. Teegarden provides an eloquent and in-depth examination of some of the ways democratic ancient Greeks subverted those hubristic groups and individuals who attempted to ‘go too far’ and take the reins of power from the demos for themselves.

Using modern social science methods, Teegarden examines how legislation from a number of ancient Greek city-states incentivised their citizens to overthrow any potential non-democratic regimes that might come to power illegally. Modelled on Athenian laws that rewarded individuals and their families for killing domestic tyrants, such legislation helped overcome what Teegarden calls the ‘revolutionary coordination problem’ – how to coordinate a successful counter-revolution when established institutions are not functioning – in two ways. First, these laws generated common knowledge of a widespread commitment to defend the democracy in the event of a coup. Second, it incentivised brave individuals to commit the first public act in defence of the democracy – the killing of the tyrant himself. With such legislation enacted, Teegarden says, in the event of a coup ‘it would be more likely that someone would commit a conspicuous act in defence of the democracy and that that act would trigger an ever-growing cascade of pro-democracy resistance’ (p. 216).

It is hard to find fault with Teegarden’s book. For what it is – a very focused examination of a limited number of ancient texts – the book’s quality is very high. But perhaps this is where one criticism could be levelled at it: despite its great merits Death to Tyrants! counts as a guide to some important facets of classical democracy, but does not attempt to make itself relevant to contemporary democratic concerns.

Daniel Falkiner
(London School of Economics and Political Science)


Despite the author’s statement that ‘this is not a book of political theory’ (p. 275), there is much of interest here for both political theorists and historians of political thought, particularly those with an interest in human rights. The book’s twofold concern is, as the title makes clear, with the ‘architecture of concepts’ in general and with the ‘historical formulation of human rights’ in particular. Additionally, the book aims to ‘test a methodology for analysing the structuration or architecture of concepts in general’ (p. 11) – this innovative methodology uses data from digital archives of written texts on the frequency of the use of certain words, groups of words and phrases.
The bulk of the book comprises three ‘slightly different approach[es] to writing a conceptual history’ of human rights (p. 40). These take as their field of analysis, respectively, ‘rights’ in the eighteenth century, ‘rights’ in revolutionary America and the impact on ‘rights’ that the publication of Thomas Paine’s Rights of Man had on the late eighteenth-century Anglophone world. In tracing the concept of ‘rights’ through these events, Peter de Bolla seeks to advance the argument that ‘there was – and is – more than one way of building a concept of rights that may do the work we want it to’ (p. 282). This has contemporary as well as historical importance because ‘current conceptions of international human rights are built upon a particular conceptual architecture that has deep roots in the Enlightenment’ which, unfortunately ‘is unfit for purpose’ (p. 2). Rather than ‘rights’ as properties of persons, de Bolla argues, we should adapt the concept of ‘rights of man’, grasped briefly in the eighteenth century before being lost, which is ‘axiomatic’ rather than ‘noetic’, in the ‘declaratory mood’ and which would be ‘our collective aspiration on behalf of humanity’ (pp. 264, 267 and 287–8).

The book is well-written and innovative in its use of quantitative data from digital archives. Although the author anticipates this criticism (p. 9), the data presented may be improved by giving the frequency of certain terms as a function of the total words produced that year: Tables 17 and 22 (pp. 100 and 141), for example, show increases in the uses of certain terms, but this may well be in the context of a general increase in words published per year. This does not, however, undermine the central arguments of what is an innovative and detailed contribution to both the history of human rights and the theory of concepts.

Matt Hann
(Durham University)


Power is one of the elusive concepts in the study of politics: employed by many but rarely understood and even less often properly explicated. This clearly signals that coming to some common understanding of it is hardly feasible. And yet, Mitchell Dean’s book, engaging with some of the dominant narratives of power in contemporary political theory, does provide a basis for at least some consolidation of the otherwise disparate field of research.

As the subtitle Sovereignty, Governmentality and Biopolitics suggests, the three core accounts of power analysed and brought into a very fruitful conversation are those of Carl Schmitt, Michel Foucault and Giorgio Agamben. At first, this choice might seem quite surprising, since although Schmitt and Agamben as well as Agamben and Foucault do have common grounding, Schmitt and Foucault are not authors often analysed together or used to fill one another’s lacunae. And yet, this choice works really well. The different accounts of power are brought into a productive tension, while at the same time exposing their partiality. The author’s answer to the supposed incommensurability of the three strands of thought is straightforward: they all, although contributing invaluable insights, are only partial, providing only a trimmed account of how power has to be approached, finally succumbing to a core fault of presenting power in a series of dualisms before reaching a cul-de-sac by turning to power as domination. As a result, only by reading those theories together can a fuller, more realistic picture be built. Ultimately, this book is not merely an exposition of and commentary on Schmitt, Foucault and Agamben: Dean offers an insightful critical analysis of their theories and, crucially, has something novel to say about each of them, thus contributing not only to the general study of power, but also to the understanding of the three authors concerned.

And yet, the book ends somewhat abruptly and leaves something to be desired – namely, more in terms of the author’s own account of power. Although some broad formulae are provided, a true coming together of the different approaches and criticisms, so painstakingly carved out throughout the book, is lacking. Therefore, the book is more of an impetus for further studies of power than a definite statement on it. As such, it is a must-read for any researcher of power as well as for those generally interested in Schmitt, Foucault and Agamben.

Ignas Kalpokas
(University of Nottingham)
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Emerging out of the ACCEPT pluralism project (an initiative concerning the theoretical and empirical analysis of cultural and religious pluralism in Europe), the authors in this edited volume take us to the heart of contemporary debates regarding the political, philosophical and sociological analysis of tolerance, intolerance and respect. The cross-disciplinary approach employed in this book is particularly timely for the following reasons. First, there is an emerging body of thought and opinion, both inside and outside of the academy, that the political principle of toleration is outdated when applied to new, modern forms of diversity. For some, while it may be a useful concept for dealing with diversity in values and beliefs, it is insufficient when dealing with ethnic and cultural diversity. Second, there has been much criticism within Europe of a perceived leniency when it comes to the toleration and accommodation of diverse ways of life. While many politicians and academics have extolled the virtues of tolerance, critics maintain that they have been less willing to talk about the importance of shared values and social solidarity. The authors in this book ground their analysis of tolerance, intolerance and respect within this challenging socio-political reality.

The book is broken up into three main sections. In Part I, three chapters examine the question of whether we need a normative principle that goes beyond toleration. In Part II, there are two separate chapters. The first focuses on the potential for a discourse of toleration to become repressive or intolerant. The second examines the various justifications in liberal theory for toleration. In Part III, two chapters focus on new, modern forms of ethnic and cultural diversity in Europe and the challenges these identities pose for liberal democratic regimes of tolerance. These sections are concluded with some reflections from the book’s editors and an additional afterword by Bhikhu Parekh. One of the main virtues of this volume is that it examines the complex ‘boundary issues’ between intolerance, tolerance and recognition. For these authors, it is in these boundary areas where major sociological, political and normative questions arise.

The editors have done a fine job in bringing together a range of expert perspectives from across the social and political sciences. This book will appeal to those interested in the normative and empirical analysis of ethnic and cultural diversity. It is a timely addition to an important debate on precisely what it means to accept cultural diversity in modern liberal democratic states.

Daniel Savery
(National University of Ireland, Galway)

The editors have done a fine job in bringing together a range of expert perspectives from across the social and political sciences. This book will appeal to those interested in the normative and empirical analysis of ethnic and cultural diversity. It is a timely addition to an important debate on precisely what it means to accept cultural diversity in modern liberal democratic states.

© 2015 The Authors. Political Studies Review © 2015 Political Studies Association
Political Studies Review: 2015, 13(4)
Durkin defends the philosophical basis of Fromm’s social theory against the claims of structuralist and post-structuralist theorists, and this provides a robust platform to launch his appeal for the continued relevance of radical humanism today. He argues impressively for the coherence of the idea of universals in human nature, drawing on, among others, the sociological perspectives of critical realists Margaret Archer and Roy Bhaskar, the neurobiological work of Antonio Damasio and the anthropological writings of Melford Spiro and Gananath Obeyesekere. On the basis of his conception of human nature and his theoretical construction of human flourishing, Fromm developed a critique of the social processes that have thwarted the realisation of human potentials. He argued that ‘affluent alienation’ in modern societies is manifested in the development of a ‘marketing character’ that appears to be infinitely compliant (pp. 85 and 182–3), but he nevertheless identifies ideas and movements that hold out the promise of furthering humanistic goals. This is the legacy which Durkin sets about reclaiming, and he succeeds admirably in this outstanding book.

Lawrence Wilde
(Nottingham Trent University)

Vulnerability: Reflections on a New Ethical Foundation for Law and Politics by Martha Albertson Fineman and Anna Grear (eds). Farnham: Ashgate, 2013. 223pp., £35.00, ISBN 978 1 4724 2163 0

The essays compiled in this book offer a varied look at the theoretical implications and the possible practical applications of Martha Albertson Fineman’s critique of the liberal paradigm in the US and of her ‘vulnerability theory’. The first chapter, written by Fineman, presents her critique of the liberal institutional bias of thinking of individuals as autonomous and independent subjects, and opposes it to her own more egalitarian thesis that sees individuals as universally vulnerable subjects who are naturally dependent on others. This ‘universal vulnerability’ implies that our social institutions should be responsive to our innate dependency, hence focusing on promoting our resilience to harm, rather than fostering the unreachable autonomy of the individual.

Although most of the chapters are written by legal scholars, the targeted audience goes well beyond the field of law, touching on philosophy, political science, sociology and public policy, among other subjects. The first five essays present a theoretical analysis of Fineman’s theory, looking at its philosophical credentials, and as a critical framework for analysing our current social order. The last five chapters apply the theoretical framework to specific empirical cases, such as local businesses, social housing policy, the distribution of assisted reproductive technology, vulnerability in the European Court of Human Rights and animal rights theory.

The wide spectrum of subjects touched by this compilation proves the relevance of ‘vulnerability’ as a theoretical framework for analysing the impact of liberalism on our conception of the self. It makes us question many of our deepest prejudices of the individual as an idealised and autonomous subject, showing how this can generate structural inequalities in our social institutions. At the same time, it presents ‘vulnerability’ as an alternative approach to justice and equality, offering empirical examples for how this framework better represents humans (and animals), and how, if implemented in legislation and public policy, it could have a major positive impact on individuals who are suffering from grave injustices in our current social order.

However, it must be mentioned that the variety of subjects that the book tackles creates a lack of cohesion among the different chapters, demanding specialised knowledge of each discipline so as to fully understand each of the essays. From this perspective, it seems that it is not meant to be read as an ensemble, but rather as a combination of various independent contributions from different disciplines to the vulnerability framework.

Nicola Brando
(KU Leuven)


Rainer Forst’s Justification and Critique elaborates on the idea of ‘the right to justification’ and its ‘recursive’ basis in the ‘overarching reflexive principle of justice’, which stipulates that there ‘be no social and political
relations that cannot be reciprocally and generally justified to all those who are part of a political-social context’ (p. 114; emphasis in the original). This basic right to justification serves as the wellspring of an expansive political theory with implications for, *inter alia*, human dignity, toleration and distributive justice. Such a theoretical foundation is refreshingly simple, yet picturesque, and yet boasts enormous explanatory power – a significant achievement.

The book unfolds over three parts. The first expounds Forst’s conceptual framework. The second engages important German and Anglophone thinkers – especially Axel Honneth and Nancy Fraser – on various ethical-political questions. And the third deals with the elusiveness of justice in a non-ideal world, the proper role of utopian thinking and the concept of ‘irony’.

One of the book’s virtues is its emphasis on injustice. Forst consistently orients himself with the politically or socially oppressed, excluded, dispossessed and disadvantaged. He claims that ‘every theory of justice requires a complex theory of injustice, not just as a normative account, but also in the form of a social analysis’ (p. 114); and through extensive historical interlays, he accomplishes just this.

Despite the manifold accomplishments of *Justification and Critique*, some issues remain. One is Forst’s stringent monological Kantianism, which commits him to some problematic positions, including the view that true consensus ‘only exists where there are shared reasons’ (p. 89). Such strong foundationalism begs difficult questions: Can reasons ever be shared in the substantive sense Forst suggests? If not, does this mean true justice is forever unattainable?

Another issue is whether the vast explanatory potential of Forst’s theory threatens to flatten, rather than enhance, our understanding of social and political struggles – viz., what is gained from reconceiving these struggles as having all been motivated by the demand for justification? Might this not obscure historical nuance and particularity?

Finally, grounding a theory of justice on an idea of persons as justificatory beings presents Forst with considerable difficulties in explaining how rights can be extended to individuals lacking full and uninhibited use of their rational capacities – e.g. those with severe mental disabilities. It also excludes animal rights and environmental issues from the domain of justice. These difficulties notwithstanding, *Justification and Critique* is a valuable contribution to the political-theory literature emerging at the intersection of Anglophone and German thought.

Ross A. Mättiga
(University of Virginia)


For such a brief 98-page monograph, this ‘overture’ on democracy is remarkable. Nominated for the 2013 Stein Rokkan Prize, Jean-Paul Gagnon’s work is a revolutionary cry to throw out our existing understandings and evidence about ‘democracy’ and, in effect, start again. Arguing on the insistent grounds that current theories and measures are irretrievably biased and Eurocentric, Gagnon posits a framework for studying democracy ‘with evidence from the whole planet’ (p. 7).

What follows is a free-wheeling whistle-stop tour of the ‘subalterns and unknowns’ of democracy with little respect for disciplinary convention. A short introduction posits a ‘framework’ for studying democracy throughout all of the Earth’s history and in every part of the globe (even oceans). Peculiarly, it does not build on existing models, but claims to replace them. The ensuing chapters work backwards to argue why Gagnon believes this framework necessary. Chapter 3 pours scorn on existing definitions for being Eurocentric and, consequently, inherently biased. He argues instead that democracy is *evolutionary*; it has existed at some point in all human and non-human forms, and is constantly fluctuating and mutating. The most enjoyably innovative chapters (1 and 2) therefore draw on conceptions of ‘democracy’ in the physical sciences, leading to such mind-bending gems as: ‘democratic behaviours happen in microscopic societies found in human blood’ (p. 33), and ‘it can ... be argued that a bacterial democratic society is present in the human mouth’ (p. 31). Gagnon’s provocatively engaging argument is that democracy is neither a system particular to the contemporary West, nor even to humans as such. Instead it is a practice ingrained to a greater or lesser extent in *every* life-form since the
dawn of time. This he terms ‘Evolutionary Basic Democracy’.

It is unusual to read such a refreshingly open-ended piece of scholarship. Gagnon doesn’t so much think outside the box as tell us we need to think differently about the box itself (see ‘Schrödinger’s democracy’ in Chapter 4). Scholars can rightly be sceptical of this book’s more outlandish claims to originality. When Gagnon claims, for example, that ‘democracy ... has never existed – but it is on the horizon’ (p. 23) it is peculiar that Robert Dahl’s classic conceptualisation of ‘polyarchy’ warrants not so much as a bibliographical reference. Some of Gagnon’s epistemological claims for his framework (‘the weight of the evidence will converge on an objective truth’ [p. 12], for instance) are also at times unnecessarily overblown.

Despite these oversights, Gagnon’s work thrillingly blows open methodological and epistemological debates in the analysis of democracy. It deserves attention from all scholars and advanced students dissatisfied with contemporary conceptualisations and measurements of democracy.

Matthew Wood
(University of Sheffield)

A World Without Why by Raymond Geuss.
264pp., £27.95, ISBN 978 0 6911 5588 3

This collection of essays by Raymond Geuss explores a range of issues concerned with questions of authority, discipline, criticism and their relation to the ‘meaning’ of human life. There are thirteen essays, some previously published and some new, that range over topics such as the organisation of academic subjects (‘Goals, Origins, Disciplines’); Cicero, Thucydides and the idea of clarity in a text, and the character of critique (‘Vix intelligitur’ and ‘Must Criticism be Constructive’); Alasdair MacIntyre and the status of Marxism as a source of universal meaning (‘Marxism and the Ethos of the Twentieth Century’); the ambiguous meaning of ‘authority’ (‘Authority: Some Fables’); the purposes of lying (‘A Note on Lying’); Bernard Williams on ethics and politics (‘Did Williams Do Ethics?’); and a provocative account of contemporary academia and its general obsession with the why-game (‘A World Without Why’).

Geuss’s particular talent is to compel his readers to the negative: there is a deep vein of scepticism that runs through all of these pieces. There is a pessimism that is not just for show. In the essay on Marxism he tells us that we might take seriously the attempt to abolish the dogmatic, baleful distinction between means and ends characteristic of the ‘ethos of the twentieth century’. But then, there is not ‘politically the slightest chance of this happening at the present’ (pp. 66–7). Nonetheless, Geuss’s deeply critical theory is not of the same order of pessimism as that of a thinker like John Gray, who effectively abandons all hope of human self-determination. There remains in Geuss’s thought some gesture towards emancipation, but it is not to be achieved through the ratiocinative order of modern academic work, still less through contemporary politics – a ‘domain deeply structured by the play of powerful agents pursuing their own interests in relatively unscrupulous ways’ (p. 143). The ‘invitation to consider something’ (p. 234), to look at it in a concentrated way in order to see how things that appear to fit together come apart on closer inspection, can itself effect some degree of liberation from ideas and practices that beguile and enslave us. Geuss cannot and does not want to provide us with any formulaic solutions to the profound problems of the present, but he reminds us very effectively that the critical – and sceptical – stance is the only one that allows us to see things anew, and thus offers hope of a way out.

Jason Edwards
(Birkbeck, University of London)

Hegel and the Metaphysical Frontiers of Political Theory by Eric Lee Goodfield.
Abingdon: Routledge, 2014. 266pp., £85.00, ISBN 978 0 4156 9847 4

Eric Lee Goodfield’s book is, in fact, two books in one. First, it is a careful exegesis of G. W. F. Hegel’s political theory, as understood in relation to his logic and especially his metaphysics. Second, it is a bold and, indeed, brave call to take seriously the linking of politics to metaphysics exemplified in Hegel’s work and largely abandoned in Anglo-American political theory today. Both elements are strikingly well conceived and defended. Goodfield’s Hegel here is freed from over a century of a schol-
arship aimed more at dismissing or domesticating him than in taking his most striking claims seriously. As such, it is among the most important works on Hegel and contemporary political theory in recent memory.

Goodfield’s Hegel (Chapters 4 and 5) is deeply troubled by the effects of the radical Enlightenment on science and ultimately moral and political thought. The turn to materialism and atomism, while appropriate in certain realms, has dangerously contaminated ethical and political theory. The growing atomism of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century natural science reoriented the science of politics to the interests of individuals over any larger conception of a greater communal good (see e.g. p. 137). To overcome this limited perspective, Goodfield’s Hegel appeals to an ancient, Platonic concept of the universal, which animates both his logic and politics (though Goodfield notes important differences between Hegel and Plato along the way).

Goodfield masterfully explains how Hegel’s reception has been shaped by various historical events and intellectual trends, resulting with him being purged of his metaphysics by twentieth-century scholars who have sought to re-cast him as a liberal champion (see especially pp. 202–12).

The book’s conclusion forcefully defends the Hegelian strategy of linking politics and metaphysics, since, as Goodfield persuasively argues, ‘there is no getting beyond such [metaphysical] commitments’ (p. 222). In other words, all political theories – whether wittingly or not – presuppose a fundamental underlying set of metaphysical commitments. With some – Plato, Rousseau, Hegel, for example – this is explicit (even though much of the secondary literature attempts to resist it). With others – Rawls, Habermas, Barber, for example – it is implicit. Implicit metaphysics succumbs to many difficulties, including a lack of self-awareness, an unwillingness to engage and defend fundamental assumptions and a lack of transparency in deliberating core political ideas. Goodfield’s Hegel stands as an immensely instructive reminder to engage the full scope of political theory with its attending metaphysics and not merely the parts that affirm our own prejudices.

David Lay Williams (DePaul University)


The relation between theory and practice continues to concern progressive intellectuals across the world. In a broad sense, we can say that this is the issue of Marcelo Hoffman’s book Foucault and Power, as is also indicated by the subtitle The Influence of Political Engagement on Theories of Power. For the first time, an author extensively analyses Michel Foucault’s political activities and not only his involvement in the Iranian Revolution. Hoffman also connects these political activities with Foucault’s theory on power and does not refer to them only as biographical information.

The book’s basic idea is that there is a dialectical relationship between Foucault’s political engagement and the theoretical concepts that he developed on power. According to this idea, Foucault was fueled by political movements and his own engagement with them, and he then produced new theoretical concepts or made some modifications to his previous theory so that this new theory would then return knowledge, ideas and concerns back to the movement.

Marcelo Hoffman develops his argument on the basis of three cases that are presented in the three main chapters of the book: Foucault’s engagement in the Information Group on Prisons (Chapter 2); the experience of the Iranian Revolution (Chapter 4); and the coup against Solidarity in Poland and Foucault’s reaction (Chapter 5). The author deals adequately with these three cases and thus provides persuasive arguments. In my opinion, the most convincing chapter is Chapter 5, which deals with the case of Solidarity and its relation with the concept of ‘Parthiesia’, as developed by Foucault. The least convincing is the fourth chapter, which deals with the case of Iran.

A great advantage of the book is its absolutely clear structure which, combined with the intelligible writing of the author, makes it very comprehensible to anyone interested in Michel Foucault, from students and researchers to non-academic, but systematic readers of his work. Another great contribution is the report entitled ‘Investigation in 20 Prisons’ by the Information Group on Prisons, presented in the Appendix at the end of the book and translated for the first time into English.
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Overall, Marcelo Hoffman’s theoretical venture gives us very useful insights. Through the highlighting of this dialectical relationship between theory and practice in Foucault’s work, the author primarily provides us with a new tool with which to approach the work of Foucault and implicitly gives us an example of a political active thinker of our time.

Antonis Galanopoulos
(Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)


James D. Ingram argues that cosmopolitan political theorists tend to make two fundamental and related mistakes. The first is to develop and propound ‘universal’ ethical principles, when ‘ostensibly universalistic principles or theories always harbour hidden hierarchies and exclusions’ (p. 75). The second is to offer global institutional prescriptions designed to deliver a more desirable future while either failing to tell us how such institutions can be realised, or endorsing processes of realisation ‘that contradict the very principle of equality on which [cosmopolitanism’s] aspirations are based’ (p. 142). In both cases, the problem is that cosmopolitan theorists have divorced cosmopolitan ethics from political practice. In response, Ingram offers a vision of ‘cosmopolitanism from below’. Instead of looking for universal ethical principles, we should recognise how prevailing norms can become ‘more universal, less arbitrary and exclusive’ (p. 205) on account of challenges from those who are excluded. Similarly, the route to a more democratic, cosmopolitan political future must be the concrete struggles of dominated political agents themselves.

While Ingram’s critiques of mainstream cosmopolitan theory are clear and engaging, his positive contribution is at first less easy to discern due to the elaborate and at times opaque style of many of the theorists he calls upon to help make his case. A final illustrative chapter, focused on the idea of human rights, is therefore highly welcome. Here we see clearly that human rights must be specified and claimed by agents themselves – those rights must be ‘their own work’ (p. 272) – if they are to be stable and genuinely expressive of equal recognition.

One suspects that the distinction between much of cosmopolitan theory and Ingram’s ‘cosmopolitanism from below’ is a little overdrawn. In order to be able to distinguish between genuinely emancipatory political practice and more sinister popular movements, for example, we surely need to be able to confidently call upon some universal concepts; Ingram makes use of the notions of ‘domination’ and ‘equality’, in common with many of the theorists he criticises. Furthermore, some cosmopolitans do give more consideration to the significance of ‘bottom-up’ social movements than he gives them credit for. Nevertheless, this is an impressive work of scholarship that provides an important warning about the dangers of thinking on behalf of others, to which cosmopolitan theorising has been particularly susceptible.

Luke Ulas
(Justitia Amplificata, Goethe University Frankfurt)


The lack of critical scholarship around the work of James Tully has been a blind spot within political theory in recent years. However, Freedom and Democracy in an Imperial Context moves toward rectifying this deficiency in a manner that advances the core debates to which Tully’s own work has contributed. Enacting his project of public philosophy, this volume successfully demonstrates the central claim of Tully’s method for contemporary political thought: that the work of a political philosopher can serve as a site for genuine intellectual and democratic engagement.

This volume confronts Tully’s 2008 two-volume work, Public Philosophy in a New Key, its title concept and its analyses of freedom and democracy in the present world. It is organised around one of Tully’s central insights there, that ‘while freedom and democracy are often understood as emancipatory ideals, their prevailing instantiations provide the very language and institutions through which imperial power relations operate today’ (p. 1). The various contributions seek to understand and critically engage Tully’s method for analysing and responding to this situation – i.e. his understanding of philosophy as a public and critical
ongoing activity that offers alternative forms of freedom and democracy (what he calls ‘practices of civic freedom and democracy’) to enable citizens to think and act differently.

Part I, the lengthiest section, provides a series of critical engagements with Tully’s methodology. It explicates the various philosophical claims behind this approach: e.g. the conception of politics as activity rather than procedure for agreement (Laden), the priority of practices over institutions/principles (Mendieta), the focus on critical activity (Vázquez-Arroyo), and the presence of realism (Honig). In contrast, Parts II and III turn to applications of Tully’s critique of imperialism and model of civic freedom onto past and future struggles. The former address topics as diverse as colonialism and indigenous rights (Angie), slavery reparations (Scott) and post-national forms of citizenship (Emden), while the latter focus on combating neoliberal forms of globalisation (Sahle), maintaining diverse forms of citizenship (Norval) and applying Tully’s method in local sites of struggle (Napoleon and Friedland). These latter contributions are all based in reflections within specific contexts, illustrating the practical consequences of Tully’s work. Finally, this is followed by an original essay from Tully responding to these chapters. The power of this volume is revealed in the richness here, as he makes several important clarifications on a range of topics.

The only weakness is in the criticisms offered of Tully. Often muted, the contributors seem to struggle to bring significant criticisms against the method of public philosophy or its applications. Perhaps this is only evidence of the importance of this unique volume and continued scholarship into Tully’s methodology for critical political theory.

Clayton Chin
(Queen Mary University of London)

**The Voice of Conscience: A Political Genealogy of Western Ethical Experience** by Mika Ojakangas. London: Bloomsbury, 2013. 253pp., £70.00, ISBN 978 1 6235 6678 4

Mika Ojakangas’ book is advertised as ‘a political genealogy of western ethical experience’ and ‘the canny voice from within’ (p. 1). In other words, the author attempts something of a history of the concept of ‘conscience’, understood as an internal ‘voice’ of ethical judgement, from Socrates onwards. The scene is set by an exploration of the role of the idea of ‘inner truth’ in Nazi thought, the congruence between Martin Heidegger’s philosophy and his support for a National Socialist re-awakening of responsibility, and Hannah Arendt’s ‘nihilistic’ view of conscience and judgement. Ojakangas then goes on to try to demonstrate a view of conscience as the ‘empty’ centre of the ethical and political subject in Western philosophy, drawing on a very wide number of thinkers, including the fathers of the Christian church, Luther, Calvin, Suarez, Pufendorf, Hobbes, Locke, Adam Smith, Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche, Levinas, Derrida and many others. A central aim, the author says following Giorgio Agamben, is to demonstrate a ‘radical continuity’ in Western ethical and political thought, and therefore to rebut the dominant view of rupture and discontinuity characteristic of intellectual history since the 1970s.

Ojakangas does not succeed in this aim. The problem is that he never makes very clear what, precisely, might be involved in the kind of ‘political genealogy’ he wants to write. There is of course mileage in the notion of genealogy in comparison to other kinds of historical writing, such as narrative or conceptual history, but it is hard to see here how a genealogical method succeeds in connecting the disparate material of numerous authors, writing in very distinct political and social contexts. Ojakangas wants to join them up, as is made clear in the conclusion, by the shared commitment to some core concept of the ethico-political subject being born out of a ‘nothingness’ at its heart, a surrendering of its given beliefs, values, and so on to the voice of conscience that allows it to become an autonomous being. He has an easier job showing some such view to be held by a thinker such as Kant, than he does when considering Hobbes and others, who are treated in such summary fashion as to appear unfamiliar. This is not a short book, but to have any chance of succeeding in the lofty aim Ojakangas sets himself requires a much closer analysis of the subjects of the inquiry than he provides. Without this, it fails to convince.

Jason Edwards
(Birkbeck, University of London)

What can we learn from past thinkers and philosophers? Is it justifiable to look at the writings of ‘men of ideas’ and try to find answers to our own problems? Zbigniew Rau and Marek Tracz-Tryniecki – the editors of this book – believe that we can learn many important lessons from Alexis de Tocqueville’s ideas ‘about the past, the present, and the future of the Old Continent’ (p. 1). Tocqueville is ‘a prophet’ who could predict in 1833 that ‘[t]he immediate future of European society is completely democratic; this can in no way be doubted’ (p. 1). In virtue of this ‘surprisingly accurate’ prophecy, the book’s authors have tried to find the answer(s) to our current problems in the writings of Tocqueville.

The book consists of eight chapters, each of which describes a different feature of Tocqueville’s ideas on freedom, patriotism, citizen participation, democratic churning, religion and civil society, human dignity and religious liberty. The chapters are not overly long and all of them are written in an explanatory way, with a conclusion at the end of each chapter.

The aim of the book is not just to describe these ideas, but also to provide some answers, or at least insights, for solving the problems currently facing Western countries. The main theme of the book is that we mustn’t be proud of ourselves as democratic countries because sometimes tyranny may arise in places where we never expected it – namely democratic societies. In this respect, Tocqueville’s legacy should be taken seriously because he was one of the rare thinkers who could provide an account of democracy and freedom in the widest sense of the word.

Unfortunately, neither the editors nor the contributors provide a methodological framework that justifies the whole project. There is no discussion about the justification of method or usage of Tocqueville’s language for twenty-first-century politics. It seems that the book over-emphasises the ‘prophetic talent’ of Tocqueville and tries to find answers to problems with which Tocqueville was not familiar.

Tocquevillian Ideas: Contemporary European Perspectives would be beneficial for postgraduate students and those who are interested in the effects of Tocqueville’s ideas on democracy and freedom in the last century; the book provides an almost comprehensive outline of the main themes in Tocqueville’s thought.

Aref Ebadi
(University of Nottingham)


Agostinho dos Reis Monteiro proposes an interdisciplinary account of human rights understood not only from the perspective of law, but also from various other perspectives: philosophical, historical, educational, political and even ideological (see pp. 6, 400 and 403). An impressive and engaging book, Ethics of Human Rights is like a detailed and useful articulation of the elusive concept of ‘human rights’ since there is not even a commonly used definition of the term nowadays. Furthermore, ‘there is no agreed legal definition of “human dignity” at either the international or national levels’ (p. 277). Here, ‘human dignity’ is conceptualised in many ways that complement each other: ‘Human dignity precedes the entitlement to human rights and remains after the definitive loss of the capacity to exercise them’ (p. 276).

Ethics of Human Rights is divided into three parts focusing on the evolution of human rights, an articulation of the human dignity principle and the recent rebirth of human rights. In conclusion, the author addresses the most frequent (and the most challenging) questions related to human rights, such as whether human rights are an exclusively Western preoccupation (p. 399). Even more relevant is the question: ‘Are human rights individualistic, neglecting the corresponding duties to others and community?’ (p. 399).

The opposite of so many philosophical soliloquies dissertating on abstract human rights issues, Ethics of Human Rights is a rich presentation of human rights theory and will be the most comprehensive resource in English to be found in a single book. Because Agostinho dos Reis Monteiro has included and referred to many sources in languages other than English (like French and Portuguese), his rigorous synthesis is much richer and more nuanced (especially in Chapter 8 ‘Answering Some Questions’) than any
other previous work from Anglo-Saxon scholars. This multilingual framework allows the reader to benefit from the writings by French intellectuals such as Louis Dumont and Luc Ferry. Appendices are generous and even creative, including a Chronology of Human Rights and a record of 18 thematic indexes (pp. 507–40).

Written in a clear style, even advanced undergraduates will be able to follow the discussion, while human rights experts will find here a rare compendium of definitions, core ideas and fundamental clarifications. Because of its unique achievement in conceptualising human rights studies, *Ethics of Human Rights* is essential for masters or doctoral students as a departure point for research in political philosophy or human rights education.

Yves Laberge
(University of Ottawa)


Removing the Commons begins and ends with the story of direct action taken by the (normally) law-abiding members of the Love Canal Homeowners Association in the face of the degradation of their local neighbourhood by the sustained environmental misuse of the local chemical company. Between these two bookends there is a detailed and forensic exploration of the legitimate ways in which natural resources can be removed from the commons. Eric Roark describes his position as ‘Lockean Left-Libertarian’, but, in the end, it owes as much to Henry George as to John Locke. Like other left-libertarians, the author wants both to defend a stringent self-ownership thesis and also to justify forms of compensation to be paid by legitimate individual users and appropriators to those who are consequently excluded (under the terms of an updated Lockean Proviso requiring that ‘as much and as good’ is left for others).

Early chapters establish the claim that, in the first instance, natural resources belong to everyone, outline the general moral grounds of a rights-based left-libertarianism and provide a detailed defence of the particular account of property right that Roark (here following Otaka) wants to defend. The two key chapters that follow explore first the use, and then the appropriation of natural resources – in the first case within, and in the second from, the commons. Roark defends use and appropriation from the commons by individuals as necessary to their full self-ownership (which he sees as the defining ambition of all libertarians, right and left). But such appropriation and appropriators must take very seriously the demands of the ‘Lockean Proviso’ in the amended variant that Roark styles the ‘Equal Initial Opportunity for Welfare Georgism Proviso’. This stipulates that ‘you can appropriate a natural resource X if and only if you are the first to claim X and you leave others their equal initial opportunity for welfare share of the full competitive value of rights claimed over X’ (p. 143). The final chapter seeks to show how the application of this proviso might be usefully applied to give morally compelling weight to solutions to the twin problems of global poverty and environmental degradation.

Overall, this is a clear, sensitive and thoughtful contribution to a much-discussed and deeply vexed question. Roark’s key claim – that we need first to consider the consequences of individual use of the commons before we consider individual appropriation from the commons – is a good one. It may not be enough to persuade those who judge that this is just not the right way to approach questions about the allocation of property and/or who think that the Lockean Proviso (even in this updated Georgist form) cannot be made to work, but everyone interested in questions about the (mis-)allocation of property will read this book to their advantage.

Chris Pierson
(University of Nottingham)


There is remarkably little considered work on the impact of post-sovereign governance on theories of legitimate authority. Nicole Roughan’s book *Author-
Roughan approaches the topic from a pragmatic, jurisprudential perspective. This is an asset, as she avoids fruitless tangents into the fruitier reaches of 'ideal' political philosophy. It is also, however, a limitation; the relation between legitimate authority, justified coercion and political obligation remains lightly treated.

The great value of Authorities is that the difficult conceptual task of understanding the legitimacy of 'plural authorities' is prioritised over the task of generating evaluative conditions for their legitimacy. Roughan also articulates normative conditions, clustered around her notion of 'relative authority', but this is secondary to the more important (and arguably more successful) analytic task of describing the 'grammar' of authority in a globalised world.

The book is dense, comprising four parts in thirteen short chapters. Part I is the most general, offering an introduction to the notions of 'legitimate authority' and 'plural authority' that is very helpful, considering the interdisciplinary nature of the project. Part II focuses on Joseph Raz's service conception of 'authority', presenting it as both paradigmatic and as a core challenge to 'plural authority'. Part III theorises a relativity condition, replacing attempts to choose between competing authorities with a proscription for how those authorities must relate. Part IV applies the theory to the real world, centrally to authority relationships in the EU and between the Crown and the Maori in New Zealand.

It is perhaps a shame that Roughan takes Raz's Normal Justification Thesis as her core foil. Although canonical, this theory of authority leaves much off the table. In particular, the circumscription of authority as a primarily normative relation, instead of a political one, seems to delimit Razian theory. The relation between authority and coercion is arguably what makes an authority political, and what makes plural authority so thorny. Roughan touches on this possibility, but does not treat it with her customary vigour and astuteness.

This being said, Roughan's book is remarkably useful. For legal and political theorists, it is a wake-up call to do more than lip service to the complexities of the globalised world. For international and transnational jurists, it offers clear insights into the relevant legal and political philosophy. The detailed case studies at the end almost succeed in ensuring we are all on the same page.

Tom Theuns
(Sciences-Po Paris)


The concept of 'constituent power' has undergone a momentous revival over the past decade within legal and political thought. Unfortunately, in such instances of collective scholarly inspiration, Mikael Spång's work, Constituent Power and Constitutional Order, is likely to be one that becomes lost within a hastily maturing body of scholarship. While the breadth of Spång's discussion is impressive, the scholarly coverage quickly obscures what should be the development of an insightful thesis. Spång hopes to read constituent power in a more encompassing manner than those before him, recognising that it must move beyond juridical ordering, and towards the ethical questions of 'becoming a subject who is free' (p. 8). While there are numerous intimations towards shrewd observation, it is disappointing that Spång often fails to follow this through convincingly. For instance, Spång suggests that constituent power is best understood as an agonistic contestation in the name of 'the People' over the 'empty place of power' at the heart of society, yet this pivotal proposition of his argument is detailed in a short page-and-a-half (pp. 22–3). These threads of insight are too often buried within an excessive account of the surrounding literature.

The text is structured across five substantive chapters, thematically grouped into three categories. Chapters 1 and 2 address constituent power as a mode of revolutionary rupture and constitutional augmentation, respectively, while the third and fourth chapters confront the problematic nature of 'the People', first as the subject of constituent politics and second as the double to the Foucauldian 'Population'. The dialectical interplay between these two iterations of 'the People' offers a potentially novel means of this contestation over that 'empty place of power', although again, the line of argument requires sharpening.

Ultimately, the relative success or failure of the text hangs upon Chapter 5, which endeavours to open up
constituent power to practices that might release ‘the People’ from their self-incurred tutelage. In this instance, Spång draws upon both Habermasian discourse ethics and Foucauldian parrhesia as being exemplary of such practices, although neglecting the substantial (and well-rehearsed) differences between the two. This treatment is indicative of much of the text, and so the line of argument remains unconvincing. Regrettably, while the kernel of an astute account of constituent power is evidently contained within the text, the observations are obscured beneath a rather commonplace account of constituent power across the initial three chapters.

Adam Lindsay
(University of Nottingham)

International Relations


The emergence of international courts has heralded a different mechanism of justice for economic, political and legal reasons. However, there are still doubts about international power relations and interest vis-à-vis the functions of international courts, and Karen J. Alter’s book The New Terrain of International Law provides a useful addition to their study. The motivation, as the book’s Preface says, is to help understand the new international courts because of ‘old ways of thinking’ (p. xv).

Alter’s book is divided into three parts. In Part I, she seeks to make readers aware of how authority is delegated to international courts. This has been hailed as a chance to expand the reach of justice and the ‘influence’ of international courts is evident (p. 3). This is welcomed, although there is a fear that international courts have consequences for sovereignty and state relations (p. 4). The international courts started in stages, says Alter, and she hints that they also began as voluntary institutions. The current international courts, however, have assumed ‘compulsory jurisdiction’, in that governments are now under obligation to them (p. 18).

The system is beautiful if international law is allowed to play its role, but it is true to say that these international courts are seen ‘as a cipher of state interests’ (p. 19) and therefore the much talked-about ‘significant act’ associated with international courts is at stake (p. 22). Whatever it takes is done, and the number of international courts has increased from six to ‘at least twenty-four’ (p. 68). This speaks volumes about the international community’s desire to hold onto something (p. 87) and undoubtedly ‘contributed to the creation of international courts’ as a necessity (p. 114). The real problem is previous international experiences, and the main fault attributed to international courts hinges on their politicisation. The key players must agree to rules. Alter is disturbed that ‘democratization movements seem to be filtering’ but she does not tell us the reasons why some countries fear ‘Euro-American power’ (p. 160).

In Parts II and III, the author analyses international courts in action and their confluence with politics and rights. In doing this, she explains that ‘dispute settlement’ functions well (p. 191). International courts also conduct administrative review and enforcement, among others processes (p. 235), and Alter reminds us here that international courts ‘face a political constraint’ for overstepping the boundaries of domestic courts (p. 325). The author dwells on the ‘challenges’ as a result of this new trend, arguing that international courts ‘are not undermining democratic choice’ (p. 343). Alter expresses relief that international courts should have ‘legal threats’ (p. 345), and that their ‘rulings reflect what the law requires’ (p. 347). It is good that the author opines that international courts must stand for justice and the rule of law against all (p. 350). In sum, Alter’s book gives us another chance to reflect on the usefulness of international courts in global affairs.

Kawu Bala
(Bauchi State Judiciary, Nigeria)


Despite the repeated calls for its ‘closure’ from a number of critics, the English School of International Relations remains a quietly influential, if from time to
time somewhat overlooked, tradition in academic IR. Nothing could better demonstrate its continued relevance and vibrancy than the almost simultaneous publication of two major works that survey the entire canon. Barry Buzan, a long-time English School contributor and key architect of the School’s ‘reconvening’ in the late 1990s, has produced a well-organised and up-to-date overview that is sure to become a mainstay of both undergraduate and postgraduate reading lists from now on. Two of the leading figures in the English School section of the International Studies Association, Cornelia Navari and Daniel Green, have gathered over fifteen scholars from both sides of the Atlantic to provide reflections on the state of key debates, approaches and tensions in the English School tradition.

One of the great strengths of Buzan’s book is that it combines an in-depth discussion of the central English School concepts and debates with an intellectual/disciplinary history of the School and its major developments. The fact that the latter is achieved with a relatively critical approach to some of the English School’s main protagonists only raises the quality of the book. The major trends in the English School literature are covered, including the distinctions between an international system, international society and world society; the historical evolution and expansion of international society; and the debate between the pluralist and solidarist wings of the English School.

Interestingly, while the book is, for the most part, aimed at those looking for a comprehensive overview of the English School and its main lines of inquiry, Buzan does succeed in his aim of also generating ‘new insights and new questions’ (p. vii) for those more familiar with the literature. For example, the sections on the security consequences for insiders and outsiders of international society and the implications of treating international society itself as a referent object of security (pp. 181–5) make a persuasive case for the need for more research in this largely neglected area and outline what the contours of this agenda might look like. Similarly, the reader is left with a clear impression of Buzan’s enthusiasm for new research that advances our understanding of the interplay of regional and global international societies.

Coming out of the English School section of the International Studies Compendium Project, the book edited by Navari and Green covers similar ground to Buzan’s book but from a wider set of perspectives. It is a mix of disciplinary introspection, historical analysis and theoretical debate. Like Buzan’s book it does not shy away from ‘classic’ English School discussions around order and justice or the ‘three traditions’ approach to international theory. These chapters include standouts from Andrew Hurrell who places the (often false) dichotomy between international order and justice in the wider context of a global power transition, and a chapter by Tim Dunne and Richard Little that shows that the debate over the system/society distinction is far from settled. Added to these more familiar themes are a reinterpretation of the normative foundations of the English School by Molly Cochran, an in-depth discussion of the English School’s supposedly under-developed methodological preferences by Cornelia Navari, and a thought-provoking attempt at mapping what he calls the ‘global diffusion’ of the English School by Yongjin Zhang.

It is in this final chapter that Zhang argues that: ‘The English School’s global positioning is one of the most significant intellectual achievements accomplished by the second generation of the English School scholars’ (p. 236). Buzan makes a similar point about the English School’s influence growing beyond its traditional stronghold in the UK, Australia, Canada and parts of continental Europe to increasingly include China, Japan and Korea (p. 11). These two books (and presumably some efforts at subsequent translated editions) can only further this trend. Buzan’s masterful introduction will serve to clarify key concepts and contextualise the development of this strand of the IR literature for new audiences. Navari and Green’s edited collection will introduce readers to the diversity of approaches within the English School as well as inspire a new generation of scholars with the intellectual challenges that the English School approach throws up for the analyst making sense of a highly globalised world in a time of global power transition. It is therefore perhaps the perfect moment for the publication of two excellent books that demonstrate the continued utility of the English School’s key concepts, the depth of its intellectual contributions and even the global ‘expansion’ of the English School itself.

Benjamin Zala
(University of Leicester)

In this concise yet wide-ranging volume, editor Stephen Chan sets himself the ambitious (and potentially controversial) task of outlining the ‘moral underpinning to China’s views and actions in Africa’ (p. ix). The result is a collection of essays in three parts. In the first, the editor sketches the philosophical and historical foundations of Sino-African relations. Touching, among others, upon the Confucian doctrine of guanxi, the Middle Kingdom and its outlands, and Three World Theory, Chan’s accessible prose succeeds in rendering these complex topics tangible for the uninitiated. In the second part, four Chinese scholars react to the opening essay, elaborating upon key themes, adding nuance and introducing further concepts. It is stressed that ‘all have Western PhDs’ and ‘none is bound to a Party line’ (p. ix), reflecting Chan’s candid assessment of Chinese scholarship on Africa. L. H. M. Ling scrutinises the use of the epic story of Zhuge Liang and Meng Huo as a metaphor for Sino-African relations – a recurring theme throughout the book. Xiaoming Huang rightfully points to the necessity of ‘differentiating the Chinese in Africa’ (p. 79), with individual Chinese workers and entrepreneurs likely to care little about ‘whether the government in Beijing has a grand strategy in Africa’, Confucian or otherwise (p. 81). Part III then gives the floor to Africans, mainly through a detailed contribution by Patrick Mazimhaka in which he stresses the contemporary importance of historical ties and affinity between Africa and China.

Together, the chapters succeed in their aim of providing a nuanced and thorough account of ‘the morality of China in Africa’. The book fills a clear gap in the extant literature, as well as providing a useful counter-weight to one-dimensional portrayals of China’s African engagement. Ironically, however, the volume sometimes falls victim to the same pitfall it seeks to address. Its renderings of both ‘the West’ and ‘Africa’ are at times flat and bordering on cliché. In Jerry C. Y. Liu’s contribution in particular, the West is equated with a ‘realist approach’ (p. 48) that is ‘pragmatic, profit-seek-ing and power-hungry’ (p. 57). Regarding Africa, the book’s subtitle is telling. While China may continue to regard itself as the ‘Middle Kingdom’, ‘Dark Continent’ would hardly seem Africa’s epithet of choice. Still, such stereotypical references abound. It is hence up to Patrick Mazimhaka to restore balance and attention to African agency, a role he fulfills expertly. From a book keen on nuancing common yet simplistic accounts, however, one would expect a more consistent effort across the board. Such flaws notwithstanding, this volume forms a unique, timely and well-written contribution to a lively debate.

Floor Keuleers (KU Leuven)


During the Arab Uprising, Libya was the unique case in which coalition forces, led by the US, then NATO, intervened. In his book, Christopher Chivvis focuses on the causes and effects of the Libya intervention in the context of the role of the US and NATO in constituting allied forces. He especially emphasises the difficult decisions regarding intervention faced by the US and European allies. The author argues that despite the scepticism about whether an intervention was necessary in Libya, the US and its allies were convinced to carry out a limited intervention due to the escalating violence after the UN Security Council’s Resolution 1973. The first two chapters of the book discuss Libya’s historical background, Muammar Qaddafi’s rule, and the 2011 revolt. In this section, the author examines the underlying dynamics of the revolt.

Chapters 3–7 analyse the military, political and economic aspects of the intervention. The author, with the experience of serving for many years in the Office of the US Secretary of Defense, scrutinises the political stages of the decision to intervene, details of the operation at a tactical level and the economic dimension. With regard to political and military aspects, the author believes that intervention was possible due to the US taking a lead role, support from NATO allies and a lack of overt opposition to intervention from Russia and China. In the economic dimension, he compares the conflict with NATO’s intervention in Kosovo in 1999, showing that the cost of Operation Unified Protector in Libya was relatively low (pp. 176–7).
Chivvis also pays attention to statements from leaders of the countries contributing troops that the aim of the operation was not a ‘regime change’ (pp. 91 and 93). Nevertheless, Qaddafi was killed by rebels after the operation and his regime was over. In the final chapter, the author explains the implication of the operation and the future of Libya in the post-war era. He considers that the Libya operation achieved the aims of enforcing the arms embargo, facilitating humanitarian relief, creating a no-fly zone and protecting civilian life (p. 174). However, despite the operation’s positive results, this is not enough on its own for the stabilisation of Libya in the post-war era and the future of the country remains unclear.

Overall, the book presents an empirical analysis of the Libya operation in 2011. Therefore, it is recommended for readers and researchers interested in the Middle East and the Arab Uprising, and particularly Libya.

Ramazan Erdag (Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Turkey)


The disciplinary history of International Relations is now a vibrant field of research. Much of this work has focused on Britain and the US, with the result that we have a much less well-informed sense of developments elsewhere. Focusing on a distinctive ‘Australian School’ of IR between 1920 and 1960, James Cotton performs a welcome service by filling in parts of the puzzle.

The book is revisionist in intent. Existing scholarship on Australian IR typically suggests that it emerged after 1960 (or perhaps after the Second World War). Cotton rejects this line, arguing that it is premised on an overly narrow conception of what counts as a discipline. If we expand the interpretive gaze beyond academic departments or programmes explicitly labelled IR, we find, he suggests, a considerably longer tradition of thought about international affairs, operating within and beyond the university system. The book is a convincing demonstration of this claim.

Cotton opens with a chapter on the institutional context of this tradition, elucidating the role of institutions such as the Round Table, the League of Nations Union and the Australian Institute for International Affairs, as well as universities. This is followed by eight chapters dedicated to in-depth readings of individuals, and a conclusion that assesses the case for seeing them as a distinct ‘School’. The thinkers are (in roughly chronological order) W. Harrison Moore, Frederic Eggleston, A. C. V Melbourne, H. Duncan Hall, W. K. Hancock, Fred Alexander, W. MacMahon Ball and Walter Crocker. Most will be unknown to readers today, although they all either played a significant role in Australia or helped to shape debate (and policy) in the British imperial world and beyond. The School was defined less by commitment to a single doctrine or theoretical perspective than by a search for ‘responses to the transnational puzzles of their era’ (p. 249). Cotton thus traces the evolving attitudes of these Australian thinkers to the British Empire (and then Commonwealth), the League of Nations and the post-1945 global governance regime.

Cotton writes with authority and conviction. He has dug deep into the archives and read widely in the primary and secondary sources. The result is an acute analysis of a range of thinkers, and a compelling case for a distinctive Australian perspective on international affairs during the middle decades of the twentieth century. It is a valuable addition to the literature on the history of twentieth century international thought.

Duncan Bell (University of Cambridge)


Jonathan Fenby, a close observer and analyst of the policies of the People’s Republic of China (PRC), has attempted with this book to provide an in-depth study of why China will not dominate the twenty-first century. The basic premise the author sets is the high hopes around the globe that China will soon emerge as one of the superpowers, while at the same time believing that the PRC has for the most part tapped its huge human resource potential and faces major challenges that stand in the way of any global domination. China is strenuously dealing with political, economic, social and international challenges, each of which involves
significant structural difficulties for the last major state still ruled by communist forces. While true that China is a nuclear weapons power with a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council, an ever increasing military budget and the world’s largest standing army – not to speak of also being an ancient civilisation and one of the world’s highest populated countries – the author argues that domination of one nation over others is simply utopian and instead there can only be some form of it.

The book is organised into five chapters, beginning with historical insights and finally leading to the various reasons why the PRC will not be able to achieve what the world expects it to achieve. The basic reason for this is Beijing’s failure to put forward viable alternatives, and this risks relegating China to the status of querulous outsider in the world system it has joined and needs, but with which it has not really engaged beyond its own short-term advantage. The domestic issues in China can only be tackled if change is grasped, and this will bring with it a protracted period of difficult transition which will affect the whole system built up since 1949. The reasons for China’s current problems emanate from her top-down political system, whereby dissent is equated with treason, and from endemic corruption and the intrusion of the party state into every sphere of life – the worst case being the family planning agents, who keep a check on women’s menstrual cycles!

This short, elegant text explores its subject by taking a clear-eyed look at China’s dysfunctional political system, which does not seem capable of dealing with the social, legal, economic, environmental, demographic and security challenges currently faced by the country. Nonetheless, readers should remain critical and question the findings of the author vis-à-vis the world’s belief in the power of the PRC.

Priyamvada Mishra
(Symbiosis Law School, Noida, India)

Out of the Cold: The Cold War and its Legacy

As columnists and policy makers seek analogies to explain the geopolitical twists and turns in Eurasia in recent years, it is almost inevitable that they turn time and again to the notion of a new Cold War. The long conflict between East and West that defined the second half of the twentieth century continues to resonate today, whether in Russian troop movements in Georgia or Ukraine, or American policy in the Middle East. Out of the Cold: The Cold War and Its Legacy is therefore timely, and the collection of essays contained therein enlightening both in understanding the context of the events of the recent past, as well as many of the reasons for the events of the stormy present.

Emerging from a 2009 conference hosted at Churchill College, Cambridge, the contributions are divided into ten sections covering every aspect of the Cold War and its politics. From the ideologies of the key political participants, through the wider cultural and security contexts, the impacts in Europe and Asia of the Cold War, the ways in which technology was changed and effected change, and the conclusion of the grand struggle with the crumbling of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the volume presents a chronological and complete picture of the bipolar world that emerged from the ashes of Berlin and Hiroshima.

The contributions to the book are not all typical academic pieces, footnoted to the gills and justifying each claim with endless references to the work of others. Instead, the writers are more often than not former participants from the conflict: diplomats, soldiers, official translators, the daughter of a US President, an Ambassador to Poland, or a broadcaster for British television. The reader trusts their accounts because they are highly personal and the authors were there in the room: this is no biographical guess or archival reconstruction of Stalin the man, but a version of Stalin presented through the eyes of one who stood next to him, worked with him and saw his strengths as clearly as his weaknesses. If there’s a flaw in the volume it is only that it is so centred on the Cold War in Europe and the machinations of the two superpowers. Granted there is a fine chapter on Asia and, indeed, the treatments of the Japanese and Chinese Cold War experiences are well told, but one does feel that so many of the Cold War stories from the South still remain untold.

Dylan Kissane
(Centre d’Études Franco-Américain de Management (CEFAM), Lyon)

Caron Gentry’s book shows how the concept of hospitality can be fruitfully used to critique but also improve contemporary Christian approaches to the ethics of war. Gentry charges that realists, pacifists and just war theorists each abstract the nature of IR by focusing on the state and the system, and fail to give adequate attention to those marginalised individuals and communities ‘about whom Christians should be most concerned’. By applying the concept of ‘hospitality’, found in both the Christian notion of agape and in post-modern thought, she seeks to transform each of these approaches to war in order to pave the way for a ‘better peace’ (p. 13).

The first half of the book outlines the need to interrogate traditional, statist assumptions about power and security in IR and particularly to find better ways to talk about and address the grave suffering that results from those ‘marginal wars’ in failing and failed states that have often been ignored by IR scholars. Gentry suggests that we need to integrate hospitality into IR in order to overcome the perversities of existing approaches. ‘Hospitality ultimately acknowledges the deep responsibility the self has for others’, she explains (p. 8). The incorporation of hospitality into IR involves ‘searching for ways to (better) provide for the welfare of all people’ (p. 12).

The second half considers specifically how hospitality can transform Christian approaches to war. Realism, represented by Niebuhr, privileges the security of the state and fails to recognise how the pursuit of security can do so much harm to vulnerable others. This can be overcome, Gentry suggests, by states accepting some degree of vulnerability alongside their security. Pacifism, represented by Hauerwas, involves a ‘paradox of privilege’ that can lead adherents to neglect the needs of others (p. 9). What is required is a more proactive pacifism that recognises and deals with our complicity with power. Just war theory, represented by Elshtain, too readily embraces the solution offered by military power. Greater emphasis should be placed on engagement with enemies and greater effort should be made to ensure that possible avenues for peace have been exhausted before resorting to war.

Some readers may take issue with Gentry’s choice of representatives for the three approaches to war, particularly the focus on Elshtain’s controversial work on just war and the war on terror. Nevertheless, Offering Hospitality is a provocative and compelling book that makes a vital contribution to Christian thinking about war.

Luke Glanville
(Australian National University)

The Success of Sanctions: Lessons Learned from the EU Experience by Francesco Giumelli. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013. 251pp., £65.00, ISBN 978 1 4094 4531 9

The Arab Spring and the Ukraine crisis have put the use of EU sanctions firmly back on the policy agenda despite longstanding controversies over the effectiveness of this instrument in the scientific literature. Francesco Giumelli argues that this dissension is rooted in the lack of a common understanding of what the ‘effectiveness’ concept entails. Prior research often exclusively focused on the behavioural change paradigm, ignoring the possibility that sanctions are not imposed to change behaviour but to send signals or to constrain. In one of the first serious attempts to fill this gap, the author introduces a four-step methodological framework, potentially enabling a more nuanced effectiveness evaluation. The four steps include: (1) situating sanctions within the larger foreign policy strategy; (2) defining the sanctions logic (coercing, constraining, signalling); (3) evaluating the impacts, effects and effectiveness of sanctions based on this logic; and (4) examining what could have happened without sanctions.

The book consists of three main parts. In Part I, EU sanctions processes and actors are described and an empirical overview of all sanctions episodes is presented. In Part II, six case studies (US, Belarus, Transnistria, Uzbekistan and China) are discussed, offering a detailed account of how different EU sanctions have been characterised by different logics and how this enables more nuanced and potentially more optimistic effectiveness evaluations. Finally, the author deduces nine lessons and applies these to the Arab Spring sanctions cases of Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Syria in Part III.

This book is worth reading for several reasons. Giumelli succeeds in explaining the puzzling contradiction between the traditionally often negative assessments
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of sanctions, on the one hand, and the tendency for regional organisations to make repeated use of this instrument, on the other. He rightly emphasises the vast complexity of evaluating effectiveness, and not only recognises that different logics can be at play within the same episode, but also stresses the importance of analysing unintended consequences and the interaction between sanctions and the broader policy strategy.

Two critical remarks can be formulated. First, Giumelli’s extremely nuanced qualitative evaluation approach makes comparative larger-N research rather difficult, creating interesting methodological challenges for future researchers. Second, despite the nuanced analytical framework and the introduction of counterfactuals, it remains challenging to identify the isolated causal impact of sanctions on the realisation of broader foreign policy goals. That being said, this book forms an important step in moving the effectiveness debate in a fresh direction.

Andreas Boogaerts
(Research Foundation Flanders (FWO) and KU Leuven)


In this collection of eleven essays we are presented with an excellent overview of the state of the art of some major global challenges, the governance of which is facing the world today: from financial instability to climate change, from security to health, migration and human rights.

Without renouncing theoretical or conceptual discussions about the different meanings of ‘global governance’, its novelty or the different traditions involved, the authors choose to introduce these disquisitions interwoven in the specific analysis of the case studies discussed in each chapter. This is a wise choice and makes the book interesting not just to scholars, but especially to students. The inclusion of recommendations for further reading and webpages is, again, a good idea.

The book is a reflection on what should be governed and why, which agents should participate in this global governance and what instruments are at their disposal to do so. Conclusions seem credible, showing that there is no single global governance but multiple versions, and the impossibility of unique recipes for managing challenges that initially might seem similar, basically because they are global.

The actors involved (states, international organisations, private agents, civil society, public-private partnerships, experts, etc.), their role, their reasons and interests for governing these challenges, the instruments to be used, the geopolitical dimensions involved and even the probabilities of success or failure are all specific to each global challenge, and each chapter in this book is extremely well-chosen and written to reflect this plurality (in its uniqueness). The evolving nature of global governance also becomes clear: as the challenges evolve, so too do the actors, instruments, needs and dynamics of their global governance.

Bittersweet in its conclusions, the book shows how there has been progress in the global governance of some topics. Nevertheless, serious deficiencies persist not only in the actual governance of other challenges, but also in the understanding of them and their inter-relationships (e.g. the connection between trade and health, or finance and international development). Thus the plurality of the actors involved not only causes coordination problems, but potentially masks the absence of supranational and intergovernmental activities of a transversal nature for governing some of the global public bads analysed. This book shows that global governance is always a vaguely defined and slippery territory with multiple edges and implicated parties, and that it places the greatest demand on the politics of IR.

In sum, global governance not only addresses the under-supply of global public goods (GPGs), but it is also an under-provided GPG in itself.

Jorge García-Arias
(University of León)


The Bretton Woods Institutions were created at the end of the Second World War by the Anglo-Saxon powers in order to serve their own economic and political interests, with little attention paid to the potential impact of the new financial institutions for the development of poor countries. This is how most
narratives depict the emergence of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund at the Bretton Woods negotiations in 1944. Eric Helleiner challenges this conventional wisdom in two important ways. First, he shows that throughout the negotiations, the Northern countries in general and the US in particular saw the economic development of the South as a priority issue for the post-war economic order. Second, Helleiner argues that Southern countries were not just passive bystanders in the negotiations, but that they made many important contributions before and during the conference discussions and thereby played a greater role in shaping the Bretton Woods Institutions than is widely believed.

By tracing back the origins of the World Bank and the IMF to the Latin American push for creating an Inter-American Bank and US initiatives around the Good Neighbor financial partnership, especially the financial advisory mission to Cuba in 1941–2, the author succeeds in demonstrating that the development of poor countries was indeed a key issue for the founders of the post-war financial institutions. Helleiner thereby shows that efforts for international development stem from a combination of Western interests for stability and development aspirations from the South, especially Latin America, and that the concept of ‘international development’ was not merely invented by the US as post-development scholars often argue.

In the ensuing chapters, the book shows how governments from the South were active players in the negotiations and strong supporters of the development mandate of the institutions. Helleiner thereby shows that efforts for international development stem from a combination of Western interests for stability and development aspirations from the South, especially Latin America, and that the concept of ‘international development’ was not merely invented by the US as post-development scholars often argue.

In the ensuing chapters, the book shows how governments from the South were active players in the negotiations and strong supporters of the development mandate of the institutions. By examining the role of Latin American, East Asian, East European and Indian delegates, Helleiner sheds light onto an often neglected aspect of the Bretton Woods negotiations. Finally, the author investigates why the British government let the Americans overtake the leadership role in development issues in the negotiations and concludes that a combination of financial constraints, imperial attitudes, the desire to maximise British influence, and the personal and intellectual interests of John Maynard Keynes explains the British stance. Helleiner drew heavily on detailed primary material for his research and presents with his beautifully written book a completely new reading of the Bretton Woods negotiations.

Tobias Leeg
(Freie Universität Berlin)


David Karp provides a compelling theoretical account for understanding transnational corporations (TNCs) as agents responsible for human rights. He claims that the responsibility of TNCs merits exploration from an international political theory perspective, and not just from a perspective internal to international law or to public policy studies. He rejects a strong version of the universalist thesis in favour of a more nuance-laying approach, the publicness approach that assesses whether and in what circumstances a particular agent has specific responsibility to protect and to provide for the normative rights of individuals. TNCs will have a responsibility to protect and provide for human rights to the extent that they act as ‘primary political agents’ in a particular set of circumstances.

The book’s first part analyses the reasons why ‘TNCs and human rights’ has become a subject in today’s international policy agenda by introducing paradigmatic examples of alleged human rights violations by corporations such as Yahoo in China and Shell in Nigeria. In such examples, corporations can be characterised alternatively as individual-like and state-like, operating sometimes in contexts which resemble the ‘delinquent state’ model. Their modus operandi challenges the validity of a pure legalistic analysis and calls for an analysis from an extra-legal perspective.

The second part develops a theoretical framework to understand the responsibility for human rights. Responsibility to respect others’ normative rights is a discretionary duty, depending on one’s ability and willingness to develop a moral framework that values others as ends. By contrast, responsibility to refrain from harming and responsibility to protect and provide are both non-discretionary duties, owed to all human beings. Nonetheless, only the second kind of responsibility falls on specific agents for specific reasons. To understand such a responsibility better, Karp assesses the capacity approach, which offers both a method to assign human rights responsibilities to specific agents and a principled middle way between universalist and state-centric perspectives. Yet it fails to offer a sustainable account of burdens on potential responsibility-bearers. The author therefore argues for the publicness
approach that identifies agents as public when they share some of the following overlapping characteristics: they are socially constructed; they have a de facto political role and provide for empirical collective goods; and they have membership in a political community as well as political responsiveness for this community’s members.

The book’s merit is to present a theoretically and practically persuasive argument for understanding TNCs as agents responsible for human rights. Karp’s nuanced and yet multidisciplinary analysis will appeal to law and philosophy scholars working on the subject as well as to businessmen learning how to cope with their responsibility for human rights in a global environment.

Alessandra Sarquis
(University of Paris IV)


International law’s complexities seldom allow concise treatments of all of its various elements, and thus one is more often left with books that seek to explore either very specific aspects of its reach and practices, or which take a wider but then less detailed approach. Shifting Global Powers and International Law draws together fourteen authors to examine the general theme of how the ‘emerging’ economies of Asia, South America and Africa are affecting the norms and practice of international law, while Ethics and the Laws of War takes a much more focused approach. But both in the end are interested in the normative developments that underpin international law.

Shifting Global Powers’ contributors mostly take the position that the developing multipolarity of the global system is removing the domination of Western mores and norms from the centre of international law and slowly (or not so slowly) shifting to a different set of normative concerns and drivers. The book starts with Shirley Scott’s reflection on the age of US hegemony which acts as a context for the other contributors’ examination of aspects of the further development of international law by virtue of the establishment of new centres of (challenging) power. Thus, in Andrew Garwood-Gowers’ chapter the chequered recent history of the ‘responsibility to protect’ norm is used to illustrate the challenge of different political perspectives on what seemed like a norm that was reaching consensual adoption. Other chapters examine similar changes in the international normative environment impacting on issues ranging from climate change to indigenous rights or economic governance, but as one might expect, four chapters seek to relate these issues explicitly to the international human rights regime. As with any edited work, it would be foolish to attribute a singular position to all contributors, but overall the volume (subtitled Challenges and Opportunities) does seem to be more concerned with challenges to the existing normative agenda than seeking to explore the opportunities that this emerging pluralism of global power might prompt for the continued development of global norms. Thus, this book offers a range of chapters that often seem to exhibit the political tension between recognising that multipolarity prompts non-Western views to rise up the agenda, while seeking also to argue that the current (largely) Western normative settlement continues to have significant value.

In Antony Lamb’s short and often rather technical book he adopts the original focus of much early (Western) writing on international law – the laws of war – but is also interested in its mobilising norms. Perhaps influenced by the very pluralism that is evident in modern treatments of the range and content of international law partly revealed in the other volume reviewed here, Lamb wishes to disaggregate the manner in which we think ethically about the prosecution of interstate law. However, rather than grounding his argument on self-defence or other frequently deployed principles, Lamb’s consequentialist argument focuses on a justification based on the concern to minimise violations of (a defined set of) rights. His defence of this position limits the rights that are focused on to those that are being broken; he rejects the projection forward of the possibility of rights being violated as a justification for the decision to go to war. This leads him then to identify the need (given the increase in the use of asymmetric technologies such as drones) to identify public rules for the
deliberation of blame (and consequence) should rights of non-combatants be violated in battle, beyond that which would normally be regarded as unavoidable in the prosecution of warfare.

In the second half of the book Lamb moves back to the wider context of the declaration of war in a governed global system to conclude that if we cannot accept that we can project forward a potential rights violation, equally when it comes to interventions (as opposed to responses to direct aggression), the decision to intervene needs to be made by a collectively empowered institution, and not a single state with partial political interests. Perhaps most crucially this suggests that preventative war can only be sanctioned when there are international rules in place that would allow a clear identification of an imminent (mass?) violation of (pre-determined) rights. This leads Lamb to conclude that because our rules to prevent unjust war are not working well, we need both to have public rule for the conduct of war and to seek to ground the war decision itself in a more consensual and global account of why such actions can (and are) justified.

There is much of value in this book, but given its often rather dense (and technical) argumentative style it is unlikely to appeal much beyond those already working on the just war tradition. Likewise, the edited volume reviewed here will also be a useful resource for analysts working on the various issue areas discussed therein, but it is unlikely to be a worthwhile purchase for anyone other than academic libraries widening their resources on the development of international law. However, priced as they are this would seem to be the conclusion that the publisher has also reached!

Christopher May
(Lancaster University)


It is generally agreed that when reviewing a book one takes into consideration its strengths and weaknesses. They are presented to the curious reader as if being in an imaginary balance of critique and appraisal. Nonstate Actors in Intrastate Conflicts, edited by Dan Miodownik and Oren Barak, is a unique read which manages to commit the reviewer to a rare middle-ground position in which the critical doesn’t overpower the constructive, but rather complements it.

Before delving into the topic and how it is discussed, it is important to begin with a general note on the book’s capacity to, first, reach into the existing literature and, second, reach out to future literature. Particularly, what the book does from a cumulative standpoint is remarkable and innovative. Not only is it able to integrate in a coherent manner various strands of current research, but it also opens a path for future research by honestly admitting its limitations.

Topic-wise, the book deals with a crucial question in IR – namely the role of non-state actors in intrastate war. A core point of inquiry, often lost to the realist refutation of its relevance for contemporary security, Nonstate Actors represents a brave research attempt. However, the book raises a question mark straight from the opening chapters due to the interchangeable use of concepts such as ‘intrastate war’, ‘civil strife’ and ‘ethnic confrontations’. In particular, it could have benefited from more theoretical clarity by linking the research to established theories. The authors’ explanation for this resides in its interdisciplinary character, and further clarifications are made chapter by chapter.

While interdisciplinarity acts like a protective belt against the theoretical disunity of multiple perspectives, this is not to say that the book makes no theoretical contributions. It defines its objects of study carefully and observes a clear distinction between types of external actors: volunteers and diaspora. Each chapter develops on one or another of these in data-rich and informative analyses. The detailed and careful argumentation is opened by a discussion on the ‘Modern Sherwood Forest’ model which speaks of external intervention from a different perspective. It is interesting to note that what is actually studied is the third party of the third party. For example, the mujahidin in Afghanistan acted on behalf of and with American support against the Soviets, and what the book explores is the mujahidin’s recourse to external help. With externally backed parties in contemporary conflicts, from the Middle East to the Horn of Africa, this book becomes instrumental in understanding current developments in conflict.

Vladimir Rauta
(University of Nottingham)

The role of communication and discourse in world politics has often been sidelined or treated as an intervening variable by scholars. In this book, Alister Miskimmon, Ben O’Loughlin and Laura Roselle emphasise the way in which communication reflects and constructs world politics, as they claim that ‘we must take seriously what we say about the world and how we see ourselves’ (p. 176). Consequently, the book is a successful attempt at placing communication at the centre of both the ontology and the epistemology of IR. For this purpose, the authors present and advocate the concept of ‘strategic narratives’, which tries to highlight the way in which political actors use communication in order to project their interests, values or norms in the new (changing) media ecology. In their understanding, strategic narratives can be seen as ‘a means for political actors to construct a shared meaning of the past, present and future of international relations in order to shape the opinions and behaviour of actors at home and overseas’ (p. 176). Moreover, they are both a medium and a tool for political actors to understand and shape IR. It should be noted here that although the book does a good job explaining the particularities of narratives and differentiating them from discourse or frames, it fails to justify why ‘strategic narratives’ are used instead of ‘strategic communication’, since for the most part no distinction is made between them.

The argument unfolds in the book in a rather standard and logical manner by first surveying the way IR scholars have accounted for the role of communication, followed by an in-depth discussion of strategic narratives and their role in world politics. In this sense, the chapters contain three key themes that are explored both theoretically and through (in some cases) detailed empirical case studies. First, Chapter 2 focuses on the idea that narratives shape our understanding of the world order. Second, the book turns in Chapter 3 to the role narratives play in persuasion in IR, which leads the authors to look at the way narratives get contested. Finally, the authors discuss the way transformations in technology and the new media ecology have changed the role of narratives in world politics. While the book is an initial attempt (only sometimes managing to go beyond interpreting or building on other work), it surely sets the agenda for understanding the salient role that communication plays in IR.

Cristian Nitoiu
(College of Europe, Natolin Campus)


This welcome book fills at least two important gaps in the literature on military ethics and private military and security companies. Up to this point, the literature on military ethics has largely ignored private armed forces, concentrating instead on public-based military forces and terrorist groups. In addition, no prior study of private military and security companies or their antecedents, mercenary groups, has provided in-depth analysis of the ethical issues surrounding their use in modern warfare. In addressing these topics, James Pattison argues that ‘private military force faces several moral problems that mean that it should generally be eschewed in favour of public-based military force’ (p. 3). Put differently, he thinks that the use of private military and security companies should rarely occur, but also that using these actors is ethically permissible in certain, limited circumstances. He reasons that it is more challenging to justify the use of firms that provide combat services to their clients than firms that limit themselves to logistical and other support roles.

Among the book’s many laudable elements is its highly comprehensive approach, given that it examines the morality of private warfare using multiple levels of analysis. By focusing on the level of employees, Pattison is able to examine the ethics of working for a private military and security company. By drawing attention to the level of the employers who own and/or manage these firms, he is able to explore issues like the circumvention of democratic accountability, pertaining to the morality of using private military forces. Finally, by highlighting the international level, he is able to analyse the collective effects of private warfare, such as the numerous positive and negative externalities of the growing global market for private...
force. Pattison also utilises an array of ethical and moral theories and concepts in his analysis, such as just war theory and the cumulative legitimacy approach.

Although his arguments are generally well-reasoned and presented in transparent, accessible prose, they would have been more persuasive if they had been evaluated against a greater range of empirical evidence of recent private military and security operations. Nevertheless, this book should be considered required reading for anyone interested in the morality of allowing non-state actors to participate in modern warfare.

Scott Fitzsimmons
(University of Limerick)


The aim of this book is to debunk the myth of US hegemony. According to Lebow and Reich, US hegemony was only partial and short-lived in a period after the end of the Second World War. Since then, the US has had a military and economic preponderance, but its influence in the world has been declining. Other actors like China, the EU and even small states like Norway, have exploited opportunities and perform normative and economic functions in a more productive way than the US. Thus to perpetuate the US hegemony cliche is counterproductive in both academic and political terms.

Of course, it is not the first time that someone contests US hegemony by arguing that the concept was meticulously constructed by politicians and Realist and Liberal academics, in order to serve their interests. However, there is a series of reasons that make Lebow and Reich’s work valuable, as they provide a more sophisticated way of thinking about IR and the relationship between the US and the rest of the world.

First, the authors differentiate power from influence and influence from material capabilities. Their view is that persuasion is the best way to exert influence. Sticks and carrots offered by material capabilities are a necessary but not a sufficient condition for a state aspiring to lead. What constitutes a sine qua non is legitimacy. Legitimacy can be based on commonly accepted goals and limits of action, previous successful cooperation, reputation and technical expertise. Legitimacy constitutes America’s Achilles heel.

Second, inspired by Thucydides, Plato and Aristotle, Lebow and Reich bring to IR debate the concept of ‘hegemonia’, which serves long-term interests and for that reason is preferred to hegemony, which can only be short-lived.

Third, they present a view of a world in which there is room for all. There are three functions of leadership – agenda-setting, custodianship of the global economy and security sponsorship – that can be undertaken by Europe, China and the US, respectively. The authors’ view is that this is not a world without competition, where division of labour is commonly agreed. It is a multipowered, and not multipolar, world where different actors performing different functions of leadership and hegemony cannot exist. Although this sounds like a rosy scenario, the authors suggest that it is the only pragmatic option if the US wishes to restore its legitimacy.

Last but not least, swimming in the same waters as Hans Morgenthau and Susan Strange, Lebow and Reich believe that IR theorising should be transformative, speak the truth and challenge conventional wisdom.

Revecca Pedi
(University of Macedonia, Thessaloniki)

The Relationship between Rhetoric and Terrorist Violence by Allison Smith (ed.). Abingdon: Routledge, 2013. 120pp., £85.00, ISBN 978 0 4158 2360 9

This book provides a far-reaching account of how linguistic content analysis can explain and estimate the rhetoric of terrorist and non-violent organisations. Allison Smith does a great job of transforming her previous work, which compared the political assertions of violent and radical but non-violent groups, into a ten-chapter book. Her work successfully analyses the Central al-Qa’eda and al-Qa’eda in the Arabian Peninsula as terrorist organisations and the Movement for Islamic Reform in Arabia and Hizb ut-Tahrir as non-violent groups through the use of interviews, articles and speeches.

This edited book is a unique investigation of two key components: the identification of violent and non-
violent groups, and predicting terrorist attacks through automated and manual linguistic content analysis systems. The major argument is that the use of these systems can support an understanding of terrorist violence as terrorists accidentally leave clues like fingerprints through their psychological and communal speeches.

One distinguishing feature of this project relies on statistical data analysis that remarkably enables the examination of political documents through indicator terms drawn from two resources: theory and earlier research. For example, Winter (Chapter 7) and Conway et al. (Chapter 8) both use manual coding systems and underline some distinctive indicators such as power, achievement, affiliation, self-direction and security. Another distinguishing feature is the provision of a method for examining the rhetoric of radical leaders. While Walker applies the automated verbs in context system (VICS) to classify the functional statements of these leaders and their philosophies of politics for reaching their aims (Chapter 6), Hermann and Sakiev apply the automated leadership trait analysis system for investigating leadership types (p. 44). In sum, this book is successful in presenting a clear framework of the language and strategies of these organisations by using computer and human coding programmes.

This is a highly recommended book providing a detailed study of linguistic content analysis as a promising method for predicting when terrorist organisations will turn to violence. The only criticism of this project is the fact that the articles do not define the distinctiveness of their specific methods adequately. However, this book contains a great deal of information about four distinctive organisations and, overall, scholars and readers of terrorism studies, particularly those who use content analytical systems, will benefit from the methods and arguments it contains.

I. Aytac Kadioglu
(University of Nottingham)


Angela Stent has produced an excellent study of US-Russian relations, from the dismantlement of the Soviet Union through to the end of 2013. This book is a careful, balanced and insightful analysis that demonstrates clearly the issues that have hindered Russia and the US from engaging in more cooperative relations. Examining issues that include the enlargement of NATO, arms control and missile defence, responses to global terrorism, the colour revolutions in the former Soviet bloc, the war in Kosovo, energy politics, the war in Georgia and responses to the Arab Spring, Stent identifies how a number of factors have undermined the ability for the two sides to construct a real and lasting partnership.

The book demonstrates how a mixture of misperceptions, genuinely divergent conceptions of international politics, often competing value systems and Cold War ideological legacies and a lack of trust have prevented the two sides from cooperating even where their own interests appear more clearly to coincide. That they do not always coincide anyway goes without saying. Another important restraint on the American side is the fact that a US President has to contend with institutional constraints on his powers from the democratic division of responsibilities between the executive and legislature, as well as other domestic institutions that have an influence on policy making.

The book basically takes a chronological approach, beginning with what is termed the ‘selective partnership’ between Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin in the early 1990s, through to the attempted reset of relations under Barack Obama. Clinton’s stated goal of integrating Russia into the global liberal economy and helping it develop democracy was undermined by a number of factors – an important one of these being the expansion of NATO, seen in Moscow as a threat to Russia, no matter what the US claimed. NATO’s unilateral intervention in the war over Kosovo also resulted in strengthening perceptions in the Kremlin that the West was seeking to undermine Russia’s position in the world. When Vladimir Putin succeeded Yeltsin as President, he sought to restore Russia’s place among the Great Powers; however, following an early period in which Putin sought to engage more positively with the West, in response to some of the problems identified by the author, US-Russian relations then went on to deteriorate still further. Stent chronicles how and why this happened.

Stent’s book provides a perfect background for helping us understand more clearly how relations...
between Russia and the West ended up in a new Cold War, just after the book was published, over the conflict in Ukraine.

Peter Shearman
(Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok)

Comparative Politics


Birol Ba¸skan’s From Religious Empires to Secular States is a welcome addition to the literature on secularisation, and the study makes significant contributions to the ongoing debates surrounding the concept of ‘secularism’. The author, by relying on the existing literature and building upon it, stakes his own claims, pointing out the differences between scholars who trace the origin of liberal democracy in the secularity of the modern state and those who hold to the opinion that the secularity of modern states was a choice made by secularist movements driven by ideologies. For Ba¸skan, ‘the modern state has to be secular whether built by religious fundamentalists or militant secularists. The secularity of the modern state stems from its nature, not from the ideology of groups who build it’ (p. 6).

The book is divided into three parts, each of which is devoted to a country, and it includes an introduction and a conclusion in which the author briefly narrates the history of secularism for each country. By approaching his case studies through comparative historical analyses, Ba¸skan identifies the similarities and differences among the countries and thus is able to point out the various models of secularisation that have been taken up in each country. Although there are many similarities among the cases analysed – one of which is the fact that strategies of secularisation were implemented around the same time – they also present a set of differences, with the most notable perhaps being that Turkey and Iran are predominantly Muslim while Russia is largely Christian. The author presents his cases in a well-structured manner, providing the necessary background information so that readers can clearly grasp the processes involved in the transition from empire to nation state, and he points out that the final model adopted by each country varied depending on the international and national historical conditions of the times, resulting in distinctly different strategies for dealing with religion.

In short, this invaluable contribution to the study of secularism and comparative politics highlights the fact that it has been the subordination of religious authorities to the state that sets the parameters for what it means to be ‘secular’. In addition, Ba¸skan argues that secularism is a constant process through which state agents interact with one another, and each case testifies to the existence of ‘different paths to secularisation and of different models of secularism’ (p. xiv). In the author’s terms, there was an accommodationist form of state secularisation in Turkey, a separationist model of state secularisation in Iran and an eradicationist approach to state secularisation in the Soviet Union. Through these insightful analyses, Ba¸skan has clearly taken discussions on secularism a significant step forward.

Nikos Christofis
(Leiden University)


This edited volume offers a fresh perspective on the radicalisation and diffusion of political violence, as well as the impact of intra- and inter-movement interaction on the process. Theoretically, it draws on a promising body of research on contentious politics and social movements, emphasising that ‘violent interactions are embedded in the wider process of political contention’ (p. 2) and focuses on the links and relations between the different actors within a specific ‘field’. Empirically, the book presents a wide array of cases from diverse contexts ranging from the South African Liberation Movement and Palestinian nationalist movement to a historically grounded interpretation of the anarchist diaspora in Spain and the Muhammad cartoons controversy. The book is helpfully divided into four parts, each dealing with a different subset of conceptual and empirical issues.
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The first part examines state-challenger interactions, including a relational interpretation of the role of emotions in violent protest and an historically oriented study of (de)radicalisation within prisons in Western Europe. Part II contains a close analysis of the internal competition among challengers. Part III looks at the contentious processes of the constant (re)construction of meaning and interpretation and the consequences these have both for violent oppositional movements and their intended audiences. Part IV considers the transborder diffusion of violent collective activism and political conflict.

The volume is empirically rich and contains quite a lot of material obtained through detailed and intensive fieldwork. However, the main contribution of the book appears to lie in its theoretical nuance, attention to contextually oriented explanation and the much-needed refinement and expansion of the social movement analytical vocabulary to paint a more dynamic picture of the complexity of violent collective action. The book will be of interest to scholars of political sociology, social movements and networks, comparative politics and IR, as well as to anyone interested in the flow, dynamics, escalation and diffusion of political protest and violence. It is also a very welcome addition to the gradually expanding theoretical literature on processes and mechanisms in social collective action.

Anastasia Voronkova
(Independent Scholar)


Amos Guiora sets out to assess the degree of extremism that can be tolerated before it poses a clear and present danger. He opens with a definition of ‘extremism’, explaining that people who challenge conventional thinking, who dissent and/or who criticise the government, are not necessarily extremists. Guiora’s comparative and empirical study examines extremism in the US, the UK, Israel, the Netherlands and Norway, weighing the price society pays when it adopts a tolerant policy toward the intolerant, and the price it pays when it does not.

The book discusses freedom of speech dilemmas in the context of multiculturalism, religious fundamentalism, political extremism and immigration, emphasising that a balance needs to be struck between freedom of expression and individual basic rights, on the one hand, and protecting vulnerable elements in society from violence, on the other. By ‘harm’, Guiora means endangering physical safety. He argues that national constitutions should protect the practice and conduct of religion, and at the same time protect against crimes committed in the name of religious beliefs. The common victims are women and children. Cases in point are female genital mutilation (FGM), honour killing, plural marriage involving underage girls and forced marriage of daughters.

Guiora’s interdisciplinary book applies legal analysis to study social problems. Guiora highlights the power of new media, suspecting that the internet causes, facilitates and fosters extremism. He discusses Anders Breivik’s mass murder and the wider problem of extreme right-wing xenophobic anti-immigration attitudes in Norway. He contrasts between the provocative speeches of people like Geert Wilders and Theo van Gogh, on the one hand, and the terrorist acts of groups like the Hofstad Network in the Netherlands, on the other. Guiora asserts that there are significant differences between people who call to bring about social change via peaceful means, and people who incite for murder and violence, especially when these people have religious charisma. Guiora also poignantly articulates the tensions that arise in Israel as a result of the lack of separation between state and religion that unavoidably leads to coercion. These tensions are compounded by deep disagreement among different sections of Israeli society regarding the formula for solving its entrenched and protracted conflict with the Palestinians.

This book will be of interest to scholars and students of political extremism. Guiora’s vivacious prose, rich with contemporary examples from different countries and informed by interviews with experts, makes this book accessible to lay people as well as academics. The book takes its readers on a fascinating journey of exploration to the boundaries of freedom of expression, which is one of the most difficult dilemmas to occupy the minds of liberals for several generations, from Voltaire and Mill to Dworkin and Waldron.

Raphael Cohen-Almagor
(University of Hull)
This book by Teun Pauwels provides a detailed account of the reasons behind voting support for populist parties. The author fully embraces the conception of populism as a ‘thin centred ideology’, opposing ‘the pure people’ versus the ‘corrupt elite’ that ‘always attaches itself to other ideologies’ (p. 27) put forward by Cas Mudde in his seminal work on radical right parties.

The factors behind voting support for six populist parties representative of the three different types are analysed through a quantitative analysis of national election studies. Although each individual party presents some differences in the variables facilitating their electoral success, the author identifies two ‘unique reason(s) to vote for populist parties in general’ (p. 186): dissatisfaction with the functioning of democracy, and a positive view of more direct decision making through the increased adoption of referendums. Moving beyond the analysis of the reasons behind populist voting, the author concludes that rooted parties that have links with pre-existing social groups are more likely to persist over time, thanks to the resources provided by the latter in the most delicate phase of their early lifespan. On the other hand, entrepreneurial parties are more likely to fail, although as shown by the case of the Dutch PVV, they can nevertheless cope with the challenges of institutionalisation if party leaders are able and willing actively to engage in the creation of a proper party organisation. Perhaps the most interesting finding of the book lies in the ‘ability of populist parties to integrate excluded social groups into the political system’ (p. 7), which are better understood as the so-called ‘losers of globalisation’. The latter are by no means the same pool of voters across the different countries analysed; on the contrary, the very meaning of ‘deprived voters ... differs depending on the context’ (p. 187).

Pauwels’ work constitutes a valuable addition to the literature of party politics. Nevertheless, as in the case of similar studies, the usage of the concept ‘populism’ appears rather problematic and unconvincing. Of course, this is not a problem of Pauwels’ analysis in itself, but rather calls for a general reassessment of the very concept of ‘populism’. Indeed, populism appears to play an important role in the modality in which a given ideology is articulated – for example, Flemish nationalism or the opposition to neoliberalism in the case of the VB or the PDS-LINKE – but it is hardly an ideology in itself, even if loosely conceptualised.

Mattia Zulianello
(Scuola Normale Superiore, Florence)


This book explores the use of referendums on all continents of the world and provides an overview of the use of referendums in democratic and non-democratic countries. It shows that referendums can be used to legitimise governments or, especially when based on popular initiatives, they can work as safety valves when representative institutions fail.

Each of the book’s chapters provides a different viewpoint on the use of referendums in different contexts. Ronald J. Hill and Stephen White review the use of referendums in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, before and after transition. Among other things, they ask why turnout and support rates of fraudulent referendums organised by communist governments were so great. The authors suggest the culture of unanimity is a possible explanation. Matt Qvortrup discusses referendums in Western Europe (excluding Switzerland) in the light of the so-called ‘freezing hypothesis’, and Uwe Serdült analyses the multifaceted phenomenon of direct democracy in Switzerland. Todd Donovan analyses the use of subnational referendums in the US and Canada, focusing especially on the ever so problematic role of money and interest groups in initiative campaigns. The chapter also includes an interesting appendix on referendums in the Caribbean and Central America.

David Altman’s chapter on direct democracy in Latin America shows how referendums in most of these countries are initiated ‘from above’, with Uruguay being the most important exemption. Norbert Kersting’s chapter on Africa focuses on the role of referendums (or plebiscites) in state-building, legitimising governments and, especially, strengthening
presidential powers. Masahiro Kobori finds out that the constitutional requirement for a referendum is the only statistically significant predictor of the use of referendums in Asia; cultural factors or political freedoms do not have explanatory power. Caroline Morris’ chapter on referendums in Oceania deals with the smaller Pacific islands in addition to the relatively well-known cases of Australia and New Zealand.

The conclusion of the book is that the use of referendums is, indeed, increasing in the global perspective. Referendums have distinctive functions in different political systems and hence the democratic credentials of referendums remain disputable. Moreover, issues of terminology and institutional design remain relevant when discussing referendums. The book is an essential introduction to the use of referendums globally. Importantly, it also deals with the less well-known instances of referendums in Africa and Oceania. It contains two extremely useful appendices: one on nationwide referendums, and the other on referendums around the issues of devolution and self-government in subordinate territories.

Maija Setälä
(University of Turku)


The equitable participation of women in politics and other democratic institutions is vital for gender parity. From the global to the local level, women’s participation in every field is not proportionate to their population. Structural barriers and discriminatory practices hamper women’s equal participation in democratic process. This book investigates the presence of women within various institutions across different continents. Furthermore, the volume aims to enhance understanding of the phenomenon of ‘contagious representation’ and how it impinges on women’s representation among different institutions in a democratic set-up. To understand contagion or the factors responsible for influencing women’s representation, the authors have examined four areas: the legislature, the executive, the judiciary and quotas (both party and national gender quotas) (p. 12).

The study’s main hypothesis is that inter-institutional relationships affect opportunities for women in public life. Women’s participation in one area affects their participation in other areas. This is a path-breaking book. It uses the novel idea of contagion based on empirical evidence. This work contains case studies and examples of the change in women’s participation over time from around the world. The authors have analysed 159 democratic countries for the years 1945–2006 to assess women’s participation in democratic institutions and how their representation in one area affects another. The most significant finding is that there is the influence of women’s participation in the legislature on women executives as well as on women’s judicial representation.

The book provides a useful reference for students, scholars and practitioners pursuing gender studies who wish to understand the different approaches, methods and level of analysis applied to the issue of contagious representation in democratic countries. This work promises a blend of epistemological, empirical and methodological pluralism.

However, the work lacks a holistic account of the case studies covered and it also fails to build a comprehensive theory of contagious representation. It is hard to generalise the findings because the political and administrative milieux in developed and developing countries are diverse and contextual. Contagion, therefore, cannot solely explain what is going on in these countries. Also, the authors are not able to capture women’s representation in toto due to strong variation across regions in terms of social, economic and cultural dimensions. However, they do provide a comprehensive account of women in democracies worldwide in a clear and well-written manner.

Jyotsna Tomer
(OP Jindal Modern School, Hisar, India)


Many classic analyses in political economy are anachronistically focused on manufacturing and tend to assume that services are all sheltered, low-wage and low-productivity. Anne Wren, in this volume’s introduction, demonstrates that technological change has upended old assumptions about services. Now, there
are ‘dynamic,’ high-skill, high-wage, service sectors that, thanks to information technology, operate across borders. The composition of a country’s service sector is variable and matters.

Welfare states shape service sectors. Iversen and Soskice argue (p. 100) that centralised wage bargaining compresses wages and lowers the cost of dynamic service sectors. That makes service sector (and other) exports more competitive while increasing the price of sheltered services, producing high real exchange rates in competitive countries – the juxtaposition of high prices and competitive success that marks Nordic countries. This combination depends on the public supply of skilled labour, since exporters will not have an incentive to train employees. Iversen and Soskice assert that the skilled labour supply depends on proportional representation, which enables such education policies. Wren and her co-authors find that there is a second way to develop dynamic services: as well as the Nordic approach, there is an Anglo-American acceptance of high wage dispersion, which creates incentives for people to privately invest in skills (p. 138). Nelson and Stephens find that social-democratic policies promote women’s employment, and Christian-democratic ones diminish it (p. 164). Ansell and Gingrich integrate higher education policies, arguing that limited free public systems go with wage compression because the returns to education will not entice enough students; wage dispersion justifies tuition fees (p. 205). Anderson and Hassel, among others, worry that German vocational education emphasises firm-specific skills and traps the country in a successful high-value-added manufacturing niche (p. 174).

Service sectors shape welfare politics. Wren and Rehm argue that workers in dynamic internationally exposed service sectors will oppose welfare states that raise their unit labour costs and competitiveness, undermining an older coalition between sheltered low-wage service workers who benefited from a welfare state that employed sheltered high-wage service workers (p. 249). Barnes proposes that people with less leisure time are less likely to support redistribution (p. 282). Iversen and Rosenbluth argue (p. 312) that women, especially those who participate in the labour market or are at risk of divorce, will support greater social spending (i.e. day care) because it compensates for irregular careers and the consequent lack of firm-specific skills.

As with most comparative political economy, the reader is left to conclude that Scandinavia is ideal, Scandinavian arrangements are unattainable for the rest of us, and Germany must be in trouble.

Scott L. Greer
(University of Michigan)

General Politics


It would be surprising if I were the only person who opened this volume assuming that it is yet another textbook of political sociology. However, readers like me will soon realise the extent to which they have under-estimated this book. In fact, as stated clearly in its introduction, this book is ‘not a text in conventional political sociology ... nor is it a book of political theory’ (p. xiii). Despite its concise form, this book sheds fascinating new light on the nature of the state, power and politics in the contemporary world. Readers will have absolutely no regret opening this book even if they have had very different expectations.

Political Sociology in a Global Era consists of an Introduction that serves as a clear roadmap plus eight chapters. The first two chapters discuss conventional and Marxist theories of the state, respectively. Through criticising the established theories, the author reminds the reader that class relations and conflicts never vanish even though the state in the twenty-first century seems somewhat different from its predecessors in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

This idea is then skilfully elaborated through a comparative-historical framework. Drawing upon in-depth reflection on several classic theoretical works, Chapter 3 generally examines the origin and development of the state. Based on the cases of Europe and the US, Chapter 4 then further analyses the development of the capitalist state. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 are the most important part of the book, highlighting the nature of the crisis of the advanced capitalist state, the role of the state in less-developed countries, and the facts contributing to the emergence of cross-national social movements and revolutions, respectively. In these chapters, drawing on theories and empirical evi-
dence, the author successfully demonstrates that class structure remains the most decisive factor determining the state and its relations with society in many parts of the contemporary world. Finally, Chapter 8 offers a brief conclusion of the entire discussion, highlighting the class basis of the contemporary state, power and politics.

Although this book is not designed to be a textbook, it is actually a must-read for all students of political sociology because very few, if any, other books are able to provide such a concise yet systematic examination of the nature and role of the modern state. Personally, though, I would appreciate more specific discussion on how class structures and class conflicts are getting (re)shaped by the ongoing globalisation process.

Yu Tao
(University of Central Lancashire)


The programme which the Nazis called the ‘Final Solution’ is the darkest incidence in human history. Ronald Berger attempts to expand the boundary of studies in sociology by bringing in history and politics. As the title suggests, the book approaches the Holocaust through historical understanding of the social construction of the whole episode. In this, the idea of religion is invoked as a pretext for the formation of collective memory against the Jews.

In his larger project of going beyond the existing sociological understanding of such an incidence, Berger attempts to bring together ‘a comprehensive synthesis of what one sociologist thinks is most important to know about the origins, implementation and postwar legacy of this archetypal genocide of human history’ (p. ix). In this process of synthesis, Berger focuses on the reasons behind the selection of Jews for genocide through an ‘introductory background on German history as the stage of incidence’. From here, the argument moves in the direction of causality in terms of roleplaying. Berger focuses on Hitler’s role in the third chapter. The next two chapters provide a detailed examination of pogrom and cases of atrocity and survival recorded to illustrate the dark side of humanity. In the later part of the book, we find the critical estimation of post-war arrangements initiated by international organisations. The last chapter rightly goes into the alienating social processes ‘that deny the full humanity’ to all of us.

Berger’s book is an excellent attempt to explore the interface of religion, politics and the Holocaust. The way he brings in historical events along with the social construction of the Holocaust seems apt for going beyond the standard framework for studying the Holocaust within the discipline of sociology. The invocation of collective memory to unleash the terror of the Holocaust rightly indicates the possibility of such events happening in the future if we do not handle things carefully. This work thus innovates at the level of theory and method to expand studies about the Holocaust. Through empirical illustration and the logical interplay of arguments regarding the social construction of the Holocaust, the book offers a great deal to researchers and students in terms of a detailed examination of Nazi atrocities.

Shashank Chaturvedi
(University of Delhi)


Films and television productions have become frequent companions in political science classes, for obvious reasons. Not only do they illustrate subjects of relevance, be it the realities of war or people trafficking, but students also tend to appreciate movie-based discussions as they link leisure with academic interests. However, one may tend to look at film, as Carter and Dodds point out, ‘as simply a representational medium, one that rather imperfectly represented the complex business of war, diplomacy, statecraft, intelligence’ (p. 3). In contrast, the authors want readers to think of films as part of international politics, as a medium that can teach us to deconstruct geopolitical norms and categories.

The book explores this interplay of film and politics along four main topics: ‘Borders’, ‘Exceptional Spaces’, ‘Distant Others’ and ‘Homeland’. Chapter 2 analyses how three films challenge the idea of definite borders, each taken on different border spaces. Carter and
Dodds effectively show how these films reveal borders to be mere ‘human creation[s] that can be built, contested and undone’ (p. 40). In contrast to highly regulated borders, states of exception eschew these very norms and have become a resort in the ‘War on Terror’ – a phenomenon which moviegoers learn to comprehend in their geographic dimension. States of exception tend to be legitimised through our ‘Othering’ reflexes, which are further explored in Chapter 4. With a keen eye on films such as the Turkish production Valley of the Wolves – Iraq, the authors reflect on the paradoxes of humanitarian intervention and its implications for Western diplomacy. Finally, Chapter 5 explores the ‘geographies of both fear and security’ (p. 98) mapped out by notions of home. Instead of sticking to the types of movies one would associate with ‘Homeland’, the book takes the readers beyond Hollywood by including, among others, the celebrated German movie The Lives of Others.

Overall, Carter and Dodds make a compelling case why film should be taken as more than just a distorting mirror of reality. In spite of its short length, the book provides many rich and enriching examples of movies that can contribute to teaching International Politics, with movies from different parts of the world. One might miss great classics that would have been similarly fruitful, in particular as contrasting visions of a pre-9/11 and an allegedly bipolar world. We can thus only hope that the publisher’s ‘Short Cuts’ series may soon include additional volumes for political scientists.

Claudia Franziska Brühwiler
(University of St Gallen)


According to Bidyut Chakrabarty, the goal of Confluence of Thought is to seek ‘to support the argument that the moral politics of redemptive love and non-violence that Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. consistently pursued represents an appealing vision for the present century’ (p. 189). Although this support is not explicitly unfolded in a substantive manner, Chakrabarty does offer an informative survey that brings the careers of Gandhi and King into conversation in a manner that implicitly supports his stated goal. Chakrabarty’s focus is on his two protagonists’ systems of non-violent thought and action, with a particular concentration on what he characterises as the ideological features of those systems. The confluences that the author references in the title are the commonalities that remain between Gandhi’s and King’s ideologies after their quite different socio-political contexts are taken into account. Through these means, the readers of Confluence of Thought learn of the social, political and ideological underpinnings of key moments in the two men’s lives, such as the salt satyagraha to Dandi and the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama. These and other events are presented in a manner that supports a conclusion that Chakrabarty returns to on a number of occasions in the present volume – namely that King selectively draws on Gandhi’s non-violence and mixes it with Christian ethics informed by Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount, with potent effect and resonance in the struggle for racial equality in the US of the 1950s and 1960s.

There are a distracting number of breakdowns in editing and fact-checking in this volume. Additionally, the prose is at points somewhat convoluted. More substantively, the language used in Confluence of Thought is inconsistent. For example, reference is made at points to ‘the blacks’, ‘blacks’ and ‘black people’. These variations are about more than grammar because the third term in this series represents an acknowledgement of the humanity of people belonging to minority groups that was central to the projects of both Gandhi and King. Additionally, it is somewhat surprising that Chakrabarty does not examine in any depth the influence of Christian ethics on Gandhi, which is undoubtedly a point of confluence that aided King in his adaption of the Gandhian method of non-violence aimed at positive social change. Such tensions noted, it must be emphasised that Confluence of Thought is overall a fine, creative and informative volume that will be of interest to political scientists and peace studies scholars working in a number of sub-fields.

Christopher Hrynkow
(University of Saskatchewan)

Beginning in the late 1970s, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) have helped to create what has been described as an ‘associational revolution’. They have played a significant role within civil society, facilitating not just the transition of many communist and authoritarian regimes to democracy, but also the process of participatory development and good governance. Most of the literature on NGOs has documented their role since the 1970s in particular, but very little has been written on the history of the NGO sector itself. Thomas Davies’ work in this context becomes an important contribution for it takes a longue durée approach and provides a history of the NGO sector over the past two-and-a-half centuries.

The central question that drives Davies is how to construct a new history of the transnational civil society that has come to play a dominant role in international politics and development in the last few decades. Davies’ argument is that the history of the transnational civil society is not limited to the last two or three decades, but ‘has a far longer history than traditionally assumed’ (p. 1). By combining both quantitative and qualitative methods, and by following a comprehensive historical analysis, Davies looks at the evolution of transnational civil society beyond the Euro-American narratives and constructs a more heterogeneous and pluralistic history by giving greater consideration to the ‘Eastern’ origins.

The book has three major chapters, describing the three major waves of transnational civil society. Davies begins by introducing transnational civil society as the ‘non-governmental non-profit collective action that transcends national boundaries but which does not necessarily have a global reach’ (p. 2). In this sense, the ‘institutions of transnational civil society are numerous, and include advocacy networks and social movements as well as more formally organized INGOs’ (p. 2). Following this introduction, the first chapter discusses the various factors that made the development of transnational civil society possible in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and explains how ‘the development of transnational civil society occurred in parallel with the development of the nation-state’ (p. 16). Chapter 2 looks at ‘the most neglected periods of the history of transnational civil society’ – that between the two world wars – and discusses the emergence of new INGOs (international non-governmental organisations) in fields such as business, humanitarianism, health and education (p. 16). The final chapter examines the contradictory role of the Cold War in splitting, as well as integrating, transnational civil society.

The book thus makes a significant contribution to the literature by providing a uniquely comprehensive history of transnational civil society. Its coherent structure and style make it a pleasure to read, and it must be recommended to students of sociology and political science.

Sarbeswar Sahoo
(Indian Institute of Technology Delhi)


In our emerging ‘Anthropocene’ era, analysing the social, political, moral, scientific and economic implications of human-induced climate change is a complex enterprise. Despite this broad scope and daunting task, Climate-Challenged Society largely succeeds in its self-declared goal to provide ‘a critical and integrative introduction, written “with attitude” ’ (p. v). In a brief 147 pages, the authors integrate an eclectic combination of academic disciplines into a concise beginner’s guide that examines the social roots, effects and ideas sustaining climate change in contemporary society. The ‘reality that all human rights and needs depend on an environment that can sustain them’ (p. 83) thereby demands that all societies must think, act and alter their structures synchronically, if climate change is to be mitigated or adapted to – sometimes drastically, requiring a ‘radical reworking of the very nature of governance’ (p. 95), political economy (p. 46) and justice (p. 75). The book’s refusal to rehash familiar ‘business as usual’ platitudes lauding economic or political ‘progress’ and ‘growth’ is its strength. Instead, ‘[t]aking climate change seriously’, it stresses, ‘changes everything’ (p. 15). Status quo narratives must instead be transformed into progressive strategies of resilience and transition to reconstruct ‘how people think about meaningful
life, how we understand the nature of societies, economies, and governments’ (p. 5).

The book is framed by a nuanced critique of the ‘failure of rationality’ (p. 15) that it claims is the main driving force behind anthropogenic climate change: capitalist free market ideologies and a global political economy that touts narratives of infinite growth and profitability. This rationality ‘intrinsically favours the existing distribution of wealth and power’, and is thus likely to reproduce the status quo power relations that catalysed our climate crisis in the first place (p. 45). However, it is unclear how the progressive and resilient roadmap the authors provide for a transition towards new social forms of political and economic organisation does not succumb to the exact same overt ‘failures’ of rationality that the book lambasts at its outset. Confusingly, rationality is both the catalyst of the current climate crisis and what underpins a transition towards new frameworks of social form, economy, politics and thought. Yet, without any normative or philosophical exposition as to how society can choose, alter or create new forms of social rationality, it is unclear exactly how the book’s overall argument can avoid repeating or reconstituting the same failures and pitfalls of political rationality that it so accurately disparages. Climate-Challenged Society thereby offers a compelling case for profound social change, without explicating how its solutions avoid the same failures of human rationality that manifested this perplexing problem in the first place.

Scott Hamilton
(London School of Economics and Politics Science)


Transnational Migration focuses on the question of transnationality in migration theory. The authors juxtapose the transnational approach with, as they put it, the usual preoccupation of immigrant researchers, who apparently concentrate on countries of immigration and seem to assume the congruence of state, society and nation. The authors argue that the traditional approach does not take into account, or even allow to be taken into account, the fact that migrants and their communities and organisations often operate beyond the borders of nation states and nations. In other words, contemporary migrants frequently live in some transnational spaces which cross national borders, and this in turn requires the development of a new theoretical perspective.

I am not sure whether such a binary opposition of the traditional approach versus the transnational approach does justice to the heterogeneous field of migration and diaspora studies. However, the authors seem to have no doubts and argue very persuasively and energetically for a new and fresh transnational perspective in migration studies. More precisely, the book has three aims. First, the authors attempt to outline the main tenets of transnationality theory by focusing on intense cross-border ties and practices and analysing the concept of ‘transnational social spaces’. Second, they try to demonstrate the importance of the transnational perspective for understanding contemporary migration and its consequences. They analyse in more detail three substantive phenomena: the links between migration and development for both the receiver society and the sending country; migrant integration with the receiver society; and the political activities and status of migrants with particular emphasis on dual citizenship. Third, the authors also try to work out a transnational methodology, focusing on multi-sited ethnography, mobile ethnography and the extended case method.

The book is clearly argued and is written in easily accessible language avoiding unnecessary jargon relatively well, and it can serve as an excellent introduction to contemporary migration research. However, it is not without limitations. Let us notice two things. First, the geographical scope of the book is rather narrow. Most of the empirical examples are drawn from a few selected locations, especially the US and Mexico, the countries of Latin America, Turkey and Germany. Second, quantitative data quoted in the book suggest that transnational practices are substantive only among some categories of migrants, especially those self-employed and the politically active. On the whole, transnational migrants seem to be in the minority. Having said this, it is doubtful whether transnationality can be termed as a new ‘paradigm’ or new theoretical perspective that would replace older theories of migration, as some scholars seem to profess. Transnationality is just another middle-range theory that merely
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describes and explains the situation of some categories of migrants.  
Krzysztof Jaskulowski  
(University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Campus in Wrocław)


The International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM) describes ‘forced migration’ as a general term referring to the movements of refugees and internally displaced people (those displaced by conflicts) as well as people displaced by natural or environmental disasters, chemical or nuclear disasters, famine or development projects. It is viewed as a complex, wide-ranging and pervasive set of phenomena. The present authoritative handbook edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Gil Loescher, Katy Long and Nando Sigona critically assesses the development of global refugee and forced migration studies. It addresses questions that encompass a wide range of migration issues and topics: How does the international community perceive migration issues? What are the various root causes of migration? Should we distinguish between economic and political migrants? How do international legal instruments and competing organisations affect the protection systems in place? Should illegal migrants get the same attention and treatment as documented migrants?

The 53 chapters written by leading subject matter experts offer not only compelling regional case studies and thematic overviews in the different fields, from disability and gender to statelessness, trafficking/smuggling and IDPs (internally displaced persons), but also take an in-depth look at solutions and future avenues for research. Examining key issues, the Handbook will allow readers to analyse not only the dynamics of acute displacement crises, but also to understand better how informed decisions for policy making are shaped. In sum, according to the editors, it is vital that migration studies do not limit themselves to describing what ‘is’, but ‘must involve challenging policy makers’ conventional approaches by providing new accounts, new insights and new frameworks’ (p. 16).

How well then does the Handbook succeed in providing innovative answers to the pressing and urgent consequences of forced migration? While providing a comprehensive overview of a wide range of contemporary migration studies, the volume does not always engage in sufficient detail with the issues under scrutiny. Take, for example, the controversial policy of assisted voluntary return arrangements promoted by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and many European governments. The chapter on voluntary return (Chapter 39) states that such programmes have increased in importance in Europe (p. 506), but stops short of analysing IOM policies. Likewise, the chapter on securitisation (Chapter 21), while examining the various aspects of securitisation as a theoretical tool of analysis, does not discuss the uncertain role of the EU border agency FRONTEX in the context of enforcing securitisation of migration in Europe.

Patrick Hein  
(Meiji University)


Citizens vs Markets is an intellectual product of a most recent event: the financial crisis which manifested in globally coordinated bail-outs of banks by governments in 2008. The book is a rare example of multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary scholarship. Hardly any volume on the crisis has been as holistic in its approach as this one, especially in debating the role of civil society during the crisis. The authors argue that we need to revisit the theoretical foundations of economics to explain the crisis. The prevailing neoliberal economic paradigm supports the primacy of the financial system over the economy, and in turn the primacy of the economy over social needs and ecological realities (p. 47). This new work explores the transformative role of civil society in the market in which it has traditionally been less proactive. The
volume contests the neoliberal central assumption of whether markets should serve citizens rather than citizens serving markets. The contributing scholars and practitioners unequivocally allege that the dominant theory of political economy appears ill-suited to addressing contemporary challenges of social justice, inequality and the destruction of our ecological systems.

The technocratic approach to the crisis has prevented citizens from playing any role. Furthermore, the interests of industry through business forums and mainstream think tanks have generally ruled the day in terms of civil society engagement in financial markets. As a result, civil society activism to steer financial markets towards the common good remains mostly muted and ineffectual, and the governance of finance generally eludes democratic accountability (p. 14). The writers exhort civil society actors outside the financial sector to play an active role in changing consumer behaviour through deliberation, campaigning and coordination to hold financial power to account. In a nutshell, markets must serve citizens and the planet, rather than the other way around. The authors suggest that civil society can engage in the financial markets along three lines: conformist, reformist and transformist. Alternatively, civil society initiatives can aim towards anything, ranging from no change at all to a systemic change in the governance of financial markets.

The book will be helpful for all students, scholars and practitioners pursuing philosophy, ethics, politics, economics and sociology, among others, who wish to understand the different approaches, methods and levels of analysis applied to the financial crisis and how civil society can play an active and constructive role in containing such upheavals in future.

Vijender Singh Beniwal
(Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi)


Appealing to a wide and non-expert audience, What’s Wrong With Climate Politics and How to Fix It sets out on a bombastic mission to diagnose and treat the forefront ills of international climate policy making: the cancer of Westphalia, the malignancy of the great polluters (US and China) and the addictions of modernity (p. 20). The inadequacies of the international climate regime are blamed on an unhealthy dominance of the Westphalian norms of sovereignty and non-interference. It is suggested that global competitiveness and national interest are the wrong objectives; rather, climate negotiations should be about the individuals (both culpable and vulnerable) within and across nations. Not only would such ‘people-centred diplomacy’ (p. 119) be sensitive to rights and responsibilities, but it would also enable policy makers to disaggregate the impact of their policies, hitting the wealthy minority hardest while helping the vulnerable majority. This emphasis on individualism runs throughout the book, legitimised by a description of today’s world as highly globalised and cosmopolitan. Indeed, the third treatment centres on individual behaviour (specifically material consumption), suggesting that both market mechanisms and a mass shift in personal values will be needed to halt the pandemic spread of ‘affluenza’ (p. 173).

The secondary aim of the book, to introduce some key problems and solutions in the climate politics debate, is certainly achieved. However, the primary mission of portraying climate politics as a globalised instance of a ‘tragedy of the atmospheric commons’ (p. 3) that can be remedied through harnessing and redirecting everybody’s insatiable self-interest is less convincing. There is nothing new or innovative about this framing, and there exists a rich literature in natural resource management and public choice theory questioning its assumptions. Consumers are neither uncritical dupes nor rational economic actors, hence the market interventions and sustainability propaganda drive suggested are fundamentally flawed – not to mention ethically controversial.

Despite the accessible writing style and concise summaries of complex debates, the author’s core arguments are not harmonious. The whole book is an attempt to realign national and individual interests, yet the first two arguments imply an ‘individual first, society later approach’ while the third issue, of consumption, calls on a strong state to regulate and re-educate the consuming masses from the top down. Is it to be governance or government? Despite this discord, the author’s arguments are clear, provocative
and open-ended, making this a good entry-level text for readers curious about why climate politics will continue to attract attention.

Ross Gillard
(University of Leeds)


‘When the winds of change blow, some build walls and others build windmills’ – an old Chinese proverb aptly summarises the current debates on climate change in the post-Kyoto space. Sanguinely, the developing countries of the world are more enthusiastic and persuasive in adopting and abiding by a policy of ‘common but differentiated responsibilities’ to combat the impacts of climate change. The raison d’être behind this stimulus is the awareness that they are the more vulnerable and critical to the effects of climate change. Economic backwardness and the lack of technological sophistication hinder any advance to mitigate the effects of climate change.

However, most developing countries are now voluntarily reducing their carbon intensity and implementing other measures to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases (GHGs). This is the theme of David Held et al.’s edited book *Climate Governance in the Developing World*. The volume has three sections. Part I covers Asia’s response to climate governance and deals with China, India, Indonesia and South Korea. Part II covers the Latin American countries Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Costa Rica. Part III deals with countries of Africa, including Egypt, Ethiopia, Mozambique and South Africa. The authors have their own reasons to justify the selection of these countries. For example, they mention that China, India, Brazil and Indonesia are major emitters and account for 50 per cent of the developing world’s total emissions. Argentina, Egypt, Mexico, South Africa and South Korea are middle-range producers of GHGs. Finally, Costa Rica, Ethiopia and Mozambique are minor emitters, but their commitments to becoming ‘carbon neutral’ and ‘carbon free’ (p. 4) in the near future are interesting and encouraging. Above all, the selection of these countries as case studies was determined either by their having already undertaken NAMAs (nationally appropriate mitigation actions) or their commitment towards taking action on climate change (p. 5).

The chapter on China’s policy towards climate governance summarises the efforts and initiatives taken by Beijing and recognises the fact that China occupies a critical position in regard to global climate governance (p. 46). The authors suggest that international and domestic pressure on Beijing yielded a positive response as China agreed at COP13 to discuss NAMAs (p. 43). Nonetheless, the book is uncertain about the gloomy future of climate governance in China and argues that success will depend on improvements in domestic governance capacity (p. 48).

Aaron Atteridge in his chapter ‘Evolution of Climate Policy in India’ emphasises that India’s climate policy is a top-down process which is very little influenced by states or non-governmental actors (p. 58). He also significantly points out that Indian climate diplomacy was driven by the bureaucracy. However, with Jairam Ramesh at the helm of the Ministry of Environment it has now shifted to the political sphere (p. 61). Nevertheless, Atteridge over-emphasises the fact that ‘social and economic priorities over climate policy’, ‘limited financial and technical capacity’ and the ‘concept of equity’ in climate negotiations (p. 57) have determined the scope and direction of India’s global climate policy, as these are applicable to all developing countries.

**Democratizing Global Climate Governance**, edited by Hayley Stevenson and John Dryzek, highlights how the US government is paralysed on climate change, and hostage to the over-representation of fossil-fuel-producing states in the US Senate and the power of big oil money in Washington (p. 3). These two books, read together, give insights into how developing countries are struggling to secure their interests from these industrialised nations in terms of climate governance. Hence there is resistance from both sides, with each side trying to maximise their respective interests. Stevenson and Dryzek thus seek to offer an approach for solving this dilemma. The book presents a deliberative-system approach to analyse and subsequently improve climate governance. The theoretically sturdy and
empirical arguments put forward are convincing. The authors feel that ‘public space’ needs to be strengthened, since it is here that ideas and critique are generated (p. 8). Although public space is crowded and busy, nonetheless a great deal of action occurs in the form of monologues (p. 42), and the democratisation of global climate governance is possible even in the absence of centralised and effective global agreement (p. 59).

Stevenson and Dryzek emphasise the role played by ‘empowered space’ in global climate governance and highlight the UNFCCC negotiations therein. They also recognise the importance of networked forms of governance, showcasing the success stories of the Clean Technology Fund, Clean Technology Initiatives and the Verified Carbon Standard. Above all, the authors stress that accountability is intrinsic to the success of deliberative global climate governance, whether in public space or empowered space.

The two books under review complement each other. Stevenson and Dryzek’s idea of a deliberative approach to climate governance could be applied to developing countries’ climate governance for increasing the effectiveness and greater participation of ‘other actors’ within these countries. Held et al.’s Climate Governance in the Developing World illustrates the initiatives taken by developing countries, breaking the myth that they are unwilling to move forward. Both books are timely interventions in the field of climate governance, where there is a need to break the impasse between the developed and developing nations.

These two books are essential reading for students, scholars and policy makers seeking to understand the tussles and gridlock on climate negotiations and how to surmount the stalemate.

Rajiv Ranjan
(Shandong University, Jinan, China)


Stratospheric aerosol injection (SAI) is the flagship geoengineering technology, often touted as a direct solution to climate change, whereby solar radiation is reflected back into space to prevent further warming of the planet. In this short and punchy book, Mike Hulme presents three clear lines of argument to suggest that such a global-scale techno-fix is precisely not what is needed. After describing SAI as undesirable, un governable and unreliable, Hulme concludes with a call for more pragmatic approaches to dealing with the hazards of a changing climate and a degree of pluralism and reflexivity in the way we frame the problem(s)/solution(s). This sensitivity to the power of problem framings and the fuzziness between research and practice will be familiar to anyone who has read Hulme’s other publications or who comes from a critical social sciences background. However, even those new to the geoengineering debate, or to climate change more generally, will have no problem with the content or prose. Key details are helpfully boxed into case study vignettes so the overall narrative flows from beginning to end.

The approach of (re)framing a complex issue to make somebody else’s framing and arguments seem ridiculous is nothing new in the world of social science. However, that is not to say it is not a valuable exercise. Hulme does not change the terms of reference (that climate change is caused by, and threatens, current human way(s) of life), but he does interpret them differently to proponents of geoengineering and SAI in particular. Viewing climate change as a ‘super-wicked problem’ (undefinable and unsolvable) (p. 138) makes the notion of a single, silver-bullet solution such as a controlling the Earth’s temperature seem laughable. Put simply, SAI cannot control regional climates, it doesn’t solve the ongoing international deadlock in the climate governance regime and its unforeseeable side-effects are irreversible. If you accept Hulme’s (and many others’) insistence that climate change is about more than just Earth’s temperature, then his arguments for abandoning SAI and hubristic geoengineering in favour of ‘climate pragmatism’ (pp. 122–30) will certainly appeal. According to this broad characterisation, a social and political response to climate change would focus on fostering social resilience, reducing all harmful emissions and pursuing sustainable energy production and provision, while a scientific response would be merely to control the climate. Deciding which is most appropriate, or ‘rational’, depends on your rationale, but this book makes a convincing argument for the former.

Ross Gillard
(University of Leeds)
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Thomas Janoski et al. dwell on the persistence of, and increase in, the level of long-term unemployment. They examine four major causal factors: skills mismatch caused by the decline in manufacturing industry and the rise of service industries; corporate off-shoring, which has led to the transfer of manual and non-manual jobs to foreign locations; development of technology, ranging from container ships to advances in information technology; and finally the instability of the global financial system, which has exacerbated the previous three factors. The upshot of these developments is that jobs are created in less developed countries. The social structure in the advanced countries changes, with a significant decline in high-paying skilled manual working-class jobs or permanent and well-paid salaried non-manual employment. The authors develop these factors in well-documented chapters, the empirical parts of which are based on the experience of the US. Not only do the authors rely on statistical sources and secondary work, but they also enliven the text with vignettes of workers, both those who are unemployed and chief executive officers.

The authors are highly critical of the neoliberal policies that underpin these developments. Corporate interests are hegemonic with deregulation and financialisation enhancing profitability. The economic forces leading to structural unemployment are well documented and the argument is generally sound, although the proposals fall short of adequate solutions to the problems outlined. Mainly with reference to the US, the authors advocate within-system remedies. They commend job-training and expanded vocational education as well as better job matching, job creation schemes, more developed entrepreneurial functions and greater research and development and, finally, they suggest more effective economic stabilisation policies.

The authors’ recommendations have the virtues of political possibility, but the economic, political and ideological forces would suggest that the economic effects of economic globalisation will continue in the same direction: high-profit capitalist economies, and a declining share of national income to labour. Other more radical alternatives could have been expanded. Policies advocating less international trade and a greater national focus, linked to state-ownership and control, could perhaps have been given more attention.

This is a well-researched book with detailed references. It successfully links globalisation to the rise of long-term unemployment in the advanced Western countries.

David Lane
(University of Cambridge)


Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson set out to undertake an ambitious project to examine borders and labour migration in the age of globalisation by contesting the notion of the international division of labour and replacing it with the global multiplicity of labour. At times, their work may be too ambitious in their attempt to marry critical geography, the governmentality of Foucault, post-colonialism and Marxist historical materialism.

The authors seek to contest the ‘borderless world’ by arguing that the intensification of the labour processes within the system of contemporary global capitalism has yielded the proliferation of borders and not their elimination. In essence: the creation of borders within borders. They note the existence of slums adjacent to gated communities as the exclusionary ‘borders within borders’ – a point which has been developed by other authors.

One of the major aims of their book is to illustrate that the border provides the reader with the analytical toolkit to construct an encounter between Marx and Foucault. As they write: ‘Power devices and technologies that are central to the control of borders in the contemporary world also reshape the reality and the spatial reorganization of what Marx called the “hidden abode of production”’. This argument becomes unclear, given the book’s complex theoretical imbroglio of post-structuralism and post-colonialism.
Above and beyond a working familiarity with Foucault and Marx, the reader would also greatly benefit from a knowledge of the work of Deleuze and Guattari. While the latter two could have been utilised to explore the autonomy of migration, Mezzadra and Neilson opted to develop the idea of the multiplication of labour. For them, the ‘multiplication of labour’ refers to the intensification of labour processes combined with the tendency of work to colonise life. A compelling point, but one which is lost as the authors digress in explaining the importance of language and the loss of the commons.

If the reader is unfamiliar with Marx, Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari, the book may prove to be a frustrating exercise. Yet it contains some very important contributions to migration theory. In addition to exploring the idea of ‘just-in-time’ migration, the authors note that migration, the border and labour struggles are important in the construction of alternative subjectivities and resistance. However, the process of migration should not be romanticised. Mezzadra and Neilson have written an ambitious book for examining labour migration, draconian border practices and migration struggles, yet *Border as Method* is unduly labyrinthine.

Peter S. Cruttenden  
(Independent Scholar)


Simone Polillo’s *Conservative versus Wildcats: A Sociology of Financial Conflict* argues that finance is, at its very heart, driven by internal conflict. The book draws on two historical cases in order to craft a compelling analytical narrative about both the origins and nature of finance and credit. Although pitched within economic sociology literature, the book will be of interest to those researching the politics of finance, which is itself a topic well-disposed to transposing disciplinary boundaries.

The book is built upon a fundamental distinction between ‘conservative’ and ‘wildcat’ visions of how banking ought to work. Conservative banking is built upon an exclusionary logic. These bankers draw strict boundaries around creditworthiness in order to restrict who can access credit. Their power is based on the ability to form a collective identity as an elite status group, and forge close relationships with an exclusive clientele. This practice in turn minimises speculation and ensures stable returns on investment. Wildcat banking, on the other hand, has an inclusionary logic. These bankers are considered a threat to conservative banking because they seek to extend the boundaries of creditworthiness. By extending credit to those previously excluded through creating new markets or financial instruments, they often aim to ‘democratise’ finance – and find new ways to make money. Polillo paints a picture in which these boundaries of creditworthiness – and thus financial circuits themselves – are never stable or innate. They are instead constantly reinstated and incrementally changed as a result of the conflict between these two opposing visions.

This is illustrated through two historical case studies: the US and Italy. While conflict in the US was centred upon creditworthiness as an issue of the individual, wildcat banking could get a foothold in Italy by linking creditworthiness to the interests of the fledgling nation. When the capacity of the US and Italian states is taken into account too, this results in divergent results. On the back of this, Polillo argues that his study debunks three myths of finance and money: (1) that creditworthiness is an objective assessment of borrowers; (2) that money is fungible; and (3) that banks act as mere intermediaries between savers and borrowers. The result is both a novel theory of how finance is constituted and a theory of money itself. Consequently, Polillo’s *Conservative versus Wildcats* is required reading for those interested in the politics of finance.

Liam Stanley  
(University of Sheffield)


With this book, Benn Steil provides a very detailed and well-written account of the negotiations that led to the creation of the post-war international economic order. He places the antipodal characters of
Harry Dexter White and John Maynard Keynes (the American and British chief negotiators) at the centre of his narrative. The eloquent and aristocratic celebrity economist Keynes struggled as the head of the British delegation to protect the interests of an economically and politically declining Great Britain. On the other side, a seemingly technocratic and lacklustre White led the delegation of the coming superpower US. The interaction of these two exceptional men, with their diverging visions and interests for the future international financial and monetary order, provides the framework for Steil’s historical account. In contrast to other portrayals of the Bretton Woods negotiations, where creation of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank is depicted as a common project of the US and Great Britain, Steil shows that White in fact largely outmanoeuvred Keynes and took advantage of the power shift between America and Britain caused by the Second World War.

Most astonishing in this context is the author’s detailed disclosure of White’s private admiration for Soviet-style economic planning and his espionage activities for the Soviet Union. Notwithstanding White’s beliefs in the superiority of economic planning and sympathies for the Soviet Union, he nevertheless firmly promoted American interests at Bretton Woods and became one of the major architects of the global capitalist order. This makes White’s personality and his role at the Bretton Woods negotiations one of the most fascinating aspects of the book.

However, the author’s decision to focus almost exclusively on the negotiations between Britain and the United States inevitably leads to the neglect of the role of other nations’ delegations at Bretton Woods. They are merely depicted as passive bystanders with no influence at all on the negotiation outcomes. As Eric Helleiner has demonstrated (see Forgotten Foundations of Bretton Woods, also reviewed in this issue, p. 581), the influence of other nations at Bretton Woods was limited, yet greater than is widely believed. Apart from these shortcomings, The Battle of Bretton Woods is a well-researched and excellently written book that is recommended for everyone interested in economic and diplomatic history.

Tobias Leeg
(Freie Universität Berlin)


Scholarly work on racial conflict regularly swings between assigning such an origin in ‘ancient ethnic hatreds’ and a more materialist view that emphasises economic advantages accrued by ruling groups through the manufacture of animosity. However, two new works in political sociology seek a middle ground, neither over-emphasising nor dismissing the role of beliefs and emotions in motivating people towards conflict. In the first, Racial Conflict in Global Society, John Stone and Polly Rizova employ a neo-Weberian perspective that examines, in large part, how the belief in the truth of something makes that thing actually true: Recognizing the importance of ideas, values and culture as critical forces in shaping conflict and social change has a particular value in a field where passionate beliefs about racial superiority and inferiority have been endemic (p. 2).

Stone and Rizova’s focus lies with globalised society and the challenges that governments, multinational corporations and other institutions face regarding racial conflict and inequality, which, as they note, does not occupy its own sphere, but rather is ‘part and parcel of a wider package that has witnessed the erosion of social obligation and regulation’ (p. 39). After illustrating how American and European attitudes towards race relations were mediated by divergent historical backgrounds (continental consolidation versus overseas colonial holdings), the authors explicate the challenges which face multinational organisations and their employees, especially given that the utility of informal contacts for securing employment remains high, even in this era of a globalised workforce and ostensible worldwide quest for talent.
Although the book primarily focuses upon conflict that does not rise to the level of atrocity, Stone and Rizova do devote a chapter to violence, noting that:

In most cases it is the occurrence of changes, or the perceived fears of possible changes in racial or ethnic privilege, or the perceived hopes that liberation or greater equality may at last be possible, which act as the spark and lubricant of hostility and conflict (p. 123; emphasis in the original).

Indeed, while longer volumes have been written on the subject of racial conflict, especially violence, this particular book engages with the complexities of conflict in a thorough but still accessible manner, thus making it useful for scholars, students, and those working in the field of international business and non-profit organisations.

In a similar vein, Olaoluwa Olusanya, in Emotions, Decision-Making and Mass Atrocities, seeks to move beyond ‘the Platonic and dualist view that emotion is the antithesis of reason or rational thought’ and that perpetrators of mass atrocities must be devoid of normal human emotion (p. 2). Olusanya instead examines mass atrocity through the lens of the macro–micro integrated theoretical model (MMITM) – a sociological model, with emotions at its heart, which the author insists can prove applicable to criminal groups of all sizes, from street gangs to the boards of corporations.

The author opens by contrasting the MMITM with other sociological theories, such as social bond theory, against which the MMITM takes the view that ‘attachment and involvement with conventional peers may in fact promulgate violence against members of the out-group when it is noted that conventional institutions are ethnocentric and part of a culture of animosity’ (p. 22). Contrary to rational choice theory, or the belief that people act in their own rational self-interest, Olusanya asserts that ‘because groups cannot be formed without emotions’, and because genocide is a group activity, emotions cannot be omitted from any analysis of mass atrocity (p. 73). In fact, because a certain amount of cognitive dissonance underlies both the decision to commit and the process of perpetrating mass violence, ‘emotions are actually part and parcel of the process of violence’, emanating ‘from efforts to relieve emotional pain or discomfort’ (p. 83). Not only do emotions underlie the societal-level strain that produces mass atrocities, but they can also facilitate reconciliation as guilt ‘is a moral emotion that activates the conscience and motivates us to act pro-socially’ (p. 119).

Unfortunately, Olusanya’s writing style often gets in the way of his ideas. For example, in the second chapter, 35 of the 63 full paragraphs begin with ‘However’, ‘Furthermore’, ‘Moreover’ or ‘In addition’ (and within these paragraphs, such transitional words and phrases are repeated ad nauseam). The result is to leave nothing feeling complete, with all central ideas in the book emerging, only with difficulty, amid a constant barrage of refutations of – and augmentations to – other theories, especially as the author never once offers readers a stand-alone summary of the MMITM. Where they can be sifted out, Olusanya’s ideas certainly prove relative to the larger field, offering a number of important insights, but his failure to summarise, even in brief, both the MMITM and competing sociological theories makes this book not very useful to scholars from different academic backgrounds trying to do cross-disciplinary work.

Guy Lancaster
(Encyclopedia of Arkansas History and Culture)

Britain and Ireland

Spying on the World focuses on the work of the UK’s Joint Intelligence Committee (JIC) from its inception in 1936 to the current day. The book examines the assessments the JIC has generated and it is emblematic of the relationship between government intelligence and policy. The authors present the key moments in UK intelligence history via the declassified JIC files to highlight the challenges governments face in mapping evolving patterns and emerging crises, and then in producing sensible responses to those crises. The authors describe a high-level picture of competence.
and success at the same time demonstrating that there is a great deal of nuance in that historical record. While they set out to show the centrality of the JIC to the machinery of UK intelligence, they note that only recently has the Committee become a public feature of intelligence debate.

This book adopts a broadly historical methodology; it is critical of its sources, but it uses them as the primary means to evaluate effectiveness and to describe these relationships. In terms of its coverage, the authors have been guided by what is present in those archives. That archive does, however, cover most of the crises and incidents that the UK has been party to or part of since 1936. There is, therefore, broad coverage of the Cold War (Russia, nuclear non-proliferation, Suez, Vietnam), crises for the UK including Northern Ireland and the Falklands, and more recent crises involving Iraq and the Syrian Civil War. The book is aimed at intelligence scholars, those with a general interest in contemporary foreign policy history and it can also be seen as providing a taster for those interested in what intelligence material is held in the archives.

Spying on the World provides a genuinely novel set of historical materials. This book is the first time such a set of materials has been curated, presented and analysed. It is highly likely that Aldrich, Cormac and Goodman will be succeeded by other historians who now enter the JIC archives seeking to build more detailed, but narrower historical constructs based on this material. The book is right to evaluate critically what can be learned and known from an archive exclusively filled with government documents, and the various tensions within historical method are well discussed here. Spying on the World is a well-written and nicely presented book. The archive material appearing in its original form is a pleasing attention to detail.

Robert Dover
(Loughborough University)


John Biffen, who served in Margaret Thatcher’s cabinets between 1979 and 1987, died in 2007, and this memoir combines recollections he dictated, at his wife’s suggestion, as a diversion during his later illnesses, with extracts from the diary he kept in the 1970s and 1980s. It offers a straightforward account of the author’s life, with almost half of it devoted to the period before he entered Parliament in his early thirties: some of the most memorable chapters are to be found here, and Biffen’s description of his and his parents’ life on a Somerset dairy farm in the 1930s and 1940s is especially vivid. The ‘political’ chapters are largely a series of (very interesting) snapshots of persons and issues, which surround a more substantial treatment of the author’s cabinet career: the largest part of this relates to his period as Leader of the House – a job which he clearly loved and felt that he did well.

However, as Lady Biffen states in her preface (p. x), ‘this book is probably not the one that [her husband] might have produced at an earlier, healthier stage of his life’. Attractive and readable though this memoir is, it is a pity that that earlier book was never written. Biffen was a highly intellectual Conservative who moved from being a pro-European to become a steadfast Eurosceptic before Euroscepticism was fashionable. His early advocacy of economic planning gave way to a classical economic liberalism, again before it became the fashion – although he pointed out that this ‘dryness’ was home-grown and looked to Hume and Smith rather than to Hayek and Friedman. Yet when he was dismissed from the cabinet, it was partly because he advocated a progressive and well-resourced social policy.

He was widely liked and admired, and reading this memoir you can see why. But he was also a private man and that quality too pervades the book. His friends often said that they wished they had known him better, and the reader shares that experience. Many things are hinted at, or discussed briefly, about which one would have liked to know much more – especially in relation to Biffen’s intellectual and political development. Semi-Detached is therefore perhaps a supplementary source for students of late twentieth-century Conservatism, but it leaves the reader with a liking and respect for the author and a very personal sense of time well-spent in his company.

Andrew Connell
(Independent Scholar)


‘The definitive biography in the English style – lengthy, thoroughly documented, heavily annotated, and generously splashed with quotations – is among the most admirable genres of historiography’, wrote Hannah Arendt in her 1967 book Men in Dark Times. Chris Bryant’s two-volume book Parliament: The Biography is a thoroughly annotated work complete with a wonderful and occasionally weird array of anecdotes. Whether this book is an example of one of the most ‘admirable genres of historiography’ is another question to which we shall shortly return.

The author certainly does not lack confidence. Even the title is indicative of the swagger. This is not ‘a’ biography but ‘the’ biography! Such self-confidence is attractive and welcome and it makes the book more entertaining and stimulating. This is an impressive book. It is well-written.

It is not a political science tract, it does not delve into details and it consciously rejects any notion of a larger narrative. Bryant – a prominent backbench Labour MP – is adamant that the evolution of Parliament has not followed a preconceived plan. ‘Time and again the hazard of fortune has sat at the table as an extra player’, he notes with the characteristic eloquence of the Anglican clergyman he once was. Bryant is not a proponent of the Whig interpretation of history and all but pours scorn on Victorian writers like the much praised Henry Hallam and his Constitutional History of England. This iconoclastic tendency adds flavour to an already wholesome book.

This irreverence from the Reverend Bryant is not the book’s only recommendation. What is perhaps most enjoyable about this tome is the abundance of anecdotes that often serve to prove a point. Bryant’s aversion to an overall narrative is supported by telling stories of how great reforms came about as a result of chance and sheer luck. One of the best examples is the well-known, but long thought to be apocryphal, story of how one of the most important laws ever passed in the history of any legislature secured its passage through the upper house. Bryant tells the anecdote thus:

One of the key texts underpinning the freedom against arbitrary arrest, the Habeas Corpus Act 1679, only got through the House of Lords by two votes when the teller for the Ayes counted a fat peer for ten votes.

And, as if to prove a point, he goes on to report that on ‘forty-nine occasions since 1801 the speaker has had to decide on a tied vote, including the occasion on the 23 July 1993 when it was discovered that one vote had accidentally been added to the Ayes over the Maastricht Treaty’. This combination of the sublime and the ridiculous makes this book a great read.

Another recommendation is that, like all good historical books, it puts things into perspective. Few parliamentarians are better known than Edmund Burke (1729–97), the Whig politician who became the ideological godfather of the modern Conservative Party. Burke’s famous theory of representation has been cited ad nauseam by defenders of representative government. Bryant duly quotes the famous lines from Burke’s Speech to the Electors at Bristol at the Conclusion of the Poll in 1774, in which the MP noted that: ‘Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgement; and he betrays instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.’

Far from showing deference to the undoubtedly great man, Bryant goes on to report that at the subsequent election in 1780, ‘he [Burke] came a distant fifth with just 18 [votes]’. To be sure, Burke was not unlike other MPs at the time; he cared little for his constituents. Before the election Burke had said that he would make at least ‘an annual complimentary visit to the constituency’. In 1780, just as the election was starting ‘he had to explain away a four-year absence’. Given that public transport in those days was rather more cumbersome than today, Burke probably had a reasonable excuse. However, his relaxed attitude to the chores of being a constituency MP is certainly in marked contrast to the present-day MP who sometimes is more akin to an overworked case-worker than a legislator.

The book gives a thorough – and sometimes a bit too detailed – account of the chequered evolution of the Westminster Parliament since it was first established by Simon de Montfort in the thirteenth century, through to Oliver Cromwell in the seventeenth
century and all the way up to the demise of Margaret Thatcher. Along the way we are told quirky little details that often puzzle students. For example, Bryant notes *en passant* that the British finance minister – the Chancellor of the Exchequer – ‘is named after a chequered cloth on a large table which was used to make financial calculations’. It is such anecdotes and irrelevant facts that make this book such a good read.

**Matt Qvortrup**  
( Coventry University)


With this book David Denver and Mark Garnett provide a valuable and timely analysis of British general elections since 1964. For the authors, Harold Wilson’s first electoral victory was the point at which specific changes in modern society were most discernible. This observation rightly provides the rationale for disregarding elections immediately following the Second World War. Indeed, popular culture was changing with the emergence of ‘mods’ and ‘rockers’, civil rights movements, the decriminalisation of homosexuality, adoption of a comprehensive education system and the so-called ‘permissive society’, and Britain’s changing relationship with the European Community also meant a new style of political engagement was clear. Therefore, although I would have been interested to see the authors’ analysis of the 1945–59 elections, starting in 1964 is the most appropriate point, given these changes in British politics and society.

More specifically, the authors’ analysis draws out changes in how politicians and the electorate used the media, how social change led to a looser relationship between voters and MPs, and how changes to the electoral system itself have produced changes to the British democratic system. Indeed, the ‘decline’ of British industry and the emergence of financial liberalisation produced a substantially different dynamic between the electorate and politicians, ultimately changing the kind of political message used by Labour and Conservative elites to attract support. This was particularly evident during the 1970s and 1980s.

Each chapter in the book follows a consistent analytical style, thereby enabling it to draw out similar yet changing themes over the period under review. These include events during the relevant Parliament, the issues raised during the campaign and the subsequent election result. This is then followed by a broader discussion of the political impacts of the sociological changes. In this manner, the authors provide an interesting overview of modern British politics.

I would certainly have no hesitation in recommending this book, which will be of clear interest to scholars of British politics. It will also be of value to political sociologists and historians, and it may likewise be of interest to postgraduate students of electoral politics.

**Andrew Scott Crines**  
(University of Leeds)


With the expansion of the franchise in the nineteenth century, authors and playwrights began producing works set in the world of British politics. As a consequence, there is a nearly two-century-long record of how Britons have interpreted politics in fiction. Steven Fielding’s book offers an examination of how British politics has been represented in these works, divining themes that parallel the changing attitudes of the British populace towards the political process and the people who inhabit it.

Contrary to the book’s subtitle, Fielding identifies John Galt’s 1832 novel *The Member* as the first fictional work centred on parliamentary politics. While Fielding credits authors such as Charles Dickens and Benjamin Disraeli with establishing many of the themes for the representation of British politics in fiction, he sees Anthony Trollope’s ‘Palliser’ series as central to the development of the genre – one characterised throughout the nineteenth century by a ‘Parliament worship’ that seems almost quaint today. As franchise expansion reached its climax in the early twentieth century, the tone of fictional works changed, reflecting disillusionment with the political process. Works in which politicians were seen as honourable and decent
continued to be produced well into the post-war era, but by the 1960s an anti-Establishment tone became much more prominent in novels, films and television shows. By the end of the twentieth century, cynicism seemed permanently ingrained within fictional portrayals of British politics, with depictions of politicians and government officials as either hapless, conspiratorial or both being the new norm.

Steven Fielding’s book provides an insightful overview of British political fiction, albeit one that takes an idiosyncratic approach to its subject. His focus is on British fiction after 1945, with the consequence that earlier works get short shrift. The television series ‘Yes, Minister’, for example, receives more attention than the entire body of Victorian novels Fielding regards as foundational. This allows him to bypass continuities that complicate his argument: the scheming George Vavasor, for example, would hardly be out of place in a political novel today. Nor does Fielding offer any support for his assertion, which bookends his text, that the works he describes shaped how the British regard politics. While a provocative claim, he provides no evidence that these works did anything more than mirror pre-existing popular perceptions. Such over-reaching detracts from what is otherwise a useful and entertaining book; one with a good deal of useful analysis on how the British have interpreted politics over time.

Mark Klobas
(Scottsdale Community College, Arizona)


In this book, Vincent Geoghegan explores the political thought of Common Wealth, the British political movement which, for a brief period in the 1940s, presented perhaps the best organised left-wing electoral opposition to the wartime coalition. In particular, he examines the ideas of four key figures in the movement: the philosopher John Macmurray, the writer Kenneth Ingram, the science fiction writer and philosopher Olaf Stapledon, and the formerly Liberal (and subsequently Labour) MP Sir Richard Acland. Of these, Macmurray is perhaps the best known today, thanks largely to Tony Blair’s (rather shaky) claim to have been strongly influenced by his ideas; Stapledon and Ingram have possibly rather niche followings, among students of science fiction and of gay history, respectively; while Acland, the youngest of the four (he died only in 1990) had a long but perhaps somewhat peripheral post-war career in Parliament and then in education. What connects them intellectually, as Geoghegan shows, is that while only three of them (not Stapledon) described themselves as in one sense or another Christian, all four brought a religious sensibility to their thinking and sought to make Common Wealth a vehicle for a politics informed in varying ways by religious values.

In this, as in other ways, Common Wealth was very much of its time. Religion, and specifically Christianity, was directly or indirectly a significant influence on elements of the British progressive politics of the 1940s. Even before Common Wealth had been officially founded, Acland and Ingram had made effective contributions to the Malvern Conference, organised by Archbishop William Temple in 1941. Yet Common Wealth was not purely or perhaps even mainly a Christian Socialist movement, as Geoghegan makes vividly clear when he moves, in his last chapter, from the ideas of his chosen thinkers to the intellectual and institutional history of the movement. In the circumstances of the wartime party truce, Common Wealth allowed voters to express a desire for change. As such, it attracted a broad range of support, and while many had been attracted to it as an avowedly moral movement, others – notably the Marxists Tom and Kitty Wintringham – were violently opposed to this tendency. Geoghegan covers this dispute extensively and instructively. And this, perhaps, is where the intellectual history of Common Wealth remains most relevant. In a post-secular society, what is the place of religion in political thought? Geoghegan offers no answers but ably and memorably illuminates the question.

Andrew Connell
(Independent Scholar)


David Judge’s Democratic Incongruities is a timely intervention in the debate surrounding British democracy that often feels to be getting more complicated by the
minute. Judge seeks to guide readers through a number of what he refers to as ‘concerns’, both in the sense of ‘a matter of importance and interest’ but also as ‘matters of anxiety and unease’ (p. vii), relating to the state of modern British politics. His two main arguments are as follows. First, Judge takes issue with recent reconceptualisations of representative democracy that have a more participatory, or direct, flavour, arguing that this is likely to lead to instability in the legitimation provided by the traditional electoral mode of participation at the same time as reducing the effect of these new non-electoral modes of participation. Second, and related, he highlights the problems faced by modern unmediated forms of participation, such as online tools, as they inevitably become tangled within the traditional electoral forms that predated them (forms of mediated participation). He locates these discussions within an eloquent critique of the ‘Westminster model’, asking the truly fundamental question of how a supposedly failing system can continue to legitimate the activities of government.

Judge tackles these questions with clarity, each chapter working both as part of the whole argument and equally as a stand-alone consideration of the specific ‘problem’ under scrutiny. Moving from the problem of the people, he proceeds to consider the problem of how power can be effectively transmitted through representation, to the problems of elected representatives, representative government and citizen participation, before finally turning to face the problems of ‘post-’ in the sense of ‘post-representative’, ‘post-parliamentary’ and ‘post-democracy’. Judge offers a relatively sceptical view of much of this work and asserts that many of the supposed alterations or supplements to elected representative democracy essentially do not alter the fact that the ‘standard account’ of representative democracy serves ‘as the ideational frame’ that ‘continues to structure official discourse’ (p. 192). Throughout, Judge does not seek to argue for a particular direction that British democracy should be taking, but is instead fastidious in highlighting the contradictions and incongruities that lie in many of the contentions of those who do. The book raises more questions than answers in many ways, but will remain a fine contribution to Judge’s existing writings on the subject of representation.

Peter Allen
(Queen Mary University of London)


A Lewis Minkin book is an event. Minkin is the foremost observer – often of the participant variety – of the British Labour Party’s relationship with its affiliated trade unions. This is his third book on Labour since 1978, and like the others, it is a blockbuster, running to over 800 pages. Such academic works are rarer in the era of the Research Excellence Framework, but when the writer is as informed as Minkin, their rarity makes them a treat. Minkin’s previous books provided a wealth of fine-grained detail that informed other writers’ work, and this one will too. It examines the internal party management of Tony Blair’s New Labour and it takes on the argument that Blair remoulded the party in his image. Minkin argues that the party, on the whole, changed little, but that Blair and his allies behaved like Bolsheviks, forming a knot of determined plotters to undertake a ‘rolling coup’ in their quest to change Labour’s image and make it electable. Managerial techniques are dissected and illustrated by revealing anecdotes (Minkin was directly involved in this book’s events). His narrative is unsurprisingly partisan and deeply critical of Blair’s party management, which Minkin feels was heavy-handed and manipulative, and took Labour too far from its roots. But the mountains of factual evidence, described even-handedly by Minkin, enable the reader to reach an independent view.

Minkin’s claim that the party itself did not fundamentally change appears true from the way it quickly abandoned New Labour on returning to opposition in 2010. His critique of the Blairites might, though, have been tempered by a consideration of the more general trend to the ascendancy of the party in public office, of which New Labour was an exemplar. The book sheds light on Blair’s relationship with the trade unions, often caricatured as outright mutual hostility. He shows that the unions were not always obstructionist and how Blair eventually saw the value of cutting deals with union leaders – an old habit of past Labour leaders. However, the old conventions of the relationship were perhaps more strained than Minkin acknowledges. He questions the extent or significance of the politicisation of funding by union donors in 2002, but it was unique.
in Labour’s history. This new assertive attitude led directly to arguably the most significant union intervention in Labour’s internal affairs in the party’s history when they delivered the leadership to Ed Miliband in 2010. However, differences of interpretation cannot detract from Minkin’s achievement in writing another book that will help Labour researchers for years to come.

Tom Quinn (University of Essex)


This book is a collection of essays on modern Wales. According to the author, Welsh history has been characterised by two themes: conflict and consensus. On the one hand, the evolving idea of Welsh national identity has produced conflict with the UK. On the other, the Welsh voters’ tendency to support the Liberal Party of Lloyd George and later the Labour Party has integrated Wales with the rest of the UK. Thus a UK party system based on common cleavages developed through functional differentiation and mass politicisation.

For Kenneth Morgan, although there has always been little support for Welsh independence, a distinct Welsh national identity has persisted. The Young Wales movement set the stage for the development of Welsh nationalism. From its inception, Welsh nationalism was non-violent and obtained its political victories through the ballot box. It was never able, however, to achieve home rule. Nationalism clashed against the other force in Welsh politics – the socialist and trade union movement – which emphasised class and central planning. Between 1920 and 1990, Wales was one of the electoral bastions of the Labour Party, grounded upon the policies of centralist planning and nationalisation of heavy industries.

Most recently, the rise of Scottish nationalism prompted Labour to revise many of its policies and to move away from post-war central planning. The reforms of Tony Blair’s government of political devolution interrupted a long phase of political stability for Wales. For Morgan, the Labour Party and Wales now face a protracted period of political instability, largely as a result of the Scottish referendum. The main parties have committed to further devolution for Scotland and this will likely encourage the Welsh Assembly also to request more autonomy. This shift by Welsh Labour towards a more localist vision of democratic socialism, first articulated by party founder Keir Hardie in 1910, presents some massive challenges. On the one hand, it might produce a very different, less centralist UK. On the other, it could deprive Wales of the traditional policy tools to stage an economic comeback after the closure of the coal mines and the steelworks.

Will a more pluralist and less centralist UK help or hinder Wales’ recovery? Will nationalism eventually overtake Welsh Labour? Will conflict ultimately prevail over consensus? The author believes that further devolution will produce a more effective Welsh government. But having three separate bodies for the National Health Service or economic development agencies might not only reduce the capacity of these essential government agencies, but increase the number of public-sector employees.

Paolo Morisi (Independent Scholar)


There are four main reasons why this is a remarkable monograph. First, it aims explicitly at both importing and developing the continental tradition of analysis of the constitutional norms defining and governing the socio-economic system (i.e. the economic constitution). Second, the book provides a systematic, updated and synthetic exposition of the British economic constitution, and in particular of taxation and borrowing, public expenditure, monetary policy, regulation of financial services, industrial policy and public procurement norms. Third, it combines meticulous attention to the formal content of norms with sociological and politological attentiveness to law in action (including the networks of interaction among key actors). Fourth, the author has made a major effort to include reflections on the changes that have occurred since the financial crisis of 2008. The book provides a wealth of detail on the ways British law and practice has changed, including the redefinition of fiscal rules, the transformation of the roles played by the Treasury and the Central
Bank, and the new ways in which EU and British law and politics have interplayed (and eventually clashed).

The aim of presenting a fully updated picture of the British economic constitution is, however, both an obvious strength and a major weakness of the book. To make sense of the changes, the author is occasionally forced to expose at length the law both as it stood before and as it stands after the crisis – something which does not make for easy reading (because rapid and constant legal reform has made of the law an ugly muddle, see especially the chapters on monetary policy and on financial services). Perhaps a more systematic use of cross-references would have been of help in this regard (especially between the institutional chapters [Chapters 2 and 3] and the policy field chapters [Chapters 4–9]). Moreover, the ambition of providing an updated account of the economic constitution is bound to prove an impossible task given the speed at which it has been changing in recent years. Finally, the author’s claim that the ‘neo-constitutionalist’ thesis according to which the European and British constitutions predetermine substantive economic policy (pp. 10 and 240–1) is an over-statement; it would have been much more convincing if the book had dealt with the substantive, and not mainly the procedural, British (and European) economic constitution.

Agustín José Menéndez
(University of León and Arena Oslo)

Against the Grain: The British Far Left from 1956 by Evan Smith and Matthew Worley (eds).
Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014. 272pp., £75.00, ISBN 978 0 7190 9590 0

The far left in Britain – communism, Trotskyism and anarchism – has been the subject of relatively little academic research. One reason may be the view that their dismal electoral performance renders them uninteresting, but the editors of this volume argue persuasively that the far left has been influential in voicing dissent from mainstream political positions and in building or supporting social movements to articulate that dissent. The most compelling evidence for this claim stems from the role of the Trotskyist movement in creating two kinds of social movement. These were the anti-war movements of the 1960s and 2000s: the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and the Stop the War Coalition, respectively, both of which mobilised hundreds of thousands of protestors. Over the same period, Trotskyists were also active in initiating anti-racist campaigns – most notably the Anti-Nazi League, which was one of the most successful British social movements. At its height, it comprised over 40,000 members in 250 branches, easily dwarfing its less impressive successors Anti-Fascist Action and Unite Against Fascism. Three chapters in the book argue that these organisations were relatively successful in curtailing the spread of far-right organisations such as the National Front, British National Party and the English Defence League. Individual Trotskyists played a major role in all of these organisations, and they did so with the explicit approval, and often at the instigation of, their parent organisations.

On the other hand, other chapters show that Trotskyist organisations struggled to come to terms with the women’s and gay rights movements. The main reason is that feminist and gay activists in groups such as the International Socialists often demanded a degree of autonomy that clashed with the highly centralised organisational structures favoured by Trotskyists. The Communist Party (CPGB) appears to have been more open to the influence of ‘new social movements’, but its positive engagement with women and gay activists was soon overwhelmed by the bitter inner-party struggles of the 1980s prior to the CPGB’s dissolution in 1991. Other chapters on the CPGB throw new light on the factionalism within the organisation, undermining the idea that splits and divisions are peculiar to the Trotskyist movement.

Overall this is a very valuable, path-breaking study of a neglected, but significant facet of British political culture.

John Kelly
(Birkbeck, University of London)

Europe


Is coming to terms with the past an absolute prerequisite for a successful political transition? Following Franco’s death in 1975, the linchpin of the Spanish
democratic self-reformation was a voluntary and stubbornly unwritten agreement among the political elites to repress memory and to forget the past: no truth commissions, no massive trials or apologies. Only a collective silence imposed upon the victims of the Civil War and the implacable Francoist regime that followed for nearly four decades. By reassessing the Spanish negotiated political transition, Omar Encarnación provocatively suggests that a political solution that abridges and thus delays justice against an authoritarian regime might be sometimes preferable to a compliant diet of enthusiastic acclamations about the virtues of remembering at all costs.

In seven well-written and detailed chapters, Encarnación reassesses the context and rationale of the Pact of Forgetting (Chapters 1 and 2), tracing the challenges and consequences of sustaining this voluntary political agreement to not remember rather than to pursue public reconciliation (Chapters 3 and 4). He then examines how the international reactions and the intensity of political debates in Spain, following the controversial decision to issue an arrest warrant for Chilean General Pinochet, shattered the Pact of Forgetting and forced Spain finally to confront its past (Chapter 5). This was the prelude to the implementation of the 2007 Law of Historical Memory that Encarnación discusses in Chapter 6. He reminds us that historical and political contextualisation is crucial and that, consequently, a transition to democracy is never straightforward (Chapter 7).

However, while Encarnación clearly aims to challenge the transitional justice literature, he does not engage with it in a sustained manner. This is unfortunate as transitional justice is a recent field of study and already in transition itself. Had he done so, his work might have been even more of a hindrance to any mechanistic understanding of democratic transition that one might find in that literature.

Perhaps a more crucial point is the hasty conception of democratic legitimacy which Encarnación tends to endorse in his book. A more theoretically engaged understanding would have strengthened his argument. Nonetheless, Encarnación’s historical assessment of the Spanish politics of forgetting and his rejection of the fixity of transitional justice studies are convincing. *Democracy without Justice in Spain* is a timely work and a must-read for anyone interested in the complexity of contemporary Spain and the still delicate and open question of democratisation and reconciliation.

Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet
(University of Manchester)


A well-established literature on performance voting at national elections suggests that when voters hold governments responsible for economic problems, they vote to ‘throw the rascals out’. Because it lacks a clearly identifiable ‘government’, there are good reasons to suspect performance voting in the EU might be different. *Blaming Europe* by Sara Hobolt and James Tilley sets out to examine whether voters do blame the EU for problems facing their countries, if they do so accurately, how blame is attributed by the media and politicians, and ultimately how this affects voting behaviour at European Parliament (EP) elections.

Hobolt and Tilley present their case with admirable clarity and concision, using a rich variety of evidence from surveys, experiments and content analysis of media coverage and political speeches. They find that voters hold the EU responsible for certain policy areas and that these attributions broadly reflect the reality of the EU’s role in these areas. However, not all voters attribute responsibility equally well: accuracy is influenced by political knowledge, prior attitudes towards the EU and the quality of information available. On the whole, the media does not provide the information necessary for accurate responsibility attributions: although it does pay attention to EU politics, the media – particularly television – tends to focus on ‘horse race’ aspects of EU politics, such as the EP elections, rather than policy matters. Although they rarely try to shift blame onto the EU, politicians also muddy the waters by using the EU to diffuse responsibility for policy problems. Finally, Hobolt and Tilley examine what effect responsibility attributions have on voting behaviour and find that because of the absence of a strong link between the European Parliament and EU policy output, ‘performance voting’ is essentially non-existent at EP elections.

© 2015 The Authors. Political Studies Review © 2015 Political Studies Association
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Blaming Europe is an important and timely work that is likely to set the agenda for academic analysis of EP elections. It will also be of value to those interested in attributions of responsibility more generally: the combination of the institutionalist ‘clarity of responsibility’ paradigm with work on psychological biases in responsibility attributions is an innovative and significant contribution to the broader literature. The issues it raises are not just academic because the absence of performance voting in the EU has serious implications for the democratic legitimacy of the EU. Without an electoral mechanism to ‘throw the rascals out’, blaming Europe leads to a decrease in trust for EU institutions. Only time will tell how this will affect long-term public support for the EU and, ultimately, the success of European integration.

Christopher Prosser
(University of Oxford)


The editors frame this book in terms of a simple question: Why is it that social democracy seems to have been one of the principal victims of the giant failure of its opponent liberalism in 2008? The authors in this book, mostly well-known figures in European political science, ask and answer most of the big questions relevant to understanding the plight and prospects of social democracy. The approaches are usually broad-brush political economy or electoral studies. The authors mostly have a special interest in the social democrats’ own agency and situation rather than comparisons to other parties (e.g. Christian democrats), more systematic or country-specific political economy or a longer historical perspective.

Among the lessons to be drawn are: First, the abstract arguments for social democratic policies are just as good as the better known abstract arguments for liberalism. Second, only the Nordic countries actually ever seem to achieve living social democracy (Rothstein and Steimmo’s emphasis). Third, social democratic parties themselves are in serious trouble, even by the standards of old cartel parties, as the editors’ exhaustive survey of party fortunes shows.

Their problems are something more than the swings of an electoral pendulum. Vachudova’s chapter brings new data to bear on their situation in central Europe, and Martin Rhodes’ fine chapter on the political economy of social democratic coalitions suggests that the survival strategies of social democratic parties have involved policies that undermine their long-term social bases. Fourth, it is unclear whether there is public support for more social democratic policies, even in Nordic countries. Fifth, it is not clear whether meaningful social democratic projects are possible in the current political economy of the EU; the structures of capitalism and of the EU itself seem unhelpful.

From this book’s arguments it seems there is nothing wrong with the project of social democracy, but the parties that support it are in big trouble. Between decaying social coalitions, a general loss of support for established parties, a putatively constraining world economy and a clearly constraining institutional framework in Europe, it is hard to see how the parties discussed here could win power and do much. Pessimistically, the book invites historical interrogation – for example, did social democracy outside Scandinavia always depend on the threat of communism as an alternative? More optimistically, it invites the reader to look for potential future social democratic class coalitions.

Scott Greer
(University of Michigan)


This book, edited by Sandra Kröger, has the ambitious goal of examining the multifaceted issue of how the representation process functions in the EU. The book is structured around thirteen chapters gathered in three different parts that analyse different aspects of the topic. The first part is devoted to electoral forms of representation, with a study of the actors that are more or less involved in the electoral process. The second part focuses on non-electoral forms and examines some peculiar actors and features of the representative process at the EU level. In the last part, Beate Kohler-Koch and Dario Castiglione present a critical review of the various chapters and sketch some reflections about
the concept of ‘representation in a multilevel system’ and the current stage of studies in this field of research.

The book engages with a fundamental topic for the EU’s future and it analyses this in a very original way through three main themes: the actors who are involved in the representation process; the different levels of representation and how they are related; and how the European system is legally and institutionally structured in order to represent citizens. To achieve these goals, the authors focus on the two main axes of representation: the channels used to represent, and the different levels on which citizens can be represented.

What emerges from the contributions is that the peculiarity of the supranational system of representation is mainly the high variety of formal and informal channels of representation that intertwine on different levels (supranational, national or even regional).

Another asset of the book is the fact that every chapter deals with the impact that the financial and economic crisis has had on the development of the representation system. Independently, each of the authors seems to agree that this crisis has amplified the democratic deficit, the lack of transparency and the inefficiency of the EU’s representative institutions. What has emerged over the last years is the enforcement of the technocratic options and an even stronger depoliticisation of European issues. As outlined in the chapter by Kohler-Koch, the main limitation of the book is probably its difficulty in providing a systemic view of the representation process in the EU in order to show how all these different features are connected to one another and how they work together.

In conclusion, Political Representation in the European Union is of particular interest for those scholars who are devoted to the study of European integration, representation studies and political theory.

Eugenio Salvati
(University of Pavia)


A very timely title by Ulrich Krotz and Joachim Schild has appeared right at the festive moment of celebrating the semi-centennial anniversary of Europe’s indispensible bilateralism, which intriguingly overlapped with yet another testing moment of the bilateral bond’s resilience and the influence of Franco-German politics on European integration.

Although a recurrent topic in public and academic debates, Franco-German relations have, until now, lacked an all-encompassing academic account. By crafting an integrative model, Krotz and Schild successfully deliver an account that manages ‘to uncover and grasp the reality of a special bilateral order and to explain France and Germany’s vital, though uneven, impact on European integration across political domains and time’ (p. 234). This bi-component analytical model of ‘embedded bilateralism’ is disclosed in two discernible parts of the book. Following the expounded theoretical framework, the first part casts an inward perspective by conceptualising the Franco-German bilateral order through the tripartite fabric of regularised intergovernmentalism, symbolic acts and practices, and parapublic underpinnings. Drawing on empirical implications of Franco-German bilateralism at the regional level, an outward perspective, presented in the second part of the book, convincingly traces the imprint of two states in shaping the European polity and policies themselves. This part holds the authors’ main argument: even if finding a common position might not be a sufficient condition for an ever greater Europe, the Franco-German input is a necessary condition for progress in European integration, for ultimately ‘nothing goes without and nothing against France and Germany’ (p. 242; emphasis in the original).

The flamboyant analytical perspective is deftly developed through the seminal blend of rich empirical evidence and theoretical novelty in Krotz and Schild’s idea of ‘embedded bilateralism’, which confirms this book as an outstanding political science and IR account. With the notion of ‘embedded bilateralism’, Krotz and Schild seem to have found the right words to illustrate what ‘motor’, ‘locomotive’, ‘axis’, ‘tandem’, ‘core’ and other terms have attempted to do.

With their skilful mapping of arguments, distinctive approach and precision about the conceptual apparatus, as well as the theoretically integrative ability of the concept of ‘embedded bilateralism’, Krotz and Schild have produced an excellent account on Franco-German relations in the context of European integration. Although it is regrettably disputable
whether ‘embedded bilateralism’ can become a fully exportable and functional model applicable to, e.g. German-Polish or Franco-British relations, *Shaping Europe* is beyond doubt a field-impacting academic piece and a must-read for students of Franco-German relations as well as a broader readership interested in the patterns of European integration, past and present.

Andriy Tyushka  
(College of Europe, Natolin Campus)


It is rare to read a book that is entertaining as well as enlightening. Fernando Mendez, Mario Mendez and Vasiliki Triga’s monograph *Referendums and the European Union: A Comparative Inquiry* is such a book. Thorough, insightful and with details that go far beyond the topic of referendums on European integration, this book is a good introduction to the timely issue of referendums in general. In addition to an historical overview of the institution, the authors provide relevant contextual information and give the reader an insight into the political developments that led to the holding of referendums in the EU countries.

The main recommendation for this book is that it provides an interesting overview of the constitutional provisions for holding referendums. This may sound like dry legalism, but the authors are able to make constitutional theory interesting through historical examples that add context to the otherwise rather dreary study of articles and paragraphs. The book also discusses referendums in other federal systems such as Canada and Australia, and provides a whole new perspective on EU referendums that has been lacking in the hitherto rather Eurocentric research on these plebiscites. That the book also addresses issues pertaining to political and democratic theory – and argues that voters now are able to make informed decisions – means this book is an impressive and erudite contribution to a growing body of literature.

One might have wished for a greater use of advanced statistical modelling, and one might also have wished for a more detailed account of why political leaders want to submit issues to referendums that could back-fire. True, Mendez et al. do touch upon the ‘logic of appropriateness’, previously discussed in the literature, and there are attempts to explain the occurrence of referendums on the basis that parties’ consensus on EU matters. Still, it is not entirely clear when or indeed why politicians who normally seek to maximise power are willing to heed the voice of the people. This, however, is of minor importance and the authors provide references to further reading that could answer the questions in the book.

This is the kind of book that connoisseurs – or anoraks – like this reviewer enjoy. It is remarkable because it provides both an introduction to the political science of referendums and direct democracy, and adds to our knowledge of the role and function of referendums for the EU. It is warmly recommended.

Matt Qvortrup  
(Coventry University)


*Politics in Private* focuses on how political affiliations and beliefs impact on intimate relationships; the way in which ‘politics is refracted in the intimate circle and in relationships based on feeling’ (p. 2).

The book is exploratory and inductive in nature. It categorises intimate political interaction into ‘figures’ (p. 3) of agreement or disagreement, including ‘osmosis’ (p. 31), ‘chilli pepper’ (p. 81), ‘political eros’ (p. 49) and ‘taboo’ (p. 137). Each figure’s core facets are informed by, and illustrated through, the analysis of qualitative feedback from interviews conducted within French society. However, the potential universality of the conclusions and arguments made is apparent to the reader. Politics, love, passion, the forbidden, agreement and disagreement and the interactions of these concepts form the nucleus of the analysis.

As one would expect from an exploratory text, the conclusions are tentative. The author warns the reader against under-estimating the mysteries of love or believing that the relationship between love and politics is a straightforward one. However, three conclu-
sions are discussed with some certainty. The first is that ‘[political] agreement and disagreement do not affect different types of love in the same way’ (p. 181). The second is that, ‘arguments over politics do not have the same impact depending on what they are about’ (p. 181). Finally, the author concludes, convincingly, that ‘[on the political left] the quest for agreement within the bounds of a relationship based on feeling is far more marked than elsewhere’ (p. 182).

The book is well-written and the short chapters complement the in-depth, enticing analysis they contain. The book perhaps over-eggs its ‘non-conventional approach’ (p. 3) and the reader may also question the superlative nature of the statement that ‘there is no more interesting or diverse country than France to study how our political opinions influence the variety of relationships we engage in throughout our lifetimes’ (rear cover). Moreover, despite ‘very little work’ (p. 2) existing on the same subject, greater emphasis could have been given to Robert Lane’s 1965 work *Political Life* and perhaps even the Hanisch-esque *personal is political* feminist literature from the 1960s onwards. However, these are minor issues in the context of the whole book. The reader, whether a professor of politics or a keen generalist of any discipline, will recognise the academic sophistication of this study and the passion with which it was pursued.

Mark Rice
(Independent Scholar)

Integrating Indifference: A Comparative, Qualitative and Quantitative Approach to the Legitimacy of European Integration by Virginie Van Ingelgom. Colchester: ECPR Press, 2014. 236pp., £27.00, ISBN 978 1 9073 0148 3

In her award-winning dissertation, Virginie Van Ingelgom rejects the conventional wisdom that the post-Maastricht evolution of orientations towards the EU can be reduced to an increase in Euroscepticism. Instead, she focuses on the rising importance of indifferent and ambivalent attitudes that have been largely overlooked by empirical research. Applying a mixed-methods approach, her central contribution consists in adding qualitative findings to a field dominated by quantitative work.

After extensively reviewing the existing literature on public opinion towards European integration, Van Ingelgom conducts several quantitative analyses using Eurobarometer survey data. First, by analysing the distributional pattern of attitudes over time in terms of variance and kurtosis, she questions the widely shared belief that the EU’s increased visibility after Maastricht has led to more polarised public opinion. Second, she underlines that the distinction between a permissive consensus before Maastricht and a constraining dissensus thereafter is an incomplete description. Finally, she shows that undecided and indifferent citizens possess distinct characteristics and that their number is on the rise.

The main part of the book deals with qualitative analyses of group interviews conducted in 2005–6. The author identifies three types of reactions towards EU issues: ambivalence caused by uncertainty and perceived lack of knowledge; indifference by feeling distant to politics; and indifference by fatalism, provoked by a feeling of being unable to have an influence on European decisions. In her conclusion, Van Ingelgom discusses the consequences of these reactions for the EU’s legitimacy and assumes that European integration in the post-Maastricht era has led to a form of ‘tacit acceptance’ that echoes the old permissive consensus model.

Overall, the author deserves praise for her well-structured and easily readable book. By re-introducing the notions of ‘indifference’ and ‘indecision’ into the studies of attitudes towards the EU, she shows that rising Euroscepticism is not the only prevailing trend and that the politicisation of European issues has led to increased ambivalence. Her results reveal not only the social characteristics and political attitudes of indifferent and undecided citizens, but also their motivational backgrounds. Finally, the author demonstrates how quantitative and qualitative methods can be combined to understand better a highly relevant, yet widely ignored issue.

However, the theoretical framework of the book is somewhat under-developed. There is no theoretical discussion on the concepts of ‘indifference’ and ‘ambivalence’, let alone the differences between the two. The outcome is a lack of theoretical expectations and research hypotheses before conducting the empirical analysis which consequently stays at a highly exploratory level. Nevertheless, Integrating Indifference
has surely advanced the scientific debate in public opinion on European integration.

Constantin Schäfer
(University of Mannheim)

The Americas


De la Torre and Arnson’s edited volume is one of the most interesting additions to the rich and continuously expanding literature on populism. Their focus is set on contemporary populist movements, political parties and leaders in contemporary Latin America, covering the cases of Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia and Colombia, and drawing interesting comparisons with the ‘classical’ populism(s) of the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s, while devoting enough space to more general contributions and theoretical reflections around populism. Leaving the general theoretical and methodological framework of the volume open for their contributors, they manage to produce an interesting ensemble of diverse approaches to the populist phenomenon, reflecting, in this way, the persistent controversy on the very meaning and significance of ‘populism’ among academics and commentators. The different axes of analysis that one immediately discerns are political economy, institutions, political strategy and discourse. The outcome is a well-balanced critical understanding of Latin American populism in its extreme variability, taking into account its inclusive, egalitarian, redistributive and, in a sense, democratising aspects, while being alert, at the same time, to authoritarian and anti-democratic tendencies that are usually closely linked to very powerful and charismatic individuals.

Perhaps one of the few shortcomings of the volume is the way in which the relation between populism and democracy is treated by the editors and some of the contributors since democracy seems to be reduced to its modern liberal variant (see e.g. pp. 5–6 and 20), neglecting other possible conceptions of democracy, or even classic elaborations in democratic theory that challenge the very ‘democratic’ nature of liberal democratic polities themselves (e.g. Dahl’s notion and critique of ‘polyarchy’). This, I’m afraid, is a reductive logic that one finds in many of the current studies on populism and democracy, and especially the ones that focus on European cases; a logic that limits the scope of our understanding of democracy in all its paradoxes and possible articulations. However, De la Torre and Arnson’s reflexive re-reading of the basic arguments of the volume in their concluding chapter remedies this shortcoming, establishing a fruitful internal dialogue within the volume, and it opens the field to new questions and hypotheses for future research.

To conclude, this is a book that will be of interest to researchers of Latin American politics and also to those with a more general interest in the investigation of the populist phenomenon in a comparative perspective. Indeed, it is a must-read for both younger students and experienced academics because it manages to combine its informative aspects with concrete and in-depth theoretical and empirical analysis.

Giorgos Katsambekis
(Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)

Evo’s Bolivia: Continuity and Change by Linda C. Farthing and Benjamin H. Kohl. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2014. 272pp., £35.00, ISBN 978 0 2927 5727 1

Evo’s Bolivia: Continuity and Change by Linda Farthing and the late Benjamin Kohl is an eloquently written and timely work. It is an effort to explain and contextualise the presidency of Bolivia’s first indigenous leader, Evo Morales, who has been in power since January 2006. The book, according to the authors, focuses exclusively on the Morales presidency and seeks to examine the most pressing themes in contemporary Bolivia in light of the authors’ social progressivist approach (p. ix). In the first three chapters, the authors seek to ground the importance of studying Bolivia now as well as introducing the readers to the culture and the historical context in terms of how Morales was able to take power.

Chapter 4 looks at the reforms of the state and the emphasis on indigenous rights. In Chapters 5 and 6 the book deals with the changes introduced in the economy and how they influenced social, education and health policy in order to meet the objectives of
providing people with the right to ‘live well’ (p. 98). The later chapters examine the problematique surrounding land and territory as well as the cultural importance of coca leaf and the link to drug trafficking. The last chapter makes a valiant attempt to look at what lies ahead for Bolivia.

The authors’ aim of striking a delicate balance between depth of subject and ease of understanding is largely accomplished. At times, however, the ease of understanding component leads them to simplify too much the complex reality taking place in the country. Methodologically, the authors succeed in solidly backing their arguments through a considerable number of interviews within politics and civil society. This lends credibility to their analysis and the ensuing interpretations of the country’s recent history.

On the other hand, because the authors approach their analysis from a particular angle – i.e. social progressivism – they seem susceptible to taking a side. In fact, Chapters 2 and 3, in particular, give the impression that the authors try to justify (rather than explain) the arrival of Morales in power. Finally, a major weakness is the insufficient critical attention paid to the often observed authoritarian tendencies of the Morales government on issues of civil and political rights. The Morales government has been increasingly criticised for some actions against critical media outlets, the political persecution against elected and non-elected leaders of the opposition, the use of state resources in his re-election campaigns and the many corruption charges against many of his closest allies.

Miguel A. Buitrago
(University of Hamburg and Leuphana University of Lüneburg)


As one of the main energy consumers worldwide, whatever happens in the US affects not only the global energy markets, but also global energy geopolitics and international climate politics. Michael Levi’s book is a practical guide for jumping into the current debates on America’s energy future.

By immersing the reader into the two ongoing energy revolutions – the boom of unconventional oil and gas, and the development of renewable energy sources – Levi disentangles the challenges and opportunities that the different alternatives for America’s energy future might present. In this regard, one of the author’s main merits is that he thinks across the economic, security and environmental aspects of the debate. It is the book’s main argument that, in spite of traditional thinking, both revolutions (unconventional resources and renewable energy) can and should be pursued simultaneously. Levi’s argument is not only supported by a strong economic rationality, but also with an in-depth knowledge of American politics and by a first-hand understanding of the societal debates thanks to the massive fieldwork that the author carried out.

Written in a manner accessible to the broader public (not only for energy experts), this book will be of interest for scholars working on areas such as energy, climate and industrial policies. It will be particularly useful for academics working on American energy policy, but also for those social scientists who want to understand better the links between the economic, environmental and social challenges regarding the energy future for America – or indeed for any other developed country. A particular strength of this contribution is its attempt to present the two sides of the coin regarding the current debates on energy policy.

With all that being said, any scholar using this volume should be aware of two shortcomings. First, when thinking about the energy future, this book is based on the predominant liberal economic thinking where goals such as economic growth are still uncontested (in contrast to the growing popularity of alternative economic perspectives). Related to this, the book does not consider the possibility that energy resources (either conventional or renewable) can be treated as a common good (not merely subject to profit and gain). In other words, the author’s conclusions are determined by his liberal thinking. Nonetheless, it is a much-needed contribution for following the current debates on how the energy future will look.

Israel Solorio Sandoval
(Freie Universität Berlin)

This book offers a critical analysis of the significance of nuclear weapons and their implications for the current international system. Thomas Nichols focuses in particular on the impact of nuclear weapons on the evolution of US nuclear doctrine and national security in the post-Cold War period.

As underlined by the author, some scholars and policy makers believed that the demise of the Soviet Union marked the end of concerns related to a nuclear confrontation between the two superpowers and also of the strategic and symbolic nature of nuclear weapons. Some policy makers and non-proliferation experts supported proposals for the reduction of nuclear arsenals by the US and other countries, while others called for a world free from nuclear weapons. Despite the growing optimism that characterised the early 1990s and the lively debates on non-proliferation, nuclear arms are still ‘a routine part of the lives of great powers’ (p. xi).

The book is divided into four parts. Chapter 1 provides a detailed historical background of the role and the concepts that influenced US nuclear strategies from 1950 to 1990. Chapter 2 focuses on the post-Cold War period, describing American attempts to revise its nuclear strategy and to make it more adequate to face new challenges. Chapter 3 highlights the advantages deriving from a revision of US nuclear strategy around the concept of ‘minimum nuclear deterrence’. The final section explores the dilemma of how to deal with small states’ nuclear aspirations.

Thomas M. Nichols is a professor at the Naval War College and an eminent expert on non-proliferation and arms control. His extensive knowledge on this subject makes this study one of the most accurate accounts on non-proliferation and on the evolution of American nuclear strategy. No Use represents an interesting and useful read for students new to the discipline of nuclear history and IR who want to learn more about the role played by these strategic weapons and the various concepts that have influenced American nuclear doctrine. It is also of interest to scholars and practitioners.

Francesca Silvestri (University of Nottingham)


Christopher Parker and Matt Barreto set out to understand, from a social-psychological perspective, what leads people to sympathise with the Tea Party (p. 3). Their work intends to be original mainly on two counts: first, contrary to previous literature, it focuses on sympathisers – not activists or members. Second, it presents a theoretical explanation that goes beyond the two common views about the movement, those according to which support either stems from traditional conservative ideology, or comes from intolerance and racism. The authors argue that Tea Partiers have a vision of the ‘real America’ identified as ‘white, middle-class, middle-aged, Christian, heterosexual, mostly male’ (p. 35), and have reacted with fear and anxiety to the feeling that this country is changing – a change symbolised by the election of Barack Obama to the Presidency (p. 36). With this theoretical background in hand, data from two large telephone surveys are used to study the position of Tea Party sympathisers on various fronts, including perception of minorities (mostly illegal immigrants and the LGBT community), patriotism, liberty and evaluations of Obama. Their evidence is solid in showing that, even after controlling for several alternative explanations, sympathy for the Tea Party remains a significant predictor of negative feelings towards out-groups, opposition to minority rights, strong dislike for Obama and belief in conspiracies involving the President (pp. 129–31, 147–8, 183–5 and 216).

While this is the most comprehensive assessment of Tea Party sympathisers to date, the book fails to argue convincingly for the theoretical innovation it proposes. The results do indicate that there is something specific to the Tea Party that differentiates it from the general public and also from traditional conservatism. They also confirm that racism, social dominance and authoritarianism on their own are not enough to explain, for instance, the negativity against minority groups by some of the Tea Party’s supporters. However, no evidence is actually provided to sustain that this ‘something specific’ is indeed fear and anxiety over one’s country slipping away, or per-
ceived threat of a group losing its social power. The psychological constructs that form the theory’s foundation – fear, anxiety and reaction against change – are not tested on the public. In the end, we are left knowing how Tea Party support differs from mainstream conservatism, but not why. Still, the authors bring together a large and original amount of data on beliefs and attitudes associated with sympathy for this movement, making the book a worthwhile read.

Bruno Castanho Silva
(Central European University)


Richard Valelly’s book consists of ten short chapters focusing on the core elements of American politics. The first five chapters focus on the three branches of government. Chapter 1 introduces US democracy and democratic benchmarks as well as failures in the democratic system. The focus of Chapter 2 is on the Presidency and the bulk of the chapter is about the rhetorical Presidency, the impact of public opinion and who provides advice to the President. The ensuing two chapters introduce Congress and provide a basic outline of how it works, followed by a discussion about the legislative-executive process. The third branch of government, the Supreme Court, is introduced in Chapter 5. Valelly focuses on the role of judicial review, providing a few cases famous cases (e.g. Brown v. Board of Education). Chapter 6 introduces the role of the bureaucracy and explains the role of delegation, but also how presidents have tried to control the bureaucracy. The next two chapters consider the role of public opinion and the role of political parties including discussions about how opinion surveys were introduced, and historical party building, with less of a focus on the current role of political parties. Valelly discusses partisan revival in Chapter 9, and the concluding chapter introduces the role of money in the US political system.

Valelly’s book is a very basic introduction to American politics and the mention of ‘rich and famous people’ (p. 3) when introducing fundraising sets the tone for the rest of the book; therefore this brief introduction to US politics should not be considered a scholarly endeavour, but rather an introduction for a lay audience. The focus in several of the chapters is on history rather than the contemporary situation; the historical aspect is necessary at times to provide essential background information about how the American political system works, but it can divert the reader’s attention from the focus of the chapters. While historical background is provided, there are also omissions – e.g. in Chapter 5 when judicial review is discussed at length, but there is no mention of Marbury v. Madison. Presidential impeachment is mentioned in brief in Chapter 2, but there is no explanation of the mechanics of impeachment. Relevant articles of the Constitution are mentioned in some chapters, but further detail would enrich this book. In summary, Velly’s book is well-written and of use to a lay audience interested in a few basic facts about the history of American government with a brief discussion of contemporary government, but it is of no use for US government scholars.

Jessica Andersson-Hudson
(University of Nottingham)

Asia and the Pacific


The internet in China is a hot academic topic. While some hold optimistic views about its role in democratising China, others argue that it is used by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) as a means of improving governance and shaping people’s minds. Both views tend to be technology-deterministic. Against this scholarly debate, Greg Austin’s book offers a timely and comprehensive analysis of China’s cyber policy and highlights the CCP’s dilemma in the digital age. The core of his argument is that there is a mismatch between the CCP’s cyber ambition and its political values, which puts it in this dilemma: it is determined to modernise and informatise Chinese society while continuing to maintain the traditional ways of governing the people and dealing with international affairs. In Austin’s view, China remains an i-dictatorship (p. 171).
After introducing the CCP’s cyber ambition, Austin reviews the context of the CCP’s legacy values up to the year 2000 when the leaders decided to informatise society. The subsequent three chapters elaborate the CCP’s dilemma in terms of the national information ecosystem (Chapter 3), the innovative information economy (Chapter 4) and the global information ecosystem (Chapter 5). In the conclusion, the author suggests that if the CCP wants to be successful in forming an information society, it has to have ‘a stronger embrace of the spirit of the information age – full transparency in governance at home and deeper integration with a free and open international knowledge society’ (p. 176).

The substantial part of each chapter primarily follows a chronological treatment. However, as detailed as Austin’s explanation can be, the book sometimes reads like a historical review of cyber development in China and can become confusing when many different abbreviated names of the sophisticated institutions are mentioned in a straight timeline pattern. As most emphasis is put on the development of cyber policy in China, the author’s opinions can be difficult to find in the main body of each chapter. As these interpretations are valuable, this reader would have welcomed greater focus on a critical examination of the dilemma that the CCP confronts in the digital age.

Overall, the book offers an essential introduction to cyber policy-making in China, through which students and scholars in China studies can gain a deeper insight into the challenges and risks that the CCP is facing on both the domestic and international fronts. It is a welcome contribution to studies on China.

Jing Cheng
(University of Nottingham)


Vahid Brown and Don Rassler devote seriously needed attention to the Haqqani network – one of the most notoriously understudied actors in Afghanistan and Pakistan as well as in the wider global campaign against violent jihadist non-state actors. The book is a must-read for anyone seriously interested in the politics of the region. What sets Brown and Rassler’s book apart is that it draws on a previously unavailable set of primary sources, thereby providing unique insights into the ideology and functioning of the Haqqani network. Divided into two distinct sections, the book sets out to take the reader through the genesis of the network as well as how it grew into the role of a facilitator between regional and global jihadist violence.

The first part of the book, authored by Brown, traces the roots of the network back to the late 1970s, doing a magnificent job of highlighting how tribal affiliations and world politics are intrinsically linked in the region. Brown’s historical overview takes the reader up to the events of 9/11. There, Rassler slightly shifts the focus to a more analytical evaluation of the organisational dynamics between the various local, regional and global actors and the Haqqani network. Rassler succeeds in delivering on the promise given in the title by working out the nexus between the various actors.

One must acknowledge the authors’ caution that by prioritising primary sources over a systematic study of the literature, the Haqqani account of events is predominant. However, rather than be seen as a methodological weakness, it is submitted that this approach is the great contribution of this book to a body of literature that is notoriously plagued with a lack of empirical data due to the inaccessibility of sources or security imperatives. More than a decade after military operations against jihadist groups first started, it does not appear that this conflict will end anytime soon, underscoring the need for continued thorough analysis of the actors involved.

Dominik Steinmeir
(University of Nottingham)


The book focuses on the discussion of the socio-economic development of China and the interactions and challenges it faces in the world of global capitalism in the past, present and future. It examines China from an historical perspective, with a background in Marxism and socialism, indicating the universal implication of a China model.
The book is clearly divided into three parts. First, it traces back to the contemporary history of socialism and the revolutionary past in order to discuss China through an historical lens and to distinguish its unique characteristics. Lin Chun further discusses the relationship between the state and the market by reflecting the historical and revolutionary paths of the country. She then argues that the Chinese model of economic development is built on socialism with state-led development characteristics rather than being an imitation of capitalism. The author maintains that China is a socialist market economy, which builds on a socialist state. The book argues that there is antagonism against a capitalist transition in which the state’s role and responsibility and its people should be taken seriously. It challenges the general assumption of the correlation between capitalism and development. Through Marx’s theoretical and analytical lenses, China’s development does not build on the experience of following the West but instead breaks the link of capitalism and development. Through the struggle and the transformations of class and society, it provides a new form of a socialist developmental state.

*China and Global Capitalism* provides a novel understanding of the transition in China. It reminds us of the importance of the Marxism and socialism debate on China’s development path at a time when the world is enjoying the country’s economic success and questioning the rise of capitalism and neoliberalism in contemporary China. It provides the interesting perspective of seeing whether China can be an alternative to the West – something that may harbour a universal implication in being able to disentangle the deadlock of social economic relations. The book examines the country and its interactions with global capitalism from the past to the present and future, emphasising the historical and socialist legacies. It discusses the class divide, land reform and state ownership, and it also focuses on the current debates around rural labour, state capacity and the World Trade Organization’s impact on China, alongside discussion of the ideological identity and organizational capacity of the Communist Party. The book is heavily theory-based, but it could have been more persuasive and more accessible for general readers if it had brought in some empirical materials.

Democracy is a political model with a global appeal. However, there is little understanding of how people perceive it. *Democracy in East Asia: A New Century* offers an in-depth understanding of people’s perception of democracy in the East Asian region which comprises around seventeen countries. As political analysts are arguing, East Asia is surely going to be the most contested region of the world on the issue of democracy. This possibility positions the book in the right context of the emerging East Asia in the twenty-first century. As this work underlines, East Asia is full of contradictions and contestations as it is both a model of economic growth for the world and also an arena of authoritarian regimes. In this regard, the book rightly poses the question of how the Asian values of growth are going to match the demands of democracy which is knocking at the doors of most of the East Asian countries.

As we see in this edited work, authors from across the world engage with the issue of the appeal of democracy in East Asia. As the opening line suggests ‘this is a book about the status and prospects of democracy in East Asia’ (p. ix). If, on the one hand, Taiwan and South Korea indicate the possibility of economic development as a precondition for the democratic process to unfold, on the other hand, Singapore and Malaysia suggest otherwise. Similarly, the book highlights Japan as the model of stable democracy, as well as the presence of communist regimes in many countries of East Asia. The structure of the book is designed in such a way that it neatly covers not only the two regions within East Asia – Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia – but also the larger issues of comparative studies in terms of institutions. Francis Fukuyama’s 2012 article ‘The Patterns of History’ sets the stage for understanding the region in the light of democratic upheavals on a worldwide scale in general.

The three editors have done an excellent job of introducing the issues, ideas and approaches of all the authors in the introduction, and it is not surprising in a book having fifteen authors with different vantage points that no coherent theoretical conclusion or neat
summarisation emerges at the end. However, one underlying understanding that seems to prevail among all the contributions is that evaluating democracy in East Asia requires keeping an eye on the emerging scenario in the twenty-first century.

Sangit Sarita Dwivedi
(University of Delhi)


This edited collection offers an innovative and original contribution to debates on Asian and global political economy. The central organising theme of the book is the importance of the household to understanding Asia’s ‘economic transformation and its incorporation into the global market economy’ (p. 1). Collectively, the chapters in this collection demonstrate the ways in which the household in Asia is implicated in global economic processes and transformations, and the broader implications of this for the analysis of global political economy. The substantive chapters are presented in three key sections: the state and the household economy; the household as a site of economic transformation; and the household and the gendered workplace. There is an impressive geographical spread in the case studies, including Malaysia, India, Japan and Sri Lanka, among others, as well as significant diversity in the subject matter of the chapters. The themes of the book will be of interest to scholars and students of Asian political economy, global political economy and, notably, feminist political economy.

This book makes an important contribution both theoretically and empirically. In theoretical terms, it builds on debates in global political economy around ‘the everyday’ as well as making a substantive contribution to debates about social reproduction and the global household in feminist political economy. As noted in the conclusion, challenges remain in acknowledging the fundamental importance of the household within the study of all aspects of global political economy, such as ‘finance, global economic governance, trade and production’ (p. 231). Nevertheless, this book can claim to be leading the way in such a theoretical endeavour. In empirical terms, the collection offers a rich contribution to the existing research on these topics. The chapters incorporate ‘snapshots’ – drawing on everyday life experiences of household members – to establish links to wider theoretical points and debates, which is an approach that works well in this context and adds to the richness of the volume. Particularly strong chapters include Juanita Elias on the role of domestic work in foreign policy debates in Malaysia; Laura Dale’s study of the lives of single women in Japan; Elizabeth Hill’s analysis of the impact of ‘extreme jobs’ on the household in New India; and the study of the Pune waste-pickers in India by Patrick Kilby. Combining these theoretical and empirical aspects, the book makes a strong overarching argument for the ‘continuing blindness and gap in policy making when it comes to the domestic economy’ (p. 228). This matters for our understandings of Asian and global political economy and the book deserves to be read widely.

Lucy Ferguson
(Universidad Complutense de Madrid)


Christine Fair’s incredibly well-researched book, the product of decades of engagement with Pakistan, pulls no punches. She analyses the role of the Pakistani army in the internal politics of Pakistan, but unlike Ayesha Siddiqa’s similarly excellent work Military Inc.: Inside Pakistan’s Military Economy (Pluto Press, 2007), she concentrates on the international dimensions of the policies pursued by the Pakistani army and the implications that this has for regional and international security. Her argument, backed up by documents produced by the Pakistani army and an extensive number of interviews, is that after the partition of the subcontinent in 1947, Pakistan has always been an insecure and a revisionist state. It seeks to be on a position of parity with what it terms ‘Hindu’ India, despite the vast discrepancies in power between the two.
Fair convincingly argues that the Pakistani army has the ‘ideational and ideological goal’ (p. 13) of resisting the rise of India. Because of this concern, she notes that not only is the settlement of the Kashmir dispute unlikely, but that solving Kashmir would not improve relations between the two countries as it would not achieve parity between them. In fact, ‘[d]espite many ‘internal security challenges, the Pakistan Army has insisted on retaining a conventional force posture that recognizes India as Pakistan’s primary military challenge’ (p. 65). The author argues that, rather than the nuclearisation of the subcontinent making conflict between India and Pakistan less likely (due to the risks of escalation), in fact the Pakistan army is confident that it can pursue low intensity conflict in pursuit of its revisionist goals.

Fair is pessimistic about any change in this regard, noting that even if the current civilian democratic transition maintains itself, the army’s notion of ‘strategic culture’ is deeply rooted in Pakistan’s civil society, political culture and bureaucracies (p. 265). A civilian transition may be necessary for a change, but it is not sufficient. She is similarly dismissive of the idea that increased economic ties could bring about a rapprochement, noting that any ‘serious rapprochement with India would weaken the army’s political position within Pakistan’ (p. 268). She concludes with a warning to policy makers: ‘It is time to accept the likely fact that Pakistan will continue to pursue policies that undermine American interests in the region’ (p. 282). Small wonder then, that her book has been so controversial in Pakistan.

Katharine Adeney
(University of Nottingham)


The main purpose of this book is to evaluate the development of policing in Afghanistan. The authors thus intend to make a contribution to the wider understanding of ‘police-building’ and to fill the gaps caused by the inadequacy of works that focus on the politics of policing and its political economy. Giustozzi and Isaqzadeh analyse the development of policing through its different stages since the early state formation in Afghanistan. Due to the abundance of sources and the estimated interest among readers, the authors focus particularly on the post-2001 period. The book evaluates policing as an instrument of the monopolisation of force and the maintainence of security, which are the two main components of modern states considered in terms of Weberian state formation.

The data for the analysis were gathered through interviews in the field. In order to enable a better understanding of the different perceptions at local level, the authors examine different case studies, such as Fray, Kandahar and Herat. They highlight, for instance, how some local strongmen view the police as a threat to their self-interests. This is because, according to a local strongman, an effective police force, controlled by central government, would challenge their authority, which is primarily based on their own local paramilitary forces. Moreover, the ethnic and tribal client-patron system is also a major obstacle to building a functioning police institution in Afghanistan.

Additionally, according to the authors, building a functioning police system in Afghanistan is further evidence that international interventions, which attempted to replace the internal dynamics, are unable to create a coherent political system in post-conflict countries. In this sense, the book poses the question: ‘which type of policing – civilian or paramilitary – would be more suitable for Afghanistan?’ , which is the main debate around Afghan police reform. The most interesting example of this debate is the neglected Taliban-era policing, which is evaluated as having been very successful in maintaining security in its areas, even by its opponents.

As a law enforcement officer having experience in Afghanistan, I can say that although policing is not the profession of either of the authors, their analysis and observations are precisely accurate in understanding the constraints of not only police-building, but also the entire state-building process in Afghanistan. Therefore, Policing Afghanistan: The Politics of the Lame Leviathan might be helpful for scholars and professionals trying to grasp the political dynamics of policing in a post-conflict country.

Emrah Ozdemir
(Swansea University)


Good research should never go underused. For this reason this double contribution from R. A. W. Rhodes and Anne Tiernan is a very valuable exercise in illuminating the most important figure on the personal staff of the Australian prime minister: the Chief of Staff. It derives from a single, and remarkable, store of primary material. In 2009, two private seminars – in effect elite-level focus groups – took place. The participants across both comprised eleven Chiefs of Staff to Australian prime ministers, covering a period from the mid-1970s through to the very recent past. In total, they made up just over half of those who had held the office up to 2008. One of those who did not take part was dead; others were unobtainable. The research asked those who did engage for their opinions on the functions of the job; how the post they all held had formed and changed over time; the demands it presented; the different ways in which particular Chiefs of Staff had operated; and any advice that might be offered to those occupying their position in future. Further interviews and research then added to this core body of work.

Concurring with my own experience in studying special advisers to ministers in the UK, Rhodes and Tiernan find particular value in giving these individuals their own voice. While they hold office, these aides of necessity have an anonymous existence. This quality only serves to excite interest. It both makes them vulnerable to media hyperbole about shadowy puppet-masters lacking in democratic legitimacy, and means it is harder for them to respond to such criticism. When so much is said about Chiefs of Staff, much of it ill-informed, an account of their own perspectives, rarely elicited or considered, is obviously worth presenting.

An attack on the ‘evil counsellor’ as a proxy for an assault on the actual leader is in fact an ancient convention of court politics. It is fitting, therefore, that one of the two books emerging from this commendable project – The Gate Keepers: Lessons From Prime Ministers’ Chiefs of Staff, should take the form of a manual in the tradition most closely associated with Machiavelli’s The Prince. A former Chief of Staff to a UK prime minister (Tony Blair, 1997–2007), Jonathan Powell, has indeed produced his own update on this text, The New Machiavelli, based on his own experience. Perhaps a more appropriate comparison, however, is Castiglione’s The Book of the Courtier since its focus is not on the Prince himself, but the competitive inner circle around the leader, within which the Chief of Staff is the pre-eminent figure in Australia. Following the manual pattern, The Gate Keepers provides us with a set of core ‘lessons’. A close personal connection to the prime minister emerges as crucial, with the Chiefs of Staff identifying a need to serve both the individual premier and the institution they represent. Short-term administration and response to events are an important concern, combined with a wider focus on policy oversight. Finally, there is a need to handle politics, from internal government relations through to the civil service, party and media. The authors then apply some of their conclusions to recent events in Australian politics, before making some closing observations.

The other book by Rhodes and Tiernan, Lessons in Governing, has a more conventional academic approach. It sets out a hard theoretical framework, taking into account assessments of presidencies, organisational theory and the ‘core executive’ school, of which Rhodes himself was a pioneer. The authors then provide an historical account of the origins and development of the role of Chief of Staff, including some extensive and useful data on the organisation of the Prime Minister’s Office over time. There then follows a depiction of the various individuals who have come to the Chief of Staff post; and a discussion of its different facets. As with The Gatekeepers, there are conclusions and a consideration of their possible application.

Without doubt, both of these books contribute to the sum of our knowledge in an area where lack of clear assessment is a serious problem, and they do so in a creative and insightful way. My conclusions about their respective merit are perhaps counterintuitive. Although it is ostensibly aimed at would-be or actual Chiefs of Staff (a small audience anyway), The Gate-
keepers may actually be more useful as an educational tool beyond the Prime Minister’s Office. Like the often-misunderstood Machiavelli, it could encourage those who might otherwise condemn behind-the-scenes operators out of hand to empathise with these aides, who face daily the dilemmas of power, with which somebody will have to contend, however we design and redesign our democratic system. On the other hand, Chiefs of Staff and other senior prime-ministerial team members, in Australia and elsewhere, may extract more from the theoretical, quantitative and qualitative analysis of *Lessons in Governing* – for political aides are often far closer to the administrator-philosopher model than is generally believed, even by themselves.

Andrew Blick  
(King’s College London)

**Other Areas**


**The Arab Spring and Arab Thaw: Unfinished Revolutions and the Quest for Democracy** by John Davis (ed.). Farnham: Ashgate, 2013. 300pp., £70.00, ISBN 978 1 4094 6875 2

*Dispatches from the Arab Spring* elucidates the myriad revolts and revolutions of the so-called ‘Arab Spring’ from a distinctive three-tier perspective: comprehension, localisation and positiveness. The first tier, comprehension, comes about because the book’s ground-breaking writings do not limit their ‘modes of engagement and analysis – the methodological framework – to the countries and spectacles of regime change that most captivated the media under the name of “Arab Spring”’ (i.e. Egypt, Libya, Yemen and Syria). This approach includes analysing Sudan, Morocco and Algeria, among other examples that usually receive scant coverage – not only in the media, but also in academia. Each chapter explains not only what occurred during the eventful year of 2011 in these countries, but also what political, economic, social and cultural events led up to and followed the unrest.

The second tier, localisation, makes the book stand out against a mass corpus of literature that has hastily and erroneously generalised, patterned or framed the ‘Arab Spring’. In analysing Bahrain, Adam Haneh eloquently and comprehensively addresses the unrest in the country, beginning with a ‘localised’ historical narrative that dictates the ‘particular characteristics of the country’s political economy’ (p. 46). In doing so, he eschews the dominant sectarian narrative that erroneously depicts Bahraini politics as a religious conflict (p. 64).

The third tier is that the book is written optimistically, leading to an uplifting read by authors who include journalists and activists who avoid despairing of the turbulences and aberrations of the Arab Spring. On Sudan, Khalid Mustafa Madani describes how his case study can ‘draw important inspiration from its Arab neighbours’ (p. 350). However, since many of the essays are written from a perspective favouring activism and social change, the writings are inevitably peppered with jargon and somewhat ‘evaluative’ conclusions. Paul Amar, for example, concludes his chapter with: ‘there is only one road to substantive democracy in Egypt’ (p. 55). Despite these issues, the authors ultimately provide an informative context and an accessibly written historical background to the unrest in differing countries.

*The Arab Spring and the Arab Thaw* seeks to offer an alternative perspective on the Middle East by employing five disparate yet interlocking qualitative approaches – as claimed by the editorial introduction – namely historical, comparative, gender, case study and levels of analysis. This methodological approach, influenced by Kenneth Waltz’s 1959 seminal work *Man, the State and War*, takes the Middle East as the locus of research. Therefore, the authors analyse their phenomena through the prism of three levels: the individual (i.e. protest groups); the state (i.e. policies adopted by regimes); and the international (i.e. regional or non-regional players). Upon this conceptualisation, the book is divided into two parts; the first dedicated to the first two system levels of the individual and the state in countries such as Egypt, Syria and Yemen. The second part is dedicated to the third level of analysis: the international. The roles of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), the Arab League, the EU and the Obama Administration are each dedicated a chapter in the book. What is remarkable about this approach is
that it illustrates the non-linear, multifaceted and ongoing nature of these changes in the Middle East. In the book’s second section, the authors move ‘vertically’ along the contours of their analysis by focusing on the international actors’ influences on and responses to the Arab Spring. Bruce Maddy-Weitzman describes the previously dormant Arab League as more active and ‘an integral part of the diplomatic manoeuvring’ throughout the Arab Spring (p. 179).

Some of the essays in the book are largely descriptive and loosely framed in methodological terms, especially in the first section. Neither does the book finally answer the main question proposed on the cover: ‘What were the unifying principles or strategies that governed the protest movements that swept the Middle East and North Africa in the spring of 2011?’ The concluding chapter, which could answer such a question, instead moves to explore newly introduced exogenous actors such as al-Qa’eda, Hamas, Hezbollah and Israel. Appropriating the analysis of these pivotal actors to such a limited space does a disservice to the sharply focused analysis that runs throughout the book.

Despite the different methodological approaches adopted in the two books, they both share a common attempt to ‘understand’ the reasons behind the Arab uprisings, while also acknowledging that each of these countries is a unique case on its own. While Dispatches from the Arab Spring is interested in reading these developments in the present by returning to the past, The Arab Spring and the Arab Thaw makes an attempt to go one step further and outline the future, and the ‘seasons’ that follow this spring.

The fifth section of the book, entitled ‘The Reception of a System’, covers the practical aspect of Mawdudi’s ideological approaches.

Jan-Peter Hartung’s book starts with the serious political and social events that occurred in 1979 throughout the Muslim world. These events describe the battle between Islam and those like the Shah of Iran, who seemingly pursued pre-Islamic values and Western thought rather than Islamic theories – another example being the Egyptian President Anwar Sadat, who supported Israel in 1977. Subsequent to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the 1970s was a crucial decade for Muslim religious and intellectual leaders. On the one hand, these were religious men and political supporters, while on the other hand they had to meet the expectations of the majority of Muslims who desired Islamic dignity and were already an advanced community. In this regard, Sayyid Abū ‘l-A’la Mawdudi, a Muslim ideologist and the founder of Jama’at-i Islami, was well-known for an ideology of ‘Islamism’.

Alongside an introduction and conclusion, this book is divided into four parts. The first part considers Mawdudi’s formative years and the context in which he grew up, and maps out his ideological landscape. Hartung then creates a connection between Mawdudi’s thought, the Islamic state and the Prism of Modernity. Chapters 3 and 4 consider the theoretical aspects of Mawdudi’s theories. For Qur’anic scholars who wish to know more about modern trends in Qur’anic studies and interpretations these two parts will be of particular benefit since they emphasise Mawdudi’s understanding of the Qur’an’s text and its true meaning:

[Mawdudi] blamed the semantic shifts that occurred over time in the Arabic language for an increasing miscomprehension of the text of the revelation, of the ‘true meaning’ (asl ma’ani) of the Qur’anic key concepts. ... That Mawdudi undertook the immense effort to compile a commentary of the whole Qur’an, which was aimed – as the title clearly states – at understanding (tafhim) rather than explaining (tafsir), is significant (p. 84; emphasis in the original).

A System of Life: Mawdudi and the Ideologisation of Islam by Jan-Peter Hartung.
London: C. Hurst, 2013. 320pp., £55.00, ISBN 978 1 8490 4248 2

Jan-Peter Hartung’s book starts with the serious political and social events that occurred in 1979 throughout the Muslim world. These events describe the battle between Islam and those like the Shah of Iran, who seemingly pursued pre-Islamic values and Western thought rather than Islamic theories – another example being the Egyptian President Anwar Sadat, who sup-
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Turkey–Syria Relations: Between Enmity and Amity provides a detailed analysis of the historical, geopolitical, security and economic relations between Turkey and Syria. This book successfully indicates the alignment change by focusing on the comparison between the relative weight of systemic and structural aspects, and the agency of state. The underlying reasons for this change are analysed along three distinguishing levels: regional relations with neighbours; the influence of the global level on regional alignment; and the internal level which underlines policy mechanism (p. 5).

This edited book is separated into sixteen thematic chapters that highlight some crucial factors, such as water relations, terrorism, power balances and the Syrian uprising. These factors are explicitly intertwined throughout the book. Particularly, Turkey has been obliged to improve diplomatic relations with Syria due to the economic cost of terrorism, which is highlighted in Chapters 2 and 11. The book investigates in detail the fact that, although Turkey and Syria have tried to normalise relations several times, such as through the attendance of Turkey’s President Sezer at the funeral of Hafiz al-Asad and the Adana Accord, there are considerable problems that have prevented the normalisation of relations, such as the issue of the city of Hatay, which became a Turkish province in consequence of a referendum (p. 111).

One of the fundamental analyses of this book is discussion of the trans-state level, which relates to issues concerning Syrian–Turkish affairs and presents multilateral relationships between these two sides. Akbaba and Ozdamar clearly distinguish the trans-state relations of these states by referring to ethnic and religious issues and the negative influence of the Syrian uprising (pp. 125–6). The other fundamental finding is the interdependencies that underpin disputes or collaboration from several different perspectives. For example, while Daoudy explores disputes about the securitisation of water and their interdependencies (Chapter 11), Tür clearly presents the significance of economic conditions (Chapter 13).

This book effectively illustrates that cooperation and conflict between Turkey and Syria have a great impact on the regional balance of power. In addition, this circumstance also influences the role of the global powers in the region. Therefore, the book is recommended to readers interested in the Middle East, Turkey and Syria as it provides a comprehensive examination of two important actors and their strengthening and weakening relationships.

I. Aytaç Kadioglu
(University of Nottingham)


The book under review focuses on the Sunni-Shi’i divide in the Middle East, Central Asia and the Indian subcontinent. Chapters 1–7 examine cases from the Arab World including Palestine, Lebanon, Iraq, Syria and Saudi Arabia., Chapters 8–9 then deal with Sunni-Shi’i sectarian politics in Iran. Chapter 10 studies the Sunni-Shi’i cleavage in Azerbaijan, while Chapter 11 explores its repercussions in Pakistan. The book also offers insights into the theoretical framework of Sunni-Shi’i dynamics (in the introduction and the conclusion). Finally, the Post Scriptum contextualises Sunni-Shi’i relations in the aftermath of the Arab Spring.

Brigitte Maréchal and Sami Zemni argue for a dynamic understanding of the Sunni-Shi’i divide. They also claim that this divide evolves with nations and tribes. In the book, it is assumed that reality is a social construction. Thus, relations and interactions should diminish the importance of collective identities. Instead, they are in a constant relative homogenisation. To support their argument, the editors draw on the complexity of these relations (exchange, rapprochement, conflict) as displayed in the different chapters of the volume. They also exploit the interdependence between weak states and the intensity of the divide. Furthermore, the book highlights the role of the foreign policies of Iran and Saudi Arabia in the amplification of the divide. The argument of social and political construction is plausible to a certain extent, but complex relations do not evolve necessarily towards appeasement.
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The editors innovate in framing the Sunni-Shi’i divide within sociology. They have produced a welcome analysis of the processes of interaction between the two religious communities. However, most of the authors privilege the tools of political science. A few of the chapters, written by Islamicists, employ history to present a general picture of the relations between Sunnis and Shi’is in relation to theology.

The book is aimed at students and scholars of political science and sociology who work on Middle Eastern politics. It successfully bridges the gap in understanding the Sunni-Shi’i divide from the perspective of the social sciences. Islamicists and historians of religion might benefit from it as well. Moreover, the book is well-written and highly accessible to non-specialists.

Abdessamad Belhaj (MTA-SZTE Research Group for the Study of Religious Culture, Hungary)


Joshua Mitchell’s Tocqueville in Arabia offers the author’s comparison between his Arab-Middle Eastern and American students’ understandings of democracy and democratic values based on his teaching experience in Qatar and Georgetown. Although there are references to Karl Marx and Adam Smith, Mitchell mainly uses Alexis de Tocqueville’s nineteenth-century classic Democracy in America to address the challenges to democracy in the Middle East. Similar to what Tocqueville claims in his study of America, Mitchell argues that the democratic age brings about a breakdown of social and kinship roles, eventually resulting in a ‘democratic man’. On the other hand, ‘aristocratic man’ is associated with the land, family ties, kingdom or empire. In a sense, to Tocqueville, aristocracy links everybody, from peasant to king, in one long chain, whereas democracy breaks the chain and frees each link.

The basis of Mitchell’s arguments surrounds this ideology posited by Tocqueville, especially the latter’s notion of ‘democratic man’ as a distinct kind of humanity, who ‘delinks’ himself from any association to realize his total sovereignty. American students, for Mitchell, embody this democratic man who is constantly negotiating in order to avoid any associations, whereas Arab-Muslim students represent the aristocratic man who is linked to the bonds of family and religion. In a sense, Muslim/Arab students live in ‘an intermediate age’ between aristocracy and democracy, and still struggle with the traditional roles and societal conventions since they understand themselves to be occupying roles as family members in relation to society. Mitchell suggests that aristocratic societies will lose their familial roles when they transform into democratic societies.

Finally, the author concludes that promoting liberal arts and social science education in the Middle East in the pursuit of democracy will set the mood for a full democratic age. It is very difficult to consider whether Mitchell’s views are correct; the main obstacle in evaluating his work comes from the dearth of supporting evidence for students’ own statements on democracy, and a lack of demographic data on students’ socio-economic backgrounds. Mitchell’s book is based neither on an analytical argumentative style nor on a quantitative interview method, but on his own personal accounts and comparisons between the Arab-Muslim and American students.

Despite the problems inherent in his work, Mitchell’s style of personal storytelling engages the reader and his original application of Tocqueville’s ‘democratic man’ to a Middle Eastern context proves to be valuable, especially in the wake of the Arab Spring.

Mehmet Karabela (Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario)


The publication of Reza Pankhurst’s The Inevitable Caliphate is very timely, especially when a Sunni insurgent group, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), claims to have formed a caliphate. In early Islam, the caliph was seen as a political leader and representative of the broader Muslim community following Muhammad’s death in 632. Even though Sunni and Shi’a Islam differ on the election and conduct of a caliph, throughout Islamic history the term ‘caliphate’ was perceived to be the ideal Islamic polity. It is, therefore,
not surprising that major Sunni political movements and pan-Islamist Muslim intellectuals in the modern period have identified its restoration (like restoring a computer to original factory settings – i.e. to early Islam) as part of their ultimate purpose.

Pankhurst focuses on three historical periods: the formal abolition of the caliphate in 1924, the post-caliphate Muslim world order immediately after its disintegration, and later movements. He examines the arguments and discourses of Rashid Rida, Ali Abd al-Raziq, Hasan al-Banna, Taqiuddin al-Nabhani, Sayyid Qutb, Abu Ala al-Mawdudi, Osama bin Laden and Abdullah Azzam, among others, on the revival of the caliphate. The author also devotes considerable attention to the positions of movements on the caliphate such as the Muslim Brotherhood, Hizb ut-Tahrir, al-Qa’eda and al-Murabitun as they promote a caliphate as a form of transnational authority among the global Muslim community.

Although the book is well-written, it is not innovative either in methodology or content because it simply summarises arguments of the previous thinkers. Most of its contents have been documented elsewhere by Hamid Enayat, Ismail Kara, Sean Oliver-Dee, Mark Wegner and Nurullah Ardic. The main failure of the book is that Pankhurst does not bring up counter-arguments (i.e. the opponents of the caliphate debate) in as much depth as he uses to illustrate the other side. Therefore, the author provides one side of the debate in order to show that the call for a caliphate over almost a century was essential in creating a very ambiguous utopia: ‘Global Islamic Union’ or the *umma*.

I do not agree with all the points Pankhurst makes in his book; however, the issue of the caliphate may perhaps challenge the way scholars of political Islam see their subject. The reader wonders how post-Islamists will respond to the recent emergence of the caliphate in Iraq and other possible appearances after it was abolished by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk in 1924.

Mehmet Karabela
(Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario)


Thomas Turner has written a powerful book about the causes and consequences of violence in the Democratic Republic of Congo. As an American academic and country specialist of Amnesty International, the author has achieved comprehensiveness in a compact and very accessible manner. Excellently researched and well-written, the text comes with many advantages, but none of the disadvantages of its academic peers. It is to be recommended as a substantial but digestible introduction to the country, while also offering a large number of facts and interesting reflections to those who are more familiar with it.

The chapters are organised along the lines of the most pressing issues – resources, identity, sexual violence and external involvement – yet their analysis is far from simplistic and goes beyond the usual headlines. Turner skilfully draws from a substantial knowledge of the country’s different historical periods, from pre-colonial times to the Congo Free State and Zaire, to ask the right questions. He wonders, for instance, how the exploitive Belgian regime relates to Mobutu’s dictatorship and the status quo. But Turner also convinces with the way he makes his arguments: instead of giving simple answers, he carefully balances the work of other scholars to make sense of complex realities. So when responding to the above question, Turner refrains from establishing direct causal links and instead summarises psychological, structural, traditional and economic explanations for the persistence of structural and physical violence in the country.

The idea of Congo as ‘a playing field’ for powerful Western and African states, particularly during the ‘Congo Wars’, is developed over two chapters. While the analysis of Western hegemony in Congo is painted in classical realist terms, the games of pawns and proxies are presented as being more complex in the intra-African context as ‘central African states are dependent on the more powerful’ to advance their interests (p. 72). In another chapter, Turner explains how identity factors such as ethnicity, language and religion have been developed and reinforced through colonial favouritism and subsequently used by Congolese politicians to play different groups against each other (e.g. Mobutu) and gain electoral advantages (e.g. Bemba).

After describing the dynamics between *autochtones* and *allochtones* in Katanga and the Kivus, Turner highlights the striking absence of class in Congolese analysis and policy making despite the Marxist background of many Congolese intellectuals. He suggests that
Congo’s ethnonationalism obscures questions of land ownership and control over the means of production. This remark is typical for the book as it demonstrates great understanding of the Congolese context, while also bringing in new perspectives.

Janosch N. Kullenberg
(University of Bremen)


Kristian Coates Ulrichsen deals with the First World War campaigns he sees as crucial to the creation of the modern Middle East. In the introduction, he explains the importance of examining the Middle East theatre, the reasons for which he chose to study this subject and the approach he used. He then splits the book into three parts. In the first part (the prelude), the author discusses mainly two topics: the economic integration of the Middle East into the world economy, and how the British Empire built a strong political and economic presence in the region in the nineteenth century. Although these two issues have been previously discussed in numerous scholarly works, Ulrichsen reveals the paradox of the Ottoman modernization that facilitated the infiltration of Western imperialism into the region upon which the Empire was trying to consolidate its authority.

In the second part (military operations), the author addresses the difficulties of fighting an industrialised war in a region with scarce sources, insufficient infrastructure and a hostile topography that forced Britain to render its presence more visible and direct in Egypt, India and in South Iraq, occupied in the early months of the Mesopotamia campaign. The author claims that this shift in British colonial rule incited anti-British feelings in the countries, which were exposed to hardships caused by the British campaigns in the Middle East.

In the third part (politics and diplomacy), Ulrichsen adds further details about the wartime arrangements and commitments that Britain made to Sherif Hussein, Al-Saud, France and the Zionists. He also discusses the conflicting priorities of the Arab Bureau in Cairo, the Indian government in Delhi, and the War Office and the Foreign Office in London during and after the war. To the author, these two factors, along with the development of a new type of nationalism that could mobilise wider segments of society, prevented Britain’s imperial designs over the region from materialising.

The author’s avoidance of the use of heavy language and long complicated paragraphs makes the book readable and easily understandable even for the common reader. The book is not free of defects, such as the overemphasis on the role of topography and the role of India. However, it still provides a solid view that is supported by some documents and major works cited regarding the legacy of imperialism in the Middle East. This study is therefore strongly recommended, particularly to students and scholars of Middle Eastern Studies.

Ahmet Gencturk
(Panteion University)
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