
Analysing in a timely fashion the new concept of global justice, this small edited book spells out coherently what it entails politically and economically. The separate contributions by scholars with roots in either continental European or Anglo-Saxon political philosophy are most informative about this rapidly evolving debate on the desirability of global justice institutions or policies.

There are two basic difficulties involved here that the adherents of global justice in this volume struggle with. First, we have reasonableness. If justice amounts to – what the great Roman lawyers already recognised – giving each and everyone his/her due, then we face the complicated question: what should a global citizen reasonably claim – respect, human rights, economic support, strict equality? I would be inclined to scepticism as to the feasibility of the radical demand for a global difference principle à la Rawls.

Second, we face governance. If the thicker and thicker carpet of IGOs, NGOs, CSOs and regional coordination mechanisms can be looked upon as elements in a world government, then we must address the sensitive problem: should international and regional bodies constitute the foundation of a hierarchical governance structure? This is hardly feasible, as it would collide with the basic principle of state sovereignty that remains a leading pillar in public international law, despite being more and more restricted by humanitarian considerations.

This book is suitable for Master’s courses in ethics or international relations, applying the cosmopolitan frameworks of Kant or Rawls to the world of today, very much in tune with the increasing support for humanitarian objectives globally. Two articles (Kofman and Nath) provide an excellent examination of the distinction between global and statist (national) egalitarianism. Another argues strikingly for the ideal of equality of opportunity at the global level (Loriaux), while admitting that such a concept ‘has difficulty accommodating cultural differences’.

Yet even if one could formulate a rational theory of global justice starting from a few deontological principles, the practicality of implementation remains uncertain, both economically and politically. This book touches upon this problem of feasibility of global justice.

Jan-Erik Lane
(University of Freiburg)


Miriam Bankovsky offers the canon an insightful and detailed account of the notion of deconstructive justice which guides her analysis of Rawls, Habermas and Honneth through the adaptation of Derrida’s model. This is an ambitious project which produces an advanced text; the purpose of the work is to advance the literature, not to offer explanation to students.

There is an assumption that her readers have at least a cursory knowledge of the authors whose work she either draws on or critiques, although she gives useful summaries of their arguments in relation to her aims.

Bankovsky comes to her project as a supporter of Derrida, and a critic of the constructivism of Rawls, Habermas and Honneth, and the tone of her study in regard to each author is clear at the outset. There are areas where the work could gain from an attempt to engage with the negative aspects of Derrida’s position as well as praising him and demonstrating the lasting utility of his model. In this sense the accessibility of the work to people from different perspectives might be improved by an acceptance of a certain level of fallibility.
The ambition of Bankovsky’s project is clear when she states: ‘I hope that my own entry into this discussion, taking the role of a citizen encouraging others to maintain attitudes to openness, humility and resilience, will contribute, in some small way, to this project’ (p. 218). I would question whether this book will reach the general citizenry, and if this were to happen whether they would understand it. However, as an academic exercise regarding the utility of Derrida’s ideas to contemporary analysis, Bankovsky makes a strong and articulate argument. It is clear throughout the book that she comes to this project as a supporter of Derrida and she is successful in concluding the study in support of the analytic merit of both his and her own work.

Overall this is a worthwhile and challenging read regardless of one’s ontological position. For those who support Derrida’s work and wish to utilise his models then this text offers a useful framework from which to start. For those who disagree with Bankovsky’s analytical position the book provides a starting point for a helpful discussion of the potential role for political theory in developing and gaining support for certain models of justice. This book marks the start of an interesting debate.

Gemma Bird
(University of Sheffield)


The ineluctable question for political theorists today is: ‘What would it be for my life as a whole to be a flourishing life?’ This book takes us through a long journey into MacIntyre’s philosophy of virtue ethics – where virtues are treated as the sole driving force of society throughout history. This expansive book presents us with two pictures: MacIntyre as a Marxist, and as an Aristotelian. The authors also explicate at large the MacIntyrean notion that virtues are to be ‘grounded’ rather than ‘free-standing’ in order to experience the common good. The book also discusses how we realise this ‘social life’, emphasising that such realisation is not possible in pure liberal societies. For MacIntyre, where Marxism failed Aristotelian ‘virtue ethics’ are the alternative. In this sense, MacIntyre’s Aristotelianism has a revolutionary flair – tradition, ‘practice’ and culture together lay down the relationship between social, political, moral and cultural spheres.

The book presents a substantial explanation as to why MacIntyre emphasises embeddedness, the only way to realise one’s life in a society through a ‘life in practice’. MacIntyre aptly claims that ‘utopianism of the present’ is more important than the utopianism of the future. The book is in a way a tribute to the philosophical ingenuity of MacIntyre and his life-long concern for ‘virtue’. It is magnificently relevant to researchers of Western political theory. Despite its focal point being Western societies, researchers outside the Western world will certainly find it an immensely insightful reflection on long historical intellectual traditions of Western political theory. The book is a success as it substantially delineates three major ideas of political theory: liberalism, communitarianism and Marxism and their sociological manifestation. This is evident from the way the book engages us throughout with its exposure of researchers to significant ideas. While the book is an impactful value-addition to contemporary political theory, it does not create the point of closure. It only gives us a strong foundation from which we need to proceed further – to understand how ‘a life in practice’ while embedded in socio-historically shared meanings of life also takes care of the ‘dynamicity’ of tradition and practice.

Chidella Upendra
(Indian Institute of Technology, Indore)


While there is a bulk of literature on social justice, far less has been written on the topic of social injustice. For much too long social injustice was seen as the absence of justice. However, reversing the relationship between social justice and social injustice has major implications. Up to the present day, it is not clear what these implications are, and it will take a lot of work to spell them out. An important contribution has been made by Vittorio Bufacchi, whose book Social Injustice is a collection of thirteen essays, of which the majority have already been published over the last twelve years in various journals and scholarly books. One of Bufacchi’s main aims was to delineate the quintessence of social injustice,
his main concern being to avoid the risk of ‘over-
inflating the concept of injustice, turning this concept
into something rhetorically powerful but analytically
blunt’ (p. 12).

In the opening chapter he therefore identifies three
dimensions, of which social injustice as mal-distribution
always has to be present, whether or not in conjunction
with social injustice as exclusion and/or social injustice as
disempowerment. As such, it should be clear that the
essence of social injustice is more than simply inequality.
At the same time Bufacchi makes a strong plea for a
bottom-up approach, which starts from empirical
research, instead of a theory-driven approach which takes
theory as its starting point and applies it to various indi-
vidual, so-called supportive, cases. The main reason for
doing this is to answer Brian Barry’s call to make every
effort to avoid the discipline of political philosophy
becoming irrelevant outside university lecture theatres.

Above all, the growing gap between what professional
political philosophers write about and what Bufacchi,
following the lead of Barry, considers to be the ‘real’
issues in politics, should be stopped. The author himself
has obeyed the call by tackling a wide range of problem-
driven topics, such as exploitation, torture and terrorism,
contractualism, deliberative democracy in Guatemala,
voting and socialism. These are all interesting essays,
lucid, well written and often thought provoking. However,
one could raise doubts about the internal
coherence of the whole volume. Of course, the essays all
relate to the general theme of social injustice, but it
would be equally true to say that they are a tribute to
Bufacchi’s former PhD supervisor, the late political phi-
losopher Brian Barry. In doing so, we would not be
doing an injustice to the author’s intentions.

Erik De Bom
(Erasmus University, Rotterdam)

Understanding Public Policy: Theories and
Issues by Paul Cairney. Basingstoke: Palgrave Mac-

The book focuses on understanding public policy in
terms of theories and concepts and the issues surround-
ing them. The book introduces us to why we study
public policy, the reason being that we want to know
why particular decisions were made by the government,
and the book’s fundamental argument is to bring
together old and new theories surrounding the issue of
public policy. Under Paul Cairney’s approach each
chapter sets out a key theory or concern of public
policy, identifies its values and explores the questions
each theory seeks to answer, considering, where appro-
priate, how each theory or concept has been applied
empirically and how much it tells us about different
political systems, policy areas and time periods.

The author analyses comparative public policies in
much of Europe and America, touches on Japan and
looks at broad topics that relate to public policy, espe-
cially theories, concepts and issues such as power, new
institutionalism, rationality and incrementalism, rational
choice, multi-level government and punctuated equi-
librium, among others.

The book is aimed at people interested in and/or
interacting with policy issues such as policy makers,
students of public policy and/or political science, inter-
est and pressure groups, researchers on public policy
and policy research institutes (PRIs) as well as public
administrators at all levels of policy.

Inasmuch as the author promises to help us under-
stand public policy, especially the theories and issues
surrounding it, he succeeds in his goals, in that he
explains every term he introduces to the readers.
Indeed, public policy being difficult to study, the book
is noteworthy because it lays bare all the theories, issues
and concepts in the field and explores their impor-
tance, implications and application.

The only gap or anomaly is in the book’s scope
because it does not highlight theories, issues and con-
cepts in much of the Third World, especially Africa, and
so deprives readers of vital information on public policy
emanating from these regions. There needs to be a
comparative study on public policy of the so-called First
and Third Worlds, or a highlighting of public policies in
the Third World. However, the author’s arguments are
plausible and grounded because they are based on expe-
riences, observations and research. Overall, the book is
well written and scholarly in its entire approach.

Moses Kibe Kihiko
(Independent Scholar)

The Origins of Free Peoples by Jason Caro.
London: Continuum, 2011. 176pp., £65.00, ISBN
9781441113047

Caro’s research reconstructs the origin of free peoples
from an innovative and interesting perspective. The
book aims to give an account of the practical and traceable actions through which people attained their liberty and of the theories that inspired or influenced them. As such, the author distances himself from the literature that understands freedom as natural and analyses the processes by which people liberated themselves from various oppressions. The history of (Western) human beings shows that, rather than being naturally and originally free, people have always needed to be liberated and have conceptualised freedom in order to attain it.

Proceeding in chronological order, the author begins by taking into consideration pre-revolutionary liberty, that is, the freedom people built before the ‘inauguration of liberté’ (p. 26). The author explores neo-Roman processes of liberation from Rome and the implication of divine rights over the political thoughts that arose before the eighteenth century. In doing so, Caro gives an understanding of how the process towards pre-revolutionary liberty began when civil laws came to be understood as subject to human judgement. Thus, laws could be understood as tyrannical and as subjects of reconsideration when unjustly limiting people’s freedoms.

The book then analyses the origins of revolutionary freedoms and the various theories explaining those processes of liberation. The author understands liberation as an ‘ongoing configuration of frenetic practices and effects’ (p. 71) rather than a one-time revolutionary affair. Those efforts are upheld by the secrets and ambiguities of freedom, where the people fighting for their own freedom can appeal to an undetermined pre-existent natural liberty that they are repeatedly called to defend through history. The final part of the book offers an insight into the development of freedom, where the author theorises possible future patterns of human efforts to defend and attain liberty.

The author’s perspective is fascinating: Caro engages analytically with relevant political thought and builds a solid argument while referring to concrete historical examples. However, the book suffers from a lack of analytical engagement with the Hegelian suggestion that every thesis is conceptualised together with its antithesis, and that only as such can it lead to a synthesis. In other words, the libertarian efforts that required a theoretical conceptualisation of freedom could only be generated under oppression or tyranny. Only oppressed people can strive towards (and therefore conceptualise) liberation and freedom, and only as such can they change the equilibrium between their vision of freedom and current oppressions. As Caro recognises, freedom and oppression have always coexisted; his work then could also be understood in terms of an analysis of the changing social equilibrium between contrasting social interests.

Beniamino F. Cislaghi
(University of Leeds)

Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel by Alexandre Christoyannopoulos.

Anarchism and religion have traditionally been thought of as adversaries. A consequence of this has been that theologians, anarchists and political theorists have neglected the important tradition of Christian anarchism. Alexandre Christoyannopoulos aims to help rectify this by providing a theory of Christian anarchism. This is done by weaving together the views of a range of thinkers from the best-known Christian anarchist, Leo Tolstoy, to lesser-known figures such as Dorothy Day and Nicolas Berdyaev.

Christoyannopoulos suggests that a coherent body of thought argues that Christianity logically implies anarchism, on the grounds that an acceptance of God’s authority necessarily leads to the rejection of all human authority. In providing an outline of Christian anarchism some of the disagreements among Christian anarchists, such as on civil disobedience, are discussed. Christian Anarchism adopts a mostly descriptive approach, although some reflections are provided, for example on Christian anarchists’ unique contribution to political thought.

The first part of the book discusses why Christian anarchists have rejected the state by examining scripture, particularly the Sermon on the Mount. This is followed by a discussion of how the church and the state have historically rejected the teachings of Jesus. The second part examines how Christian anarchists believe they should interact with the state, and how they can bring about a stateless vision of society. Before concluding, Christoyannopoulos cites various examples of pre-modern and modern Christian anarchists. Christian Anarchism will be of interest to Christians, theologians, anarchists and historians of political thought.
This is the first study to provide an overview of Christian anarchism. On its own terms it achieves its aim of synthesising a range of Christian anarchist writings and demonstrating that Christian anarchism is a coherent school of thought. However, whether Christian anarchism would appear to be coherent after a thorough examination of the tensions between Christian anarchists remains to be seen. Important disagreements within Christian anarchism, such as questions of economic justice, are unfortunately only briefly discussed. Furthermore, most of the thinkers who are discussed in depth are from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and it would have been beneficial to have assessed the ideas of pre-nineteenth-century Christian anarchists, such as the leader of the Diggers Gerrard Winstanley and the Ranters. Nonetheless, this book is a well-written, important and useful starting point for a subject area that is likely to grow.

Daniel Duggan
(Durham University)


Debates on Democratization reproduces five debates conducted by leading scholars in the Journal of Democracy (JOD) over the last two decades. The first tackles what constitutes democratic consolidation. Linz and Stepan posit three conditions: (1) the need for a state-enforced rule of law; (2) routine free and fair elections; and (3) rulers governing democratically (p. 3). Four articles follow, questioning these criteria as too demanding or too biased towards Western conceptions. The second debate questions whether there is a dominant transition paradigm. Carothers argues that there is and that it contains these assumptions: (1) countries moving away from dictatorial rule are moving towards democracy; (2) democratic transition follows a process (opening to breakthrough to consolidation); (3) free and fair elections are overvalued in the process; (4) the importance of leadership committed to democracy outweighs political culture, history and economics in consolidation; and (5) transitioning countries have an adequate state for consolidation (pp. 79–80). He concludes that many countries fail to meet these criteria and are in a 'grey zone' between democracy and authoritarian government. Five articles follow challenging Carothers’ claims that (a) a transition paradigm exists for scholars or democracy practitioners and (b) it is useful.

The third debate is over the sequencing process. Carothers claims that some scholars have begun arguing that preconditions (like the rule of law and a functioning state) should exist before introducing democratic elections (p. 130). He disagrees, claiming that sequencing arguments give authoritarian rulers grounds for stalling democratisation. Instead, he advocates gradualism and the ensuing articles discuss the merits of sequencing versus gradualism. The fourth debate explores the causes of post-communist colour revolutions. Articles explore the possible culprits, which range from unpopular or poor leadership, openness of media, level of organisation of the opposition and the existence of independent electoral monitoring to foreign pressure and support for democratisation and the diffusion of tactics from one country to the next. The final debate begins with Linz claiming that presidentialism is less conducive than parliamentarianism to democratic stability. Four articles follow, questioning whether presidentialism is the cause of instability and testing how the assumption holds up for parliamentary or semi-presidential countries.

Collectively, the book serves two audiences. Scholars new to the democratisation literature will find a good introduction to its debates. It is also suitable for graduate or undergraduate courses; in particular the fifth debate could be a useful way to introduce differences between presidentialism and parliamentarianism. However, all articles are reprinted from the JOD, so where there is access to it there is little reason for the book, beyond convenience.

Michael T. Rogers
(Arkansas Tech University)


Iain R. Edgar’s new study, The Dream in Islam, focuses on the role of dreams in the everyday lives of Muslims. This book is an interpretation of an interpretation, in the sense that Edgar, as a social anthropologist, interprets the Muslim practice of using dreams as a technology of the sacred in justifying behaviour. He ties this
to reports of how especially militant jihadist groups, such as al-Qa’eda and the Taliban, rely on dreams for inspiration or propaganda in their political struggle. To this end, the book tries to trace the genetic codes of the contemporary suicide bombers through an evaluation of ‘true’ dreams in Islamic prophecy, looking at the Sufi notion and the tradition of dream interpretation dictionaries.

The fundamental argument of the book is that a considerable number of Muslims seek guidance via dreams and especially the practice of istikhara, that is, Islamic dream incubation, as a last resort after exhausting other crisis management techniques when they face a major life decision. Central to this argument is the claim that jihadist dream narratives serve as authorising agents for dreamers and are used as a political strategy to promote their dreams as ‘revelations from beyond this world’ (p. 121). As a case in point, Edgar discusses Mullah Omar’s dreams and how these were used as authorisation in leading the Taliban.

Most of the fieldwork for this book was conducted between 2004 and 2008 with special attention given to the geographical areas and social contexts of the United Kingdom, the United States, Pakistan, Turkey, Northern Cyprus and Bosnia. Edgar’s empirical work mainly consists of interviews with Muslims from all walks of life in these specific regions, interpreted in the light of methodologies of social anthropology. Although the author fails to apply a consistent method throughout the book, he succeeds in the goals he outlined for himself in the methodology section, since he acknowledges the inherent limitations of his study from the outset.

The book stands out as noteworthy in one respect especially, because the author goes beyond the continual struggle between orientalists and anti-orientalists. One consequence of defining Islamic studies within this vicious circle is that a majority of the current generation of Islamic historians believes that the study of Arabic legal, theological or historical texts from the eighth to the nineteenth centuries is good enough to define ‘native’ Islamic civilisation. Edgar deconstructs that old approach, and brings to the task considerable expertise in social science methodology. Subsequent case studies on dream narratives will benefit immensely from his imagination-based research methods.

Mehmet Karabela (McGill University)


Ian Fraser and Lawrence Wilde’s The Marx Dictionary is the third volume with a similar title on my shelves. Why should anyone buy this one? Two reasons immediately spring to mind: it offers something different and delivers on its promise of providing an excellent introduction to many of the key concepts used by Marx. On the one hand it covers a much wider selection of concepts than are to be found in Terrell Carver’s A Marx Dictionary. Both books open with a brief survey of Marx’s life, but then Carver focuses on just sixteen key concepts, each of which attracts a fairly substantial essay.

Fraser and Wilde, by contrast, cover about ten times as many concepts in a not substantially longer book. While gains in breadth are made at the expense of some loss of depth, this does not mean that what is covered in The Marx Dictionary is superficial: far from it. Fraser and Wilde know their Marx, and provide authoritative definitions of numerous concepts. For this reason their book will prove to be a useful resource both for new students and experts alike. On the other hand, by contrast with Tom Bottomore et al.’s A Dictionary of Marxist Thought, Fraser and Wilde’s book is both more compact – it deals with Marx rather than Marxism – and less concerned with debate.

One great strength of Bottomore’s collection is that it surveys debates on a very wide range of topics, leaving the reader in no doubt that Marxism is a contested and living field of inquiry. Although Fraser and Wilde’s book does not do this, this is perhaps no great failing. As long as it is understood that their aim is to provide a more or less classical Marxist account of the numerous concepts they survey then the definite article in their title can perhaps be forgiven. Experts might disagree with the odd definition here and there – I found little I could fault – but from a student’s perspective the clarity of expression is a great positive. This is an excellent book which should be read by anyone trying to make sense of Marx’s ideas.

Notes

In this book, Marc Hanvelt supports the critique, made by Bryan Garsten and others, that modern liberal and democratic theory is neo-Kantian; therefore it wrongly divorces reason from the passions, and hence is ineffective in the real world. He also joins Garsten in proposing recourse to the combined reason and passions of rhetoric as a necessary revision to neo-Kantian principles. Hanvelt proffers Hume’s ‘polite rhetoric’ as a particularly helpful aid to this project. Reading carefully throughout the Humean oeuvre of philosophical tracts, essays and English history, Hanvelt describes Hume’s rhetoric as ‘just and accurate’ – properly founded on Humean empiricism – and ‘polite’ – not only rhetorically aware of its audience but also aspiring to and capable of provoking further conversation, rather than shutting it off peremptorily. He also details how Hume is more thoroughgoing in his rhetoric than (among relevant predecessors and contemporaries) Aristotle, Smith or Campbell, and hence productively interested not merely in defending the role of rhetoric, but also in distinguishing between the improper, ‘low’ rhetoric, used by zealots to produce factions that disrupt the public sphere, and the proper, ‘high’ rhetoric, ideally ascribed to Demosthenes, which counters low rhetoric and persuades towards virtue and the common good. It is the combination of a Humean embrace of rhetoric and a framework by which to discriminate among rhetorics that Hanvelt proffers to modern liberal and democratic theorists.

These theorists might justly be cautious of accepting this critique. The rhetorical critique rests on very different philosophical premises from the neo-Kantian project: the rhetorical project in general, and Hanvelt’s Hume in particular, argue a radical critique as likely to upset as to support neo-Kantianism. Indeed, the interest of Hanvelt’s work lies precisely in his exploration of the power of Hume’s rhetoric, not in his taming Hume to meet neo-Kantian conclusions. Moreover, Hume limits discussion to polite topics and participants – a limitation by manners as grievous as the equivalent limitations imposed by revelation and reason. Furthermore, both his definition of the common good and his discrimination between ‘high’ and ‘low’ rhetoric rest upon Humean aesthetic judgement – a topic Hanvelt does not explore here, but should, if his work is either to support or supplant neo-Kantianism. He would also benefit from a more thickly historical approach, placing Hume more precisely within the long traditions of rhetoric and philosophy. But this book generally is accurate in its scope, persuasive in its argument and provocative of further discussion; consequently it is nicely emblematic of its Humean topic.

David Randall
(New York Studio School)


Typically monographs on Sartre adopt a sideways approach, and thus start by categorising under fixed headings such as ‘existentialism’, ‘phenomenology’, ‘Marxism’, etc. This is a tried and tested method, and one that gives good results, given that it is hard to summarise a philosopher whose work not only spans a 50-year period, but which also transcends the normal boundaries we typically construct between, say, psychology and philosophy. Hatzimoyosis gives us a breath of fresh air, through introducing Sartre in another way. He attempts to take ‘the less travelled path of introducing Sartre’s thought by focusing just on specific parts of Sartre’s work’ (p. xii).

A caveat is needed, though. It is clear that this work is a monograph on the early Sartre, despite claims to the contrary. Hatzimoyosis does inform us, however, that the book focuses on certain themes ‘whose discussion might help introduce the reader to the Sartrean way of thinking about reality’ (p. xii). As such, Sartre’s early works such as Intentionality, The Transcendence of Ego, Sketch for a Theory of Emotions and Imaginary are explored in great depth (each given its own chapter), but at the grave expense of a full exploration of Sartre’s seminal work Being and Nothingness and his two later stages of thinking, exemplified in Critique of Dialectical Reason and The Family Idiot.

In view of the above, the book may be misleading to those approaching Sartre for the first time, missing out critical details that only the experienced Sartrean will
notice, while simultaneously giving the impression that Sartre’s philosophical themes (i.e. ‘intentionality’, ‘emotions’ or the ‘ego’) remain consistent throughout his work. Indeed even the structure of the book itself is risky for it gives the false impression that there is a certain amount of continuity in Sartre’s thinking.

Nevertheless, all the themes that are addressed in this work are done with true rigour and insight, performing a fine balancing act that deciphers a complex philosophy, put in an accessible language, without sacrificing detail or depth. The chapter on emotion is particularly insightful and one of the best accounts of Sartre’s theory of emotions to date. The book, if viewed as a reading guide to all of Sartre’s pre-Being and Nothing works, is a worthy piece, and certainly more accurate and clear-cut than previous attempts.

Christian Gilliam
(Royal Holloway, University of London)


Nathan Jun offers an ambitious, mostly quite engagingly written study of anarchism’s historical and intellectual context, which aims to convince the general reader or political philosopher that not only is there no such thing as ‘classical anarchism’, but also that anarchism is best understood as the first ‘postmodern’ philosophical and political movement, in fact that in the study of anarchism could be retrieved the ‘long-lost positive content of postmodern philosophy’ (p. xxii). Jun does so on the presumption that many of today’s radical political movements embody anarchist principles and that the academic establishment needs to re-examine and catch up on anarchist political philosophy, in order to understand such movements.

For this Jun adopts an approach that is partly historical, partly systematic in nature. He begins with an attempt at elucidating ‘the political’ in its relation to philosophy. The shortcomings in the understanding of normativity may be understood to arise from anchoring the debate in the reading of Todd May, and from a Heraclitean confusion of politics with ‘social physics’ based on a hypostasised notion of power (pp. 11–5). Notwithstanding irritations regarding the question of how ‘an ethics or axiology based on the value of life’ (p. xvii) should be anything else than normative, we can follow Jun in identifying wrongheaded ideas of representation, philosophical and political, as the focus of anarchist criticism of modernity. Jun helpfully limits the scope of modernity by addressing only those aspects ‘that may be properly called political’ (p. 45).

After having discussed the conceptions of human nature, morality and political and economic power relations contained in socialism and liberalism in chapters 3 and 4, Jun sets out to argue that anarchism is not so much a deviant rippling in the wake of these two major political ideologies of modernity but a strong current that opposes modernity from the outset. How this propagates, historically, in the different anarchist propositions is neatly shown in chapter 5. However, it is doubtful whether the suggested alignment of anarchism with postmodernism, which follows in chapter 6, combined with statements that ‘to be revolutionary is to be on guard against death, to prepare oneself not to flee death, nor even to fight it, but simply to change the subject’ (p. 185) – which, given the struggles of our times, must sound almost dangerously aloof or cynical – will achieve greater academic appreciation of anarchist political philosophy, or whether anarchism does not deserve an analytic recovery in its own right.

Mara-Daria Cojocaru
(Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich)


Gentili was a young Italian lawyer born to a Protestant family. He fled Counter-Reformation Italy and ended up at Queen Elizabeth’s court in England. He became one of England’s leading jurists, aiding the English court concerning the key international conflicts that beset England at that time. Gentili, along with Grotius and Suarez, is credited with the modern formulation of international law. This is why a bilingual critical edition of Gentili’s work would be a boon for scholarship for those concerned with the so-called ‘Machiavellian Moment’ or interested in the foundations of modern international law. It is to be hoped that this critical edition and translation of De armis Romanis is only the initial part of similar volumes for the whole of Gentili’s corpus, especially his De iure belli libri tres.
The heart of the text is a debate between two opposing arguments about the way the Romans waged war. Each book presents an argument divided into thirteen chapters, first con then pro, like a legal argument presenting both sides of the case, although not directly with Gentili himself, but rather by two personas – the con by someone from the same city as Gentili and the pro by a Roman. Although the themes and concepts of Machiavelli are present throughout De armis Romanis, the only place he or any of his works are actually directly referred to or quoted by the Roman is in Book II, chapter 12, and the work is Machiavelli’s Art of War. This is in the form of a Socratic dialogue rather than a treatise and it was the only work on history or politics that was published in Machiavelli’s lifetime. The similarities between Gentili’s text and Machiavelli’s Art of War open some rather interesting perspectives on the transmission of Machiavelli’s thought in later political and legal thinking.

This bilingual critical edition and translation of De armis Romanis makes it available for the first time in English. The translation is a mainly faithful one from the Latin, trying to keep as close to the original as possible. The fact that to the left of the translation is a critical edition of the Latin text with critical notes gives this volume the feel that the Loeb edition gave to classical Greek and Roman texts. And given the declining knowledge of Latin among scholars of international law and the history of political thought, such editions are of critical importance to allow future scholarship to continue. Overall this edition is a masterpiece and will be a very beneficial resource for future scholars.

Clifford Angell Bates Jr
(University of Warsaw)


In this book Dylan Kissane explores how classical and neo-realists have understood the international system and the world order. By placing the concept of ‘anarchy’ at the centre of analysis, Kissane admits the limitation of the neo-realist approach in international relations and offers the alternative ‘theory of complexity’. He argues that realism and its theoretical offspring cannot fully comprehend current international politics, characterised by non-state actors and regional (supranational) organisations. Thus, this alternative theory expands the definition of international political actors from traditional states to a variety of actors which have ‘the ability to control or influence another actor’ (p. 210). The complex theory therefore dismisses the argument that states are the dominant actors in international politics. On the contrary, it argues that states are rather reactionary to the rapid changes in the modern world and that even an individual can influence states – hence ‘the chaotic dynamics’.

While the book is valuable in reviewing the theoretical evolution of international relations and of realism(s) in particular, this reviewer believes that the analysis is rather short on international relations theorists from other schools. Even though Barry Buzan is cited to strengthen the author’s arguments, Hedley Bull and his ground-breaking The Anarchical Society is found nowhere in the bibliography. Hence, the book omits the entire discourse offered by the English School of international relations and its ‘international society’ theory. The ‘anarchy’ in this discourse means the absence of world government and it does not necessarily mean the absence of order, or ‘chaos’. By admitting the evolutionary discourse of states, the vacuum of power welcomes the rise of sub-national or supranational actors. The neo-realist discourse argues that such phenomena are either ignorable or temporary. Yet in view of rising non-state actors, states act based on their fear – the original realist rhetoric. This reviewer does not claim that realism is right – rather, he expresses the wish to see the second volume of the book and Kissane’s discussion on the above point.

Tom Hashimoto
(University of Tartu, Estonia)


Hannah Arendt ends Eichmann in Jerusalem with a statement about the sentencing of Adolf Eichmann: ‘we find that no one, that is, no member of the human race, can be expected to want to share the earth with you’. Kramer’s excellent new book develops an original line of argument that echoes that Arendtian sentiment into what he calls the purgative justification for capital punishment.
In the first half of the book, Kramer explores and rejects the most state-of-the-art versions of the four most prominent philosophical defences of capital punishment: deterrence, retribution, incapacitation and denunciation. He finds that each of them lacks the necessary moral justification to support capital punishment, based, at least in part, on the Minimal Invasion Principle. This principle claims that any exertion of legal-governmental power should be done by means of the least invasive and restrictive method available. According to Kramer, all four of the standard defences fail to show that the death penalty is the least invasive way to meet their stated ends.

The final two chapters of the book develop the argument for the purgative justification. In some empirically plausible cases (Kramer uses the case of the Night Stalker, Richard Ramirez), a criminal’s acts do so much damage to the moral standing of the community at large that there is a moral duty to kill the miscreant to restore moral order and standing. It is a clever move, and one that might aid Arendt’s condemnation of Eichmann, but it faces lingering problems. The most glaring is the fact that the purgative (despite careful arguments for placing it only in liberal democracies where procedural fairness is the rule) seems open to worries about failures of justice and fairness, and there seems to be a tremendous amount of ‘looseness’ even in Kramer’s careful discussion of Eichmann. It would seem quite plausible, for instance, that strongly pro-life anti-abortion activists can develop plausible arguments about the evils abetted by abortion providers, claiming (as some already do) that there is a moral duty to kill those individuals to restore the moral dignity of our society. But despite these worries, Kramer’s book is a well-argued and inventive work that will generate new avenues of discussion in legal and moral philosophy.

Eric M. Rovie
(Georgia Perimeter College, Atlanta)


The ongoing current economic crisis increasingly reveals itself as the worst in capitalism’s history. In Britain, the slump was initially so stark and rapid, the recovery so painfully slow, that even comparisons with the 1930s look increasingly acquiescent and docile. Yet those economic commentators who dominate the mainstream British media consistently neglect historical contextualisation, and remain trapped within a neoliberal logic.

This situation symbolises not only the failure of economic practice but, more importantly, the travesty of its theoretical orthodoxy. The translation and publication of Capital and Affects by Semiotext(e) in 2011 is, consequently, long overdue. This text was originally published in Switzerland in 1994, and was written in the aftermath of the recessions in the United States and Europe during the early years of that decade.

Its concerns could not be further removed from economic orthodoxy’s fascination with rational choice theory, econometrics, game theory, and so on. Marazzi’s concern, in contrast, is to bring sharply into focus the overlap between language and affects and their impact on economic developments, particularly in the last few decades of the twentieth century. These issues are in line with the approach developed by Italian autonomist and post-autonomist thought, but Marazzi’s analysis is more directly applied to the field of economics.

The book is very much alive in the way it grapples with and develops a number of concepts and key terms that have subsequently become more widespread: lean production, just-in-time, post-Fordism, Toyotism, cognitive and immaterial labour, communicative mode of production. Alongside these theoretical developments, Marazzi identifies and explores a number of historical developments since the 1970s, and considers their impact on the economy. These include females’ increasing inclusion into remuneration, the weakening of the class structure of Fordism and industrialism, transformations in employment, the comparative decline in wages for the majority in Western economies and the concomitant rise in credit.

In short, Capital and Affects provides a welcome range of theoretical analyses to conceive of economics and its wider relations. Its key weakness springs from its innovatory approach, dwelling insufficiently on themes here, combining multiple theories unsatisfactorily there, and a general lack of signposting. These are easily forgiven because, despite the immediacy of many of the concerns and the theoretical exuberance, the analyses developed by Marazzi have a lasting value, casting light not only on the recessions of the 1990s
Marcuse believed desperately in the need to resuscitate the sensuality and joy of Eros in society. He felt that the rationalisation of consumerism had distorted the individual’s ability to conceive of alternatives to the imposed structure and needs of everyday life. Miles breathes fresh confidence into Marcuse’s energised calls to revolt against the confines of popular society and truly live as art.

This is an important and valuable introduction and accompaniment to the reading of Marcuse’s many works. He is a provocative philosopher who has not been encountered nearly enough in theory that considers the malaise and disconnect within today’s public spaces and institutions. The primary idea in this book, and in the writings of Marcuse himself, that creativity can rejuvenate both individuals and society, should be a vital source for reflection and change as we move further into the twenty-first century.

Diana Boros  
(St Mary’s College of Maryland)
intuitive verdicts about how to act in and how (for affluent people) to avoid a broken future, but utilitarians might have to reconcile themselves to the impossibility of finding a version of utilitarianism that does not make extremely stringent demands.

The broad message of the book, however, is that affluent moral and political philosophers, whatever their theoretical orientation – and people in affluent societies more generally – do not do a good job of incorporating future people into their moral framework, and that this is a significant failing, especially given the looming problem of global climate change and its attendant far-reaching and unpredictable effects. Given the extensive and plausible argumentation in this book, it is difficult, if not impossible, to resist this conclusion.

Like an introductory philosophy class, the scope of the book is quite broad. Although the book’s audience is general, the book’s argumentation is complex and densely packed, and most of the book is devoted to critical analysis instead of exposition. One will derive more benefit from this book if one has more background knowledge than Mulgan provides. (He usefully provides details on where to acquire this background knowledge in a brief appendix, however.) The book is recommended for anyone interested in extensive, sophisticated criticisms of well-known figures in recent moral and political philosophy, and anyone interested in the question of what morality implies for our treatment of future people.

Justin Moss
(Avila University, Missouri)


Aside from its genuine value as a university text, *Medieval Political Philosophy: A Sourcebook* provides a thoughtful consideration of a number of themes, including the relation between religion and politics. As the editors point out, recent events have served as a reminder that the salience of religion and politics as an issue has not been confined to the medieval period. This book, edited by Joshua Parens and Joseph Macfarland, represents a revision of the original work of the same name, edited by Ralph Lerner and Muhsin Mahdi. Examining Islamic, Jewish and Christian traditions, the editors include excerpts from works by major thinkers within each tradition. In each of these traditions, there exists a tension between religion and philosophy. In the Islamic and Jewish traditions this takes the form of a tension between the law and philosophy, while in the Christian tradition it tends to adopt the form of a tension between theology and philosophy.

For all save a limited number of specialists, medieval political thought in practice has become a neglected field. Few medieval thinkers other than St Augustine or St Thomas Aquinas are well known by political scientists in general or are conventionally viewed as part of what has come to be referred to as the ‘canon’. Many of the original texts are not widely available. In making the subject more accessible, Parens and Macfarland are doing something to remedy this. Among the figures represented are such major thinkers as Alfarabi, Avicenna, Averroes, Maimonides, St Thomas Aquinas, Dante Alighieri, Marsilius of Padua and William of Ockham. One might suggest the addition of a few thinkers not included, for example, St Augustine, John of Salisbury or John of Paris. Scholars will likely use the original texts from which these excerpts are drawn but for teaching purposes this collection will be useful.

James G. Mellon
(Independent Scholar)


Tom Rockmore offers a holistic approach to understanding the history and events before and after 9/11 by connecting an analysis of economic factors, such as Western economic globalisation, with the prevailing cultural (Huntington), religious (Lewis) and political (Bush neo-conservatism) theories that have sought to explain the perceived animosity and conflict between the West and conservative Islam. In doing so, Rockmore renders an understanding of 9/11 more accessible to the reader by guiding the dialogue beyond the familiar headlines and sound bites that have accused a ‘faceless-coward’ (p. 5) of orchestrating the destruction on 9/11.

Rockmore’s strongest contribution is an articulate narrative describing the ceaseless expansion and transformative nature of capitalism, which displaces other
forms of social and economic organisation, particularly in the Middle East (p. 71). This invasive Western capitalism has been eroding autonomy and local centres of influence in traditional Islamic societies. Western viewpoints suggest that conservative Islam is ill adjusted to the modern world (p. 31), whereas Christianity is highly compatible with both democracy and capitalism. From this perspective 9/11 lacks a singular cause, but is a reaction to gradual Western economic expansion into Islam-dominant regions, often linked mistakenly to a purely anti-Christian or anti-democratic mentality.

Furthermore, Rockmore adopts a constructivist approach to understanding history. The author favours an actor model which evaluates events ‘in terms of the intentions and goals motivating human actions’ (p. 53). His explanation of the US reaction to 9/11 is heavily invested in the evangelical Christian and neo-conservative influences on President Bush that thrust American forces into at least three wars (Afghanistan, Iraq and the global war on terror), ostensibly in defence of freedom. The final chapter devotes many pages to analysing the Bush administration’s execution of these concurrent wars and the effect that Bush’s personal politics played in defining America’s reputation in the region. However, this book fails to give a full account of the other actor in play, namely Osama bin Laden. Omitting a central figure such as bin Laden from the discussion ultimately weakens our understanding of 9/11 and overlooks important motivating factors and intentions on the part of al-Qa’eda.

Rockmore argues convincingly that Western reaction to 9/11 has been flawed and short-sighted in believing that terrorism is a problem solvable through military might. He rightly elevates economic explanatory factors at least on a par with cultural and religious theories to elucidate the tensions building before 9/11, and provides ample evidence to support his claim. Additionally, despite being published only ten years after the September 2001 attacks, this book offers a robust post-9/11 analysis.

Daniel E. Westlake
(George Mason University, Virginia)


In an upbeat and engaging style, Jon Roffe offers a profound reading of a provocative debate in contemporary philosophy: that between Gilles Deleuze and Alain Badiou. At issue in the book is ‘neither the correctness of Deleuze’s philosophy, nor ... that of Badiou, but rather the evidence in Deleuze’s philosophy to support the reading offered of his work by Badiou’ (p. 160). This approach is not only unprecedented in its interpretative depth, but – as such – also a remarkable contribution to the creation of a ‘Deleuzian project’.

Badiou’s reading is oriented around the destruction of the popular image of Deleuze as a prophet of ‘anarcho-desire’ and ‘rhizomatic-becomings’. He argues that, despite the endless amount of cool (Bergsonian and Nietzschean) concepts and creations, Deleuze’s philosophy is in fact ‘organized around a metaphysics of the One’ (p. 6); a conservative metaphysics derived from Duns Scotus and Spinoza in which ‘Being’ is a unique One-Agent ... distant from its productions and yet their active source’ (p. 19). This purification of Deleuze forms the a priori decision or axiomatic ‘filter [and] lens’ (p. 5) on which Badiou’s entire argument is premised. Moreover, Roffe shows that it is, in fact, a fundamental misrecognition which ‘leads Badiou astray from the very beginning’ (p. 5).

This is carried out by means of an examination of important concepts such as multiplicity, substance, truth and the event. According to Roffe, all of these contain figments of a ‘Deleuzian philosophy ... irreducible to Badiou’s account’ (p. 22). For instance, in chapter 4 it is made clear how Badiou reduces the complex and dynamic nature of the ‘virtual–actual’ distinction in Deleuze to an oversimplified ontological dualism. Likewise, in the vital chapter ‘Truth and Time’ Roffe argues that Deleuze’s fundamental goal to ‘broaden our conception of being’ (p. 106) is repeatedly ignored in the global, hierarchical and homogenising scheme of Badiou.

Despite his attempt to ‘defend Deleuze against [this] Badiouian scheme’ (p. 161) Roffe advocates a quite ‘Badiouian Deleuze’; he, somewhat surprisingly, praises a new engagement with Deleuzian philosophy via Badiou’s (unsuccessful) account. The hope of formulating a complete Deleuzian metaphysics could, nevertheless, be said to go against Deleuze’s own ‘nomadic’ aim to move ‘beyond philosophy through philosophy [itself]’: a neo-Leibnizian, materialist movement which escapes Badiou’s account and is, thus, absent from that of Roffe.
Notes
1 See, for example, his Deleuze: The Clamor of Being, University of Minnesota Press, 2000, and ‘Of Life as a Name of Being, or, Deleuze’s Vitalist Ontology’, Pli, 2000, 10, 191–99.

Lukas Verburgt
(University of Amsterdam)


Marx’s theory of alienation has been served well by theorists. In the 1970s Bertell Ollman and István Mészáros produced their standard works on the topic, while recently Dan Swain has published an excellent short primer. Sean Sayers’ book is different from all of these. Most importantly, it is a collection of essays. This could be a weakness, and indeed Sayers admits there are areas of overlap and repetition. Nevertheless, the essay form allows Sayers to tackle a number of related issues in short pithy papers that can be read independently.

There is, nonetheless, an overall argument, and this is presented in a short introduction in which Sayers points out that though Marx’s concept of alienation has sedimented into common discourse, it has done so in a misleading way. In particular, Sayers argues that Marx refused a one-dimensional rejection of capitalism but rather developed an immanent critique of it from the point of view of those workers’ struggles that could only emerge with the rise of capitalism. Marx’s vision of socialism is therefore not about re-appropriating some pristine pre-class form of social organisation, but is rather a very modern model of proletarian democracy.

The essays themselves start with a survey of the changes and continuities between Hegel’s and Marx’s concepts of alienation. This is followed by a discussion of the ways in which Marx recognises production as a free and creative concept. Sayers then moves on to a third essay in which, through the lens of a critique of Hardt and Negri’s use of the concept of immaterial labour, he shows how Marx’s concept of labour is not the crudely materialistic caricature that is usually supposed. In the next two chapters Sayers shows how Marx conceived the relationship of the social to the individual in such a way as to overcome the simplistic opposition between individualism and collectivism, followed by an analysis of the equally dialectical relationship between freedom and necessity in Marx’s thought. The second half of the book moves to discussions of alienation as a critical concept, the social content of Marx’s critique of private property, his discussion of the problem of the division of labour and finally communism. This is an excellent text that deserves a space in every university library.

Paul Blackledge
(Leeds Metropolitan University)


This book is a response to the theoretically inchoate relationship between capitalism and democratic governance. As a prelude to advancing a concept of capitalism that embodies a political and governmental inflection, Bruce Scott first adumbrates the antecedents of capitalism’s fastness in societies which, as maintained in the second chapter, were preconditions for the efflorescence of democracy.

Recognising that different varieties of capitalism exist in so far as political leaders are responsible for regulating the institutions of capitalism that generate markets for its citizens, Scott defines capitalism in the second and third chapters as a system that is co-dependent on politics to indirectly govern economic relationships politically, administratively and economically. Capitalism is therefore not a one-level economic system (invisible hand of the market). Scott’s tripartite definition of capitalism is one that encapsulates a perpetual, interdependent relationship between markets that function in accordance with rules administered by regulators who are, in turn, subservient to the legislative directives of politicians. Governments are therefore innovators and administrators charged with the responsibility of promoting the weal of the demos through capitalism. There is nevertheless an asymmetry between democracy and capitalism. As markets often generate economic inequalities, Scott points out that the golden mean to eradicate the excesses of political corruption and inequalities can only be achieved through effectual democratic governance.
Historical case exemplars of capitalism’s origins and evolution include Europe (ch. 5), Latin America (ch. 6), Italy (ch. 8) and North America (ch. 9). There are two chapters (chs 13, 14) dedicated to the historical transformations of capitalism in the US between 1830 and 1937 and 1965 and 2009. While this book is about capitalism as a system of governance that ‘requires a political vision to guide market frameworks that will work toward [the] achievement of societal goals’ (p. 49), it is also an excellent work on the economics of capitalism by a distinguished professor of business administration. In the prevailing climate of China’s tepid nouveaux riches who are disinclined to initiate democratic reform, a chapter about East Asia’s ‘authoritarian capitalism’ and the ‘Asian values’ debate of the 1990s vis-à-vis democracy would have been propitious. Nevertheless, the author’s tour de force in weaving the connections between the economic, administrative and politico-sociological dimensions of capitalism provokes one to think more critically about capitalism as a political concept. At nearly 700 pages, this capacious volume can be readily recommended to readers interested in economic history, political sociology and the international political economy.

John Lowe
(Independent Scholar)


It has taken a long time for political philosophers and political theorists to start to reflect on the subject of federalism. Although up to the present day no fully fledged normative political theory of federalism has been worked out, an important step has been taken by Kyle Scott. In his lucid, well-written book he offers an original account for which he draws both on a wide range of thinkers, such as Althusius, Aristotle, de Tocqueville, Plato, Montesquieu, Locke and Calhoun, and on various examples from all over the world, ranging from Belgium to Sri Lanka, and from Israel to Ethiopia.

Throughout the book Scott defends the basic thesis that countries are better off decentralising. He does so from the concern that governments should be made more humane, by taking into account, among other things, scale and procedures. It is the only way to involve the people directly in government decisions. As such, Scott’s plea for smaller forms of governing units is also closely linked to his striving for a more workable model of direct democracy. By adopting a federal form of government, the various constituent units are far better adapted to select the most appropriate means in view of the proper ends. Such an understanding could give rise to the impression of relativism, which is vigorously challenged by Scott. Unlike Condorcet, for instance, who stated that ‘a good law should be good for all men. A true proposition is true everywhere’, the author defends the thesis that although there are universal ideas, the means to attain them depend on individual circumstances.

In working out the practical framework of his theory, Scott relies on three basic concepts which he deems crucial for any healthy form of federalism, and which in the past have often been considered to be controversial: the powers of nullification, veto and secession. These are all means to revitalise civil society, in that citizens are given the instruments to shape government decisions by which they become direct participants. What makes Scott’s theory especially interesting is the close interconnection he sets up with theories of deliberative democracy. As he puts it himself, ‘federalism can also be introduced as a way to make deliberative democracy practical’ (p. 33). However valuable and original this link may be, it is at the same time the Achilles heel of the book, which deserves a more thorough examination in order to spell out in more detail its various implications.

Erik De Bom
(Erasmus University, Rotterdam)


What is the place of the majority in democracy? What is its correlation to democracy’s commitment to the principle of non-domination? This book sets out to deal with this problematic. The book employs empirical cases of South Africa, the Middle East and Northern Ireland (SAMENI) and spotlights the debate with the illuminating flare of the Lockean democratic schema and the Madisonian perspective of the federalist papers. In analysing the SAMENI cases (ch. 3), the importance of popular support for politi-
cal legitimacy in conflict resolution and the consequence of failure to appropriate it in peace processes are underlined.

In contending with the estate tax repeal in the United States, the book argues that public opinion matters for policy outcomes and that organised interests are central to them. The abortion policy (ch. 7) illustrates the complexity of the judicial review process. Shapiro recognises the fact that majoritarian rule in the process is whimsical and contradictory to democracy’s principled commitment to non-domination and espouses the inbuilt caveats that protect non-domination. The book partly responds to critics of the author’s earlier works, judged by them to be deficient on matters of basic interests, economic inequality, deliberative democracy and public institutions. Democratisation of power relations provides the best guarantee for people’s basic interests, Shapiro argues. It is further argued that economic inequality matters because it plays into power relations mitigated only by a robust wage while competitive convergence keeps democracy ‘honest’ (p. 270).

The work deploys theory and empirical data to underline the dynamics of majority rule and the principle of non-domination. Its re-engagement with the containment policy of the bipolar era is illuminating. Its post-Cold War conception has a democratic streak that is at variance with cosmopolitan democrats’ view of a world government but which inclines towards non-domination rather than domination. Students of politics and diplomats will find this well-written book invaluable.

Shapiro presumes that liberal democracy is equal to democracy and is to be universalised both in practice and in theory in ways that leave no choice for countries charting the democratic course. The author’s position in favour of a benign democratic approach to containment buckles under aggressive utilitarianism for its arbitrary support for pre-emptive strikes against post-Cold War so-called ‘rogue regimes’ (p. 174). Finally, while Ian Shapiro is the only name on the cover, it should be noted that chapters 3, 4 and 6 are jointly authored, and therefore it would be misleading to credit the lead author with the entire reflection in this work.

Sylvester Odion Akhaine
(Lagos State University)

Political Studies Review: 2013, 11(2)


The notion of friendship (eros, philia, agape, fraternitas, etc.) was the dominant socio-political, scientific and ethical paradigm of the ancient world. It is striking how great was this paradigm’s fall, à la Humpty Dumpty, too fractured thus far to achieve a second coming. The last great book on friendship was arguably Cicero’s De Amicitia. This horizontal friendship principle, certainly from Caesar forward – leaving aside antecedents like Darius, Xerxes, Alexander and Pompey – has been gradually entombed under vertical, laval accretions of power and dogma. Judaism came to serve Christianity as an integrative template. The later Imperium Romanum was similarly served by Christianity. The case is the same, later still, with an emergent Islam.

Under the religions of the Book, love of the other is largely reconfigured as love of Yahweh, Deus or Allah. That aspiration equates with the soul’s prospective redemption through merger with a higher power. The trick is to know, in life, that this merger, in death, will succeed. A token of certainty might be gleaned from ‘works’ accumulated on earth – inclusive of things and beings (such as slave and female inventory). This worldly self-enhancement may steer in an atheistic direction, yet not necessarily. For commercial enthusiasms often retain an evangelical edge. Capitalism itself (recalling Weber and Tawney) is birthed and swaddled in vibrant religiosity.

Modern politics makes a bed for the commodity fetishism of Lasswell: ‘who gets what, when, how’. And that lets down the drawbridge to the corporate state of global outreach. With friendship exiled, modern political philosophy is redesigned behind thick ramparts of liberty, or liberal equality, topped by the thin glue of tolerance. Modernist, egocentric and vertical reconstructions of politics have met with push-back from many quarters. The historical logic of extreme individualisation and alienation nonetheless persists in working itself out, though there are signs that this process may have reached its apogee.

Political Studies Review: 2013, 11(2)
The two books under review are keenly aware of the vagaries of friendship’s philosophical history, while signalling its potential for modified re-emergence in late modernity. Schwarzenbach’s *On Civic Friendship* (hereafter, CF) ambitiously argues for friendship’s re-entry into the canon of principles undergirding modern (liberal) states, success in which would radically transform the study and practice of politics. CF re-examines the history of political thought from the perspective of the civic friendship it has lost, paying major attention to Aristotle, Locke, Marx and Rawls, and less to others like Hegel, Kant and Schmitt (not ‘Schmidt’). The major social movements CF features are liberalism and feminism; socialism enters a diminuendo; multiculturalism is absent.

The core of CF’s argument, and of its genuine originality, is that Locke’s theory of private ownership is pervasive and wrong. Labour does not legitimate private ownership. Rather, the principle of private ownership legitimates (and constrains) labour. Schwarzenbach’s judicious feminism locates the bedrock of social systems in women’s traditional labour, which does not lend itself to Locke-like appropriation of product. Women’s labour typically yields an ethical outturn – in the form of reproduction and care. If Locke’s principle of appropriation is the *ultima ratio* of current privatisation policies, then damage to it must damage them. A radical shift from patriotic to matriotic theses – central to local, hard to soft, exclusion to inclusion – can only swell the progress of affective theorisation of the modern democratic state.

*Friendship and the Political* by Graham Smith (hereafter FP) also takes a narrative approach, and assumes the interpenetration of past and present. Smith anchors his narrative in a (necessarily selective) reprise of Plato (ch. 2) and Aristotle (ch. 3). He offers political philosophy, not ideology, in that his friendship paradigm presents as a historical foundation, not a set of sacred texts. He advances from this baseline to engage with three significant thinkers of the modern period: his choice of Kierkegaard, Nietzsche and Schmitt is inspired. The moral of his story is this: among the few major modern thinkers who reflect on the friendship principle, few or none is able to endorse it foursquare.

Kierkegaard desires friendship, but in God, not among men. Nietzsche sees in friendship the joy of youth, but the bane of sober, solitary maturity. Schmitt is the most typical of moderns (Nazism aside). He strips the principle of autonomous value; makes it instrumental (like Nietzsche); deploys it rather as a networking strategy – in which ‘friend’ essentially reduces to ‘enemy of my enemy’. These middle chapters are FP’s most perceptive and valuable. For us, they flag the need for further such studies – as of Mill, Renan, Emerson, James, Freud, Dewey and Buber, *inter alia*. Judging by Schwarzenbach and Smith, re-entry of the friendship principle is imminent.

Preston King
(Morehouse College, Atlanta)


The subject of Natan Sznaider’s book is the formation of the cosmopolitan ethos in the European Jewish tradition and memory, before and after the Holocaust. The book reconstructs the content of that ethos under the rubric of ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’, which encompasses the nexus of, on the one hand, particularist national attachments, engagements and concerns and, on the other, a universalist world view and political attitudes and practices by Jewish European intellectuals in the period from the 1920s until the 1960s. As such, ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’ emerges as a response to an ‘existential problem of how to reconcile the idea that people should be equal ... with the particularist identity that defines so many things that people, especially minorities, care about, and that seems to [have] been present since the birth of nationalism’ (p. 17). It emerges as a Jewish ‘hidden tradition’ and as a ‘diasporic view of an existence on the margins’ (p. 11). As such, the Jewish ethos of ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’ becomes a political alternative to the ‘lachrymose’ political identification of the Jews (with the history of victimisation and suffering) and, in contrast to the homogeneous institutionalisation of ethnicity in the state of Israel, a necessary affirmation of the plurality and diversity of the Jewish intellectual, cultural and political European heritage.

In his book Sznaider undertakes a careful and informed study of the philosophy and politics of ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’ before and after the war in the writings of Jewish intellectuals, including, primarily, Hannah Arendt, as well as Franz Rosenzweig, Gerhard Scholem, Lion Feuchtwanger, Stefan Zweig, Salo Baron.
and many others. Rather than offer solely a philosophical reading of these ideas, *Jewish Memory* enriches its interpretation with the analysis of significant political events and actions (including consideration of their ideational significance). These include the destruction of the Jewish literary heritage by the Nazis, the post-war initiative of the Commission for European Jewish Cultural Reconstruction (including Arendt’s involvement as its research director) and the Jewish intellectual involvement in the formation of the UN Declaration against Genocide. A particularly noteworthy aspect of Szaider’s study is the inclusion of writings of and debates among (often less quoted) East European Jews, such as the theorist of the notion of genocide Raphael Lemkin, the historian Simon Dubnow and the writer and artist Bruno Schulz.

This book will be of interest to students of Jewish political thought and, in particular, researchers of Hannah Arendt’s intellectual legacy, as well as those interested in the historical formation and contemporary politics of the cosmopolitan idea.

Magdalena Zolkos
(University of Western Sydney)


In this provocative book Robert Talisse scrutinises the thesis of value pluralism and its alleged relationship with liberalism. He makes three major claims: first, that while the existent arguments in favour of value pluralism have some merit, they fail to prove any metaphysical thesis about the existence of plural values; second, that various arguments that purport to show that pluralism entails liberalism fail because value pluralism is prescriptively barren (p. 29). In light of these claims he endorses ‘weak epistemological pluralism’, a position that holds that ‘there is an irreducible plurality of goods in the sense that, as things stand, we are unable to reduce all of the things we are warranted in holding objectively valuable’ (p. 108). In the later chapters he articulates his third major claim when he defends social epistemic liberalism. This position comes to liberalism ‘from a view of our most generic doxastic practices’ which Talisse claims have a set of internal norms, most significantly the norm that when we believe we aim at truth. To this end, he insists that despite our divergent moral commitments all people have an overriding interest in getting morality right (p. 142), and that this commitment is best satisfied by familiar Millian Open Society norms (p. 120).

Despite the many virtues of the book I was ultimately unconvinced by Talisse’s attempt to ground liberal politics via epistemological fiat. It seems to me that even if we share epistemological reasons for endorsing open society norms this only entails a commitment to a political regime that ensures a wide-ranging liberty of thought and discussion. There is no reason to think that it enshrines the kind of basic rights and freedoms that modern liberal-egalitarians favour. For example, our commitment to getting morality right might actually justify the state forcing the public to attend nightly moral philosophy classes. To ground a thoroughgoing liberal egalitarianism we therefore either need to endorse an additional set of moral claims, or a particular account of liberal legitimacy, as Talisse does at various points in his argument. However, if we do this we have everything we need to endorse liberalism as the best political response to the conditions of reasonable pluralism we face, without recourse to a (controversial) epistemological view.

Despite this, Talisse should be commended for writing a stimulating and provocative book that is crammed with a plethora of refreshingly pithy arguments. I hope that it will be widely read, especially by those who presume that the relationship between pluralism and liberalism is unproblematic.

Edward Hall
(London School of Economics and Political Science)


This engaging book explores the vice moralism, which Craig Taylor sees as a distortion of moral thought that arises when we think about the place and scope of morality in the wrong way. He examines this vice from a variety of perspectives, especially by engaging with literary examples, and in the process challenges some assumptions about moral reflection that analytical moral philosophers typically endorse.

In the first three chapters Taylor argues that moralism often involves the failure to recognise the humanity of those who are being judged, the evasion of serious moral
reflection and ‘the will to be scrupulously honest with and about oneself’ (p. 40). In chapters 4, 5 and 6, he discusses the overweening nature of morality, argues that moralism adopts an impoverished narrow conception of moral thought, and disputes the extent to which moral judgements can claim to be universalisable. In chapter 7 Taylor turns to politics and argues that ‘there can be a kind of radical disconnect between a person’s moral judgements and political reality ... [which] involves a kind of moralism’ (p. 132). The basic problem is that if we judge a policy purely by the demands of morality this mistakenly ‘counts any pressure of government that conflicts with the demands of morality so construed as somehow illegitimate: as merely distorting an agent’s judgement about how they should act’ (p. 137). One implication of this is that when we come to assess politicians, ‘we need to ask ourselves honestly what someone should do in their situation ... it is not sufficient merely to criticize some course of action actually taken; we need also to state more positively what alternative course of action we are recommending’ (p. 135).

The book is well written, although some of the main points are rather repetitively made. It succeeds admirably as an introduction to some of the debates about the problem of moralism and gives the rather disparate claims about moralism made by other philosophers a certain unity that has hitherto been missing. However, it is less clear that Taylor develops and deepens the philosophical debate about moralism itself, because while he makes numerous worthwhile points, there is little that is not discussed more originally and in more depth elsewhere. Nonetheless Moralism: A Study of a Vice is a welcome addition to the literature on this under-examined topic.

Edward Hall
(London School of Economics and Political Science)


Reaktion’s ‘Critical Lives’ series aims to ‘explore the life of the artist, writer, philosopher, or architect in question and relate it to their major works’. Paul Thomas’ book can be considered a great success when set against this measure, and in this sense at least it marks a distinct contribution to the field. Whereas other studies of Marx tend either to be framed around key concepts or theories or to provide a more or less substantial biography, this work nicely situates a number of Marx’s key works within their historical and biographical context. Divided into four main chapters alongside an introduction and conclusion of relative substance, Thomas deftly maps discussions of Marx’s key works into his biography.

In his introduction he treads well-worn ground in attempting to dissociate Marx from Stalinism. However, whereas others who have attempted a similar feat have tried to unpick Marx’s theoretical contributions from his practical activity – David McLellan argued, for instance, that Capital’s completion was delayed by Marx’s activity within the International Working Men’s Association – Thomas insists that the evidence points in the opposite direction: it was precisely the sense of urgency fostered by political practice that spurred Marx on to publish Capital in 1867, and the relative dearth of publications in the last decade of his life is best understood against the background of the bleak political terrain following the defeat of the Paris Commune.

After chapter 1, which gives a brief summation of Marx’s childhood and studies leading up to his doctoral dissertation and his radical democratic journalism, chapter 2 moves on to his ‘discovery’ of the proletariat in Paris in the mid-1840s. This chapter includes discussions of key essays including On the Jewish Question and The King of Prussia and Social Reform before moving on to an excellent survey of Marx’s Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts. The next chapter examines the works of the second half of the 1840s, including his settling of accounts with Proudhon and the Young Hegelians before providing an overview of the Communist Manifesto. Finally we encounter Marx in London, where introductions to Marx’s studies of Louis-Napoléon’s coup and the Paris Commune sit alongside an excellent introduction to Capital that squarely locates its publication in the context of Marx’s work within the First International. This introduction to Marx’s ideas is highly recommended.

Paul Blackledge
(Leeds Metropolitan University)


The idea of recognition has already gained wider currency and various interpretations in the realm of contemporary social and political theory. The struggles over
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the meaning and purpose of recognition have been a subject of critical exchanges among theorists which in turn have resulted in the enrichment of this idea. The critical social theorist Axel Honneth has taken an ambitious journey to interpret the entire human struggles for justice within a single framework of recognition. However, the volume under review attempts ‘to place the spotlight on misrecognition’ and takes a critical approach towards the existing treatment on the idea of ‘misrecognition’ which often considers it ‘as a background issue, one that can be grasped simply as the absence or lack of recognition’. Thompson and Yar argue that misrecognition is not ‘the opposite of the normative conception of recognition’ and therefore should not be viewed ‘as a synonym for injustice’ (p. 1). Misrecognition is a distinctive social phenomenon and has unique intersubjective roots and dynamics that demand close examination both theoretically and empirically.

In such an endeavour the essays presented in this volume try to inquire into the constitutive logic and consequences of misrecognition for theoretical construction and various social experiences like slavery, work, disability, disease and crime. For example, at the conceptual level, Nasar Meer’s essay deals with the injuries of ‘double consciousnesses’ faced by Afro-Americans and how such a consciousness of misrecognition leads to their emancipatory struggles. Andrew Sayer’s article analyses the potential problems of misrecognition in the class division of labour and how it undermines the dignity, respect and social esteem of lower-class workers. Laura Brace’s study brings out the very nature of violence and injury embedded in the social relations of slavery.

The strength of the volume lies in its ability to offer insightful reflections on various forms of social experiences of misrecognition. However, this has been done without undermining its organic link with the idea of recognition. The book intends only to supplement, not to supplant the idea of recognition, thereby avoiding confusion regarding recognition. The conceptual clarifications and empirical investigations offered in this book give enormous scope for undertaking particular and comparative studies of misrecognitions in different social and political contexts. In this reviewer’s opinion, misrecognition can provide a coherent structure for unravelling the insult and injuries produced by the concept of untouchability and the caste system in the South Asian context in particular, and the degradation of work and the dignity of the poor in the neo-liberal world in general.

Chandran Komath
(Jawaharlal Nehru University)


This book examines the intellectual foundations and development of neo-liberalism. It argues that neo-liberalism is ‘an ideology of reinvention’, that is, it ‘borrows ideas from the past and then reinterprets them on a new ideological terrain’ (p. 7). The author draws on Michael Freeden’s approach to ideologies (p. 9) and adopts Terence Ball’s ‘conceptual-historical approach to neo-liberalism’ (p. 12). Turner’s main argument is that neo-liberalism is a complex ideology incorporating many different strands, yet it has a distinctive identity.

Part I utilises Foucault’s genealogical approach in order to trace the origins of neo-liberalism. Turner examines the liberal traditions of Germany, Britain and the US and argues that, despite neo-liberalism’s national variants, there are unifying themes which connected the neo-liberal movements in these three countries (ch. 2). Chapters 3 and 4 explore the revival of liberalism from the founding of the Mont Pelerin Society in 1947 to the attempts to translate neo-liberal ideas into policy in the 1970s and 1980s.

Part II focuses on ‘the decontested concepts that are at the core of neo-liberalism’ and on their ‘adjacent and peripheral concepts’ (p. 217). Accordingly, chapter 5 examines the core concept of the market; the adjacent concepts of evolution, spontaneous order, limited knowledge, free exchange, individualism and entrepreneurship; and the peripheral concepts of the enterprise culture, income tax relief, privatisation, deregulation and share ownership. Chapter 6 explores the core concept of welfare; the adjacent concepts of freedom, personal responsibility, self-reliance, equality of opportunity and negative rights; and the peripheral concepts of reduced public expenditure, private insurance, education vouchers, ‘workfare’ and negative income tax. Chapter 7 looks at the core concept of the constitution; the adjacent concepts of freedom, private law, legal responsibility, abstract order, ‘rules of just conduct’ and evolution; and the peripheral concepts of the legal state (Rechtsstaat).
separation of powers, administrative courts, ‘fiscal constitution’ and balanced budgets. Finally, chapter 8 discusses the core concept of property; the adjacent concepts of ownership, possessive individualism, individual initiative, legal privilege, negative justice and private association; and the peripheral concepts of capital accumulation, private inheritance, voluntary savings and maximised shareholder profits. ‘It is the ordering of these concepts in this specific configuration that gives neo-liberalism its distinctive identity as an ideology’, says Turner (p. 218).

The book’s style is accessible and the arguments are presented in a clear manner. The book is informed and informative; it is equally useful to students and academics. Overall, it achieves its objectives.

Evangelia Sembou
(Independent Scholar)


This collection of essays, which is aimed mainly at graduate students and academics researching in the area, focuses on the relationship between neuroscience and political theory. It brings together authors who claim that contemporary neuroscience can illuminate central problems in political theory with those who hold a more sceptical view. The result is a number of contributions that explore to interesting effect the complexities of the relationship. On the one hand, it examines the implications of recent findings in neuroscience, such as the discovery of mirror neurons and the extent of neural plasticity, for issues such as the unity of the self, the character of political agency, the contribution of emotion to political action, and the possibilities for and constraints on democratic politics given the interaction between brain, mind and society. At the same time, several of the essays demonstrate the ways in which neuroscientific knowledge has itself been shaped across the twentieth century by social and political forces (see the contribution by Meloni in particular). What is at stake in these — at times very intricate — arguments is set out clearly in the editor’s introduction. Of not least importance is a re-evaluation of the relationship between the natural and social sciences, given the claims by some neuroscientists that they hold the key to the study of social and political relations.

On the whole, the book works very well. Discussions of neuroscience in political theory have been limited to the work of a few notable authors, such as William Connolly and Leslie Thiele, yet through their (critical) engagement with the existing literature, the contributors show how there is considerably more mileage in an exploration of the relationship. The most successful pieces are written from a sceptical position, and particularly noteworthy is the essay by Slaby, Haueis and Choudhury, as well as the editor’s own contribution. What their arguments point towards is the possibility of a critical evaluation of contemporary neuroscience and its social and political implications by political theorists. This is an important task given the often crude and reductive picture of the constitution of social and political life by ‘the brain’ that increasingly pervades popular intellectual culture and holds too many social scientists in thrall. Moreover, one comes away from a reading of this book with a clearer view of the extent to and means by which the organisation of social and political relations shapes embodied human brains and minds.

Jason Edwards
(Birkbeck, University of London)


This richly informative book aims to redefine the concept of health in terms of the capabilities approach pioneered by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum. Venkatapuram argues against the received view that health should be understood in terms of the absence of disease and statistically normal functioning. Instead he contends that it should be understood as the capability for functioning in those ways that are essential for the realisation of human dignity. Put negatively, an individual without one or more of those basic capabilities to a threshold level would lack the minimum conditions for human flourishing. That line of argument is then used to defend the cosmopolitan claim that all humans are morally entitled to the basic capabilities. In addition, the author argues that the causes of health should be expanded beyond the biological, individual behaviour and physical environment to include social conditions. Recent research into the social determinants of health suggests, for example, that hierarchy can have a deleterious effect on health. Equally the work of Sen and
Jean Drèze indicates that famine mortality is largely due to economic and political arrangements, rather than local food shortage. Expanding the causes of health to include social conditions means that health policy cannot be interpreted as merely the provisioning of medical care. In sum, Venkatapuram argues for the expansion of the concept and causes of health, with the consequence that health justice entails more entitlements for each individual and more obligations for others.

What we are presented with, therefore, is a remarkably broad understanding of health. Health includes, for example, the capability to avoid preventable illness as well as the capability to play and to have meaningful social relations. Some may insist that the concept of health should be restricted to its narrower meaning, while still acknowledging the claim that health is socially produced. Indeed, it may be argued that research into the social determinants of health demonstrates that most, if not all, of the other basic capabilities identified by the author are instrumental to (rather than constitutive of) the capability to be healthy in the narrow sense. This book does an exceptional job of bridging the gap between the social justice, well-being and epidemiology literatures. It will be of considerable interest to those curious about the interplay between those literatures as well as those engaged in the debates surrounding the capabilities approach.

Simon Wigley
(Bilkent University, Ankara)


By and large, the creation and dissemination of those things we need and desire to reproduce ourselves is predicated upon the exertion of human activity. Indeed, Kathi Weeks argues, invoking William Morris, ‘there might be for all living things “a pleasure in the exercise of their energies” ’ (p.12). However, this persuasive and well-written work of Marxist and feminist theory argues that a very specific organisation of our productive capacities has been both normalised and valorised. This has occurred to such an extent that ‘work’ – and waged work in particular – rarely forms the object of inquiry, let alone critique, in political theory today. This book offers a corrective.

It opens with a discussion of the work ethic, as theorised by Max Weber and others, along with a consideration of its vulnerabilities, particularly in the context of post-Fordism. This ethic haunts even many critical approaches. Developing Jean Baudrillard’s 1975 critique of ‘productivist’ Marxism, Weeks demonstrates how its limits continue to inflect many feminist as well as Marxist perspectives. Importantly, however, she also points towards counter-currents within these traditions advocating a ‘refusal of work’ – a strategy simultaneously ‘understood as a creative practice, one that seeks to reappropriate and reconfigure existing forms of production and reproduction’ (p. 99).

The book sketches out possible means towards these ends in developing its notion of ‘utopian demands’, touching on the ‘wages for housework’ campaign, the call for a guaranteed basic income and the demand for shorter working hours, reclaiming ‘utopianism’ through Ernst Bloch’s Principle of Hope. While there may be little gained in demanding ‘abstract utopias’ – ‘conjured up without sufficient regard to present trends and conditions that could render them possible’ (p. 195) – Weeks finds potential in those aimed at what Bloch calls the ‘Real-Possible’. Demands for ‘concrete utopias’, she argues, are those rooted by seeds already found sown in the present. So while the demand for a basic income is a relatively radical policy proposal, it retains a degree of plausibility. Yet the potential efficacy of utopian demands also exceeds any capacity to win immediate reforms. Wages for housework, for example, not only sought remuneration, but an increase in women’s collective autonomy. In this sense, it was ‘a demand for the power to make further demands’ (p. 133). It is this strategy – of ‘reformist projects with revolutionary aspirations’ (p. 229) – that makes Weeks’ book not only a substantial contribution to political theory but also, potentially, to activist practice.

Ben Trott
(Freie Universität Berlin)


As the title suggests, Huw Lloyd Williams’ book, On Rawls, Development and Global Justice, is not only about
global poverty, but also an important contribution to Rawls scholarship. More specifically, it focuses on The Law of Peoples by taking it seriously and not dismissing it as a weak decoction of Rawls’ more radical liberal egalitarian position in his original domestic theory of justice. The main aim of the book is to elaborate on one of the core principles of The Law of Peoples, viz. the duty of assistance that is analogous to the distributive justice principle in the domestic context.

Williams’ account is well informed, well written and well structured. He develops his thesis in the course of the three distinct parts. First, he offers a critical presentation of Rawls’ text itself by scrutinising the form and content of the duty of assistance. He takes time to refute carefully several of the criticisms uttered by liberal cosmopolitans such as Charles Beitz, Thomas Pogge, Kok-Chor Tan and Allen Buchanan. In the second part, Williams constructively elaborates on the duty of assistance, by developing it into a robust and far-reaching principle. He offers a justification of the duty and seeks to define the extent of its measures. The third and last part of the book is of an evaluative nature. Williams holds his own theory up to the previous criticisms of the liberal cosmopolitans and delineates how his robust duty of assistance relates to Rawls’ international theory in general.

Apart from the tightly argued character of the whole book, this study is important and innovative for two distinct reasons. First, Williams’ answer to the liberal cosmopolitans is inspired by drawing attention to the distinction between ideal and non-ideal theory. The principles that apply to the former are not identical to those of the latter. And since only Rawls’ domestic theory of justice belongs to the field of ideal theory, the principles of his international theory of justice may not be assessed according to the same standards. As a consequence, Rawls’ duty of assistance may be fully in line with his domestic egalitarian point of departure, because both principles reflect a different side of the same coin. Second, in working out his robust theory Williams brings in the work of Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum by employing their capability approach, the main assumption being that justice should be measured in terms not of goods but of freedoms. In doing so, he builds a firm basis on which institutions could be shaped to attain the social minimum that Rawls strived for in the international realm. In short, this is an important book whose reach goes beyond strict Rawls scholarship.

Erik De Bom (Erasmus University, Rotterdam)


This book offers a theoretical blueprint of a left-libertarian society, a ‘non-statist socialism with a participatory democratic ethic’ (p. 1). Chris Wyatt finds the core problem of capitalism contained within Marx’s description of the commodity fetish, and sets out to describe a post-capitalist future with de-commodified societal relations. He identifies a post-Washington Consensus consensus (p. 8) which acknowledges neoliberalism as bankrupt, and claims that his New Economic Democracy (NED) ‘provides a left-libertarian solution to the glaring inadequacies of the Washington Consensus’ (p. 9). Along the way he leans heavily on G. D. H. Cole’s writings concerning cooperative ‘guild’ socialism, and engages with Robert Michels’ theories of oligarchy within contemporary political organisations. The essence of Wyatt’s argument is that democracy must extend to the economic realm, and ‘full democracy can only be achieved by a system of workers’ control’ (p. 9), excluding both capitalism and statist socialism.

The work is divided into two parts: the first describing the structure of the NED and how it will de-fetishise societal relations, and the second engaging with potential criticism in the form of Michels’ critique of democracy and oligarchy. While the work is mainly theoretical, Wyatt uses the Mondragon Cooperative’s success in Spain as a case study. This is the book’s strength, as he crafts a robust argument for worker-run co-ops, organised into ‘guilds’, as the only potential way a future socialist society could direct a collectively controlled economy without succumbing to bureaucracy and oligarchy. Multiple levels of direct democratic input in production and consumption councils describe how a democratically planned society could function, a rare point in socialist literature. Democratic control leads, for Wyatt, to non-alienated and de-commodified labour. In the second half Wyatt presciently identifies Michels’ warnings of oligarchy as a primary concern for theorists of democracy and socialism.
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Wyatt’s work stumbles in a few places. Curiously, no discussion of reform or revolution in reaching his post-capitalist future appears. No time is given to outlining how his economic governing bodies would deal with non-economic political problems. All workers in the book seem to be industrial or craft, ignoring the vast amount of modern non-productive labour and how it might be de-alienated. Wyatt’s focus on domestic problems lends his society an autarkic character and ignores the potential impact of international trade and foreign relations with potentially hostile capitalist powers. In all this is an important book for democratic and socialist political thought, engaging with old topics in a fresh way.

Peter Lavenia
(Clarkson University, New York)


The Politics of Belonging begins by exploring some of the intrinsically held opinions and beliefs with respect to political nationality, citizenship and similar constructs vying for people to belong to, such as religion, feminism or cosmopolitanism, within a theoretical framework. Key concepts include: intersectionality (and its boundaries); belonging, and the politics of belonging that constructs citizenship and other collectives; sociological theories and constructions of identity; globalised migration; power and security discourses.

Importantly, Yuval-Davis notes that citizenships vary in definition, participation and relationship. She explores the various constructions, forms and degrees of citizenship and belonging such as multicultural and multilayered citizenship and their technologies of definition such as passports and registrations. She begins chapter 3 with the differentiation of (state) citizenship and nationality and the relevance of boundaries, versus membership of a collective, for example indigenous or feminist groups. Additionally, the author acknowledges that the complex concept of religion strongly relates to ‘notions of culture and power’ (p. 114) that may provide an enhancer or alternative to contemporary ‘projects of belonging’ (p. 117).

Cosmopolitanism is compared to globalisation as a popular and complex term with a plethora of definitions. Yuval-Davis goes on to discuss citizenship, incorporating many NGOs at the forefront of ‘cosmopolitan world governance’ (p. 155). From the ‘soft’ significance of NGOs to their global successes, the book continues in chapter 6 with ‘The Caring Question’, focusing significantly on feminist philosophy, ethics, citizenship and power with respect to ‘a feminist political project of belonging’ (p. 199).

In conclusion the author offers an outline of her multilayered, cosmopolitan project. She includes acknowledgement that movements of belonging, inclusion and change take time. Furthermore, such progress demands education to ensure that change is not merely the transfer of power from one group to another; she offers the example of the 2010 Egyptian resistances as a negative example. This reference also summarises and positions the book as a relevant, popular and pragmatic reference, being one that most can relate to and understand.

Gillian Hutchison Perry
(Independent Scholar)

International Relations


The world has changed since the post-Cold war era. More complicated issues have emerged, and energy is a key issue around the globe, including in Russia, where robust energy policies are crucial. The volume is divided into three parts and it begins with an introduction to the heuristic theoretical model that links various energy policy actors in Russia with these four structural dimensions: ecological, institutional, financial and geographical. The actors develop schemata that help them link their core interests with the policy environments depicted in the four structural dimensions. By making use of this theoretical framework, Markku Kivinen, David Dusseault, Nina Tynkkynen and Pami Aalto pertinently focus on the national level. Kivinen presents a set of hypotheses on tension between the interests of the Russian state, the various interest groups within its bureaucracy, and the oil and gas industry. Dusseault examines the energy policy actors and their policy environments in the Kovyrka gas field, the Sahka Republic and Sakhalin Island, while
Tynkynen and Aalto focus on environmental sustainability in Russian energy policies since 2010.

The inter-regional section of the volume delivers a lucid account of the interaction among Russia’s energy policy actors, its transit states and its energy customers in countries in neighbouring regions. Margarita Balmaceda examines the disputes between Russia and Ukraine over the period 1994–2010 and disagreements with Belarus.

Although it is not possible to render the entire theoretical model into analyses in one volume, the contributors present the complexities of energy policy formation explicitly by studying some parts of the complex theoretical model. However, the book could benefit from addressing the social structure model of Russia’s energy policies at a global level more thoroughly, with an examination of case studies, particularly from the Far East. Yet the chapter by Kivinen brings interesting and new in-depth information on Russia’s energy policies at a national level and pushes readers to consider the public and business actors in Russia’s energy policies.

Overall, these remarks do not reduce the value of the volume, which improves our understanding of the complex issue of energy in the new millennium. The work may benefit policy makers, practitioners, researchers and students in international relations, and political economists and those who are interested in Russian-related issues.

Fatemeh Shayan
(University of Tampere, Finland)


Rethinking International Relations Theory via Deconstruction attempts to offer a ‘rethinking’ of contemporary IR theories through an ‘experience’ of Derridean deconstruction. As Arfi observes, while ‘IR theorists have ceaselessly sought to understand, explain, and transform the experienced reality of international politics’, they pursue this goal by ‘eliminating or reducing the antinomies, contradictions, paradoxes, dilemmas and inconsistencies’ (p. 24) within their approaches. The unquestioning presupposition of this quest, argues Arfi, has enclosed possible thinking and conceptualisation in IR theory. In other words, what Arfi seeks in this book is to reveal the possibility and impossibility implied by the presuppositions of IR theories by Derrida’s ‘metaphysic of presence’, grounding the presuppositions on ‘undecidable pseudo-concepts’. The selected works for deconstruction include: Patrick Jackson’s Weber-based idea of science; the positive ontology in theorising the agent–structure problematic; the aporetic politics in thinking about identity/difference; the ‘as-if’ element in theories of trust; John Ikenberry’s theory of constitutional order; and different logics of action deployed by IR scholars. This book thus requires readers with some understanding of IR theories and Derridean philosophy.

The work of deconstruction, Arfi claims, ‘is an indispensable thinking framework’ and ‘is resourceful and rigorous’ in addressing the dilemmas in IR theories (p. 25). The readers will not find this too bold a claim through the chapters. The question, however, is what this deconstruction work may contribute to IR theory. Arfi is not agnostic with regard to this suspicion. In the beginning of the book, he explicitly articulates that to practise deconstruction is not to seek but to prevent any closure (pp. 5–7). This does appear to mean that no conclusion will be drawn. For if there is a conventional conclusion, then the conclusion itself seems to be representing another closure, which sets right against deconstruction. However, whereas Arfi proclaims that the ‘aporias that inhere within these theories without seeking to lift or resolve these aporias ... are chances for IR theory to have a future’ (p. 210), he does not make it clear how a deconstruction work can make a contribution in this aspect. In short, the author has offered an insightful and innovative ‘rethinking’ about IR theories, but at the same time this book does not seem to hold a clear position with regard to what and how it contributes to IR theories or theorising in the future.

Shang-Lin Wu
(University of Exeter)


This is a most timely book, offering a number of insights into the so-called G20 group. The G20 group has evolved out of the G8 and the G8+5 frameworks
for global coordination. As it is the broadest approach to global governance outside the UN framework, it is essential to come to grips with how this loose organisation works, as well as how it can be improved upon, given the benchmark of the basic stylised objectives pursued typically within globalisation, including economic stability, development and poverty alleviation.

The book is a collection of articles from international symposia in connection with the launching of the G20 framework. A few of them spell out in depth the logic of economic coordination on a global scale, focusing upon coordination among major states against global imbalances – in demand, savings, internal and external deficits, trade patterns, supply, etc. – with the objective of furthering economic growth around the world. Other pieces deal with the efforts at global banking regulation, replacing Basel II with Basel III. Finally, there are inquiries into the relationships between the G20 framework and other international or regional bodies, such as the World Bank, the IMF and the EU. The role of international civil society is also covered in some pieces in this instructive volume.

One may distinguish between two theoretical perspectives on the evolving pattern of global governance, including both international organisations and regional ones. On the one hand, there is the search for optimality. Thus, several articles discuss how the G20 should function. Indeed, one encounters long wish lists, which have a somewhat utopian character. Several authors want the G20 to broaden its objectives to include the environment and global climate change. Others suggest stronger links between the Bretton Woods institutions and the emerging G20 framework.

On the other hand, we have the positivist approach, attempting to understand what a loose coordination mechanism like the G20 is, coping with conflicting preferences among its member states and balancing conflicting demands. The ambition to understand and not to recommend may profit from insights into how domestic organisations generate bias, opportunism and ‘no action, talk only’ (NATO). The positivist lessons seriously dampen the normative search for optimal global governance.

This volume contains much relevant material. However, its recommendations for strong coordination in response to the challenges that the process of globalisation throws up are questionable, not only in relation to global economic policy making but also with regard to the illusion of comprehensive overall decision making on a combination of general objectives. It simply cannot be done, and if at all feasible then is hardly desirable. Global governance can at best be the art of muddling through.

Jan-Erik Lane
(University of Freiburg)

Theories of International Politics and Zombies

Theories of International Politics and Zombies is a unique introduction to several major theoretical approaches in international relations. The academic goal of this book is to introduce those without previous exposure to political philosophy to various key theories such as realism, liberalism, bureaucratic politics and psychology, among others. Drezner utilises his supernatural phenomenon of choice – zombies in popular culture – in order to discuss how each selected theory views the world and predicts behaviour. This book ties to a larger movement, blending the study of the supernatural (such as Harry Potter, vampires and The Lord of the Rings) with current scholarly research to engage a wider audience. Drezner provides a brief overview of zombies in popular culture for people not familiar with the mobile undead, importantly because theories often generate predictions contingent on the exact kind of undead plague; for instance, whether the zombies are ‘fast zombies’ (such as in 28 Days Later) or ‘slow zombies’ (as in Night of the Living Dead). He then devotes one chapter to each chosen theory in order to show how these diverse philosophies arrive at different predictions of behaviour when faced with the same existential threat.

The book’s real strength is in how it parsimoniously introduces several theories of international relations. Seminal works like Michael W. Doyle’s Ways of War and Peace can be a daunting starting point for a student lacking exposure to the major philosophical underpinnings of international relations. Drezner’s volume is a far more accessible introduction to these theoretical approaches, beginning each chapter with a succinct overview of the major points of that particular theory before moving into specific discussions of how that theory would predict behaviour in the event of a real-
world zombie outbreak. The challenge of this book is
the depth in which each theory is explored. While it is
written as a brief introduction and targeted at the
neophyte to international relations theory, it often has
to make editorial decisions that give short shrift to the
explored theories. For instance, in the nine-page
chapter on domestic politics, Drezner gives paragraphs
to the President, Congress, public opinion, interest
groups, defence contractors and hindrances to policy
implementation. Each topic he presents in that chapter
could have stood alone as its own chapter. Overall, this
is an accessible first introduction for students unfamiliar
with the philosophical side of international relations.

Christopher Housenick
(Arkansas Tech University)

On the Fringes of Diplomacy: Influences on
British Foreign Policy, 1800–1945 by John Fisher
306pp., £70.00, ISBN 978 1 4094 0119 3

This volume is a collection of essays examining how
individuals, for the most part not members of the
country’s diplomatic corps, have nonetheless played an
important role in the formation of British foreign
policy; or, if they were diplomats, how that influence
was exercised through parallel networks of personal
contacts. The editors argue at the outset that ‘the
conduct of British foreign policy can be better under-
stood by looking at a broad range of actors other than
the “usual suspect” ’ (p. 1). The reader will quickly find
him or herself in agreement, as each of the chapters
provides evidence that foreign policy making, in the
cases reviewed, has been far from linear. The charac-
terisation that Paul Kennedy laid to rest some years ago
in his Realities behind Diplomacy clearly informs these
studies. The individuals who have drawn the attention
of this volume’s authors range from those already
known to historians, such as Lady Derby, Sir James
Rennell Rodd and John Buchan (Lord Tweedsmuir), to
the comparatively unknown (e.g. Armenius Vambery).

In any collection of essays, a reader’s attention will
naturally be drawn to certain topics over others. This
volume is no exception to that rule. However, most of
the chapters are both very interesting and insightful.
The chapter on the role of the press in Lord Palmer-
ston’s foreign policy is a case in point, as is the study of
the embassy of Rodd in Rome before and during the
First World War. Both pieces reveal an acute under-
standing of the political environment within which
foreign policy was made and highlight the influence of
private channels on Whitehall’s foreign policy. The
chapters on Anglican missionaries Vincent Kraft, Sir
Eric Phipps and John Buchan further reinforce the
editors’ thesis that, in some cases, that influence can be
considerable, and directly impacts upon the course of
global affairs. But even in those chapters where the
people being studied seem less central to the history of
the time, the reader will recognise the importance of
studying those characters for what they tell us about
foreign policy making.

This is a useful set of essays for anyone interested in
the history of international relations. The case studies
that are presented offer a wide variety of examples
where the documentary evidence can only tell part of
the story. Works such as this highlight the incredible
richness of the field, but also shine a light on possible
topics for future research.

Ben Lombardi
(Defence Research and Development, Canada)

International Law, International Relations and
Global Governance by Charlotte Ku. Oxford:
77873 2

This new treatment of the intersection(s) of the aca-
demic disciplines of international relations (IR) and
international law (IL) appears in the ever-expanding
‘Global Institutions’ series. The book presents a histori-
cally rich account of international organisations and the
emergence in the mid-to-late twentieth century of
global governance, presented as a reflection of techno-
logical shifts, the pluralisation of global politics and the
rise of demands for global participatory politics, culmi-
nating in the Responsibility to Protect and the politics
of intervention in the new millennium.

Charlotte Ku discusses these issues in a form that is
in part an extended review of the state of the two
disciplines, in part an exploration of the problems of
contemporary global governance and in part a nuanced
historicisation of these contemporary issues, including
the plight of the sovereign state. There is much of value
in this book, from its careful integration of history and
analysis to the author’s clear command of the develop-
ment of IL as an analytical discipline. The structure of
the book sensibly does not try to synthesise an overarching approach but rather oscillates between looking at the practice of international law from the perspective of IR and the actuality of international relations from the perspective of IL.

Along the way, Ku offers some summary treatment of the histories of both disciplines, and here the one slight weakness of the book (for a European audience at least) is revealed: while acknowledging the English School’s approach to international law, the disciplinary horizons are in the main North American. Thus, mainstream theories (represented by US scholars) are emphasised while critical theories get much shorter treatments. For instance, constructivism in IR is briefly mentioned although Alexander Wendt’s work is explored in more detail in the final chapter, and critical legal studies, while being accounted for in a little more detail, is (again) largely dismissed by omission rather than through engagement. That said, this is a relatively short book that seeks to map a broad set of issues for an audience unfamiliar with many of these detailed analytical debates and thus such quibbles remain just that: quibbles. Overall this is an excellent and timely summary of the current state of play where IR and IL meet in their analysis of global governance. While it may raise more questions than it answers for scholars already immersed in the field, Ku’s book remains a sure-footed introduction to an important contemporary field of concern.

Christopher May
(Lancaster University)


The end of the Cold War in 1989 created a unique momentum in which the so-called ‘international community’ seemed to conceive cooperation in the area of peace and security not only as possible, but also desirable and necessary. This somewhat generalised sense was partially fulfilled by scholars, policy makers, donors and public opinion, all united by a naïve and oversimplified understanding about the ‘victory’ of the West and the prospects of a peaceful ‘new world order’. The edited volume under review offers a wide-ranging picture of one of the results of this post-Cold War momentum: the resort to the practice of tutelage in world politics. In the book, this practice is explored in places the editors define as ‘new protectorates’, that is, ‘territories where a medium- to long-term international presence, multilateral yet de facto Western leadership, was established with transformative goals at their core’ (p. 1). Places as distinct as Kosovo, East Timor, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq and Afghanistan are thus included in the concept and their realities are subject to the scrutiny of contributors. As a whole, the chapters challenge the often benevolent and altruistic discourse upon which Western interveners frame their actions, thus pointing out the challenges associated with the rather intrusive character of governance of new protectorates by the ‘international community’.

Perhaps the most distinctive strength of the volume is the diversity of topics and the array of new protectorates covered. They include, inter alia, conceptual and empirical issues related to peace operations in the new protectorates (the chapter by Wolfgang Seibel), the normative ideas orienting recent institutional arrangements such as the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission (Richard Caplan and Richard Ponzio) and the contradictions related to the use of foreign police forces to maintain law and order in the new protectorates (Michael Boyle). Particularly insightful is Mats Berdal and David Keen’s chapter on the political economy of the new protectorates. In their contribution, they point to the importance of this critical approach in challenging the record of external intervention by looking into two sets of challenges: the so-called ‘spoiler problem’ and the difficulties related to combating crime.

The New Protectorates is an invaluable academic contribution that is certain to appeal to those interested in contemporary debates on the challenges of external actions (usually Western driven) in post-conflict societies.

Fernando Cavalcante
(University of Bradford)


This volume of fourteen articles (by thirteen European authors/co-authors and three Americans), with a brief introduction and conclusion by the editors, provides a broad overview of the interaction between European
foreign policies and those of the United States in the Middle East in the years since 1945. Consequently, the 60-plus year sweep of this volume begins prior to both Israeli independence and the formation of the European Coal and Steel Community and concludes with a chapter on Iran’s nuclear ambitions.

The book begins with articles on the 1956 Suez crisis (Tore Petersen) and the 2003 Iraq War (Victor Mauer). While these two events provide convenient hooks to highlight how American and European interests can clash in the Middle East, the extent of the divisions over Iraq were ultimately less pronounced and less psychically scarring than those over Suez. Eighteen NATO members, including Britain, Italy, Spain, Poland and the Netherlands contributed troops either to the war or the occupation of Iraq, and France rejoined the NATO command structure in 2009.

Nevertheless, Washington’s regional interests have diverged at times from those of its European allies over the past 60 years. Four of the articles deal with the waning of British imperial influence in Palestine (John Sakkas), Iran (Malcolm Byrne) and the Gulf (Stephen Blackwell and Rosland Popp) and the role the United States played in replacing British commercial and imperial security interests with its own commercial and anti-communist security interests. Six of the articles are ostensibly on the Arab–Israeli conflict, although one of these is really about the European response to the 1973 Arab oil embargo and the resulting energy crisis (Daniel Möckli). Three chapters deal with Europe’s policies between the oil embargo and the end of the Cold War, the 1990s, and include a thoughtful commentary on the current state of European diplomacy in the Middle East by Costanza Musu. Six chapters examine Gulf security, an area where US and European interests have run in parallel since the Cold War through to the present day, with the notable exception of the divisions over Iraq in 2003 – divisions that were both intra-European as well as transatlantic. The final chapter, on the most recent concerns over Iran’s nuclear programme (Harsh V. Pant), returns to shared American–European interest in Gulf stability and notes the degree to which European strategies of engagement (‘good cop’) and the American strategy of containment/coercion (‘bad cop’) are complementary rather than contradictory.

Mark Duckenfield
(Air War College, Montgomery, Alabama)


The starting point of this important book, written before Osama bin Laden’s death, is the ‘growing sense among terrorism analysts that al-Qa’ida is on the losing side of the battle against its enemies, foremost among them the United States’ (p. 1). In this view, inspired by cautious optimism, al-Qa’eda and its jihadi allies have weakened and are unlikely to achieve their ultimate goals but, despite various setbacks and failures, they remain operationally capable.

The editors of the volume ascribe the weakening of the transnational jihadi movement to a combination of ‘exogenous’ Western-induced pressures (particularly counter-terrorism efforts) and ‘endogenous’ problems. Fault Lines in Global Jihad is devoted to the study of the latter class of factors, less explored by Western scholars and analysts.

Internal splits and quandaries are divided into two categories: fissures dividing jihadis themselves and fault-lines between jihadis and other Islamic and Islamist groups. The first part of the volume covers the intra-jihadi divisions and reviews the dispute about takfir (‘excommunication’) and violence against Muslims (Hafez), the near and far enemy debate (Brooke), the rift between strategists and doctrinarians (Lia), the classical/global jihad dichotomy (Brown), the tensions between Arab and non-Arab jihadis (Stenersen) and the impact of ideological recantations (Lahoud).

The second part of the book examines the disagreement between jihadis and other influential Islamic (and Islamist) actors and communities such as the Muslim Brotherhood (Lynch), the Shi’a (Haykel) and Hamas (Paz). It also investigates the Islamic disputes on the internet (Sanford). The final chapter by Moghadam and Fishman discusses the volume’s main findings and presents its implications for policy. In their opinion, ‘these divisions have and continue to weaken al-Qa’ida, but neither in an automatic nor in an exclusive fashion. Instead, the global jihad movement is simultaneously vulnerable and resistant to the cracks and divisions described in this volume. The roots of this ambivalence lie in the movement’s endemic characteristics and its situational context’ (p. 232). However, they argue that these fault-lines are salient and could be prudently exploited.
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As for the methodology, the volume is mainly based on a case study approach employing qualitative analysis. The widespread use of primary sources, especially in Arabic, is praiseworthy. Overall, *Fault Lines in Global Jihad* is a unique volume, comprehensive (if not exhaustive), well organized, cautious and written in a clear style by specialists. The volume fills an important gap in the literature on terrorism and, particularly, on jihadism. It can be considered as a valuable resource for scholars, analysts and policy makers.

Francesco Marone (University of Pavia)


A compilation of succinct and interesting articles, this edited volume broadens scholarship on regions and regional change through a variety of styles and perspectives. Virtually all students of international relations understand that IR theories – realism, liberalism, constructivism and others – can provide satisfactory explanations of various soul-crushing systemic puzzles, but they face shortcomings when applied to regional contexts. *International Relations Theory and Regional Transformation* is a step in this direction and goes some way towards correcting this uneven record. This volume’s key argument is that, although the leading paradigms of IR are heavily grounded in Western experience and systemic understanding, they can still provide substantial insights to visualise positive regional transformation.

An impressive line-up of distinguished IR theorists provides a rich analysis of regional transformation, by developing regional-level analytical frameworks, from the perspective of their school of thought. Following the introductory chapters on conceptual issues by T. V. Paul and Barry Buzan, Part II addresses the realist position on regions. Dale Copeland and Jeffrey Taliaferro bring in various strands of realist perspectives on regional orders that assess regional stability through the probability of conflict and the conditions of cooperation. In Part III, John Oneal and John Owen provide a liberal viewpoint, especially concerning economic interdependence, international/regional institutions and democratic sources of regional order and peace. Their view is that only the Kantian tripod can ensure regional cooperation and enduring peace. In the next section, Amitav Acharya and Vincent Pouliot present constructivist perspectives in terms of the power of ideas and security communities. According to them, regional cooperation can be achieved by common identities and intersubjective norms that foster trust among the members of a given region. The eclectic notions of regional orders are the focus of Part V. In their compelling presentations, Norrin Ripsman and John Hall argue that none of the three paradigms of IR – realism, liberalism and constructivism – can adequately explain regional transformation, especially in isolation, and a simultaneous approach is fruitful in this respect. And finally, while charting a course for future research on regional transformations, Stefanie von Halatky concludes the volume by presenting its central theme.

By taking a balanced approach, the book significantly deals with all paradigms and squeezes out various policy-relevant ideas for regional transformation, especially akin to the European model of regional security community. This volume must certainly be welcomed as a much-needed initial step towards a better understanding of regional transformations from a vast range of scholarly perspectives. It is a noteworthy starting point for all those who wish to widen their regional horizons through cross-theoretical dialogue, especially advanced students and scholars.

Surinder Mohan (University of Delhi)


New literature debating and investigating nuclear arms makes a welcome contribution because of the limited number of publications after the Cold War. *Justifying Ballistic Missile Defence: Technology, Security and Culture* addresses several of the contemporary nuclear arms issues, especially measures against ballistic missiles. Although several other countries are mentioned, the book is mainly a study of US anti-ballistic missile initiatives. Columba Peoples is a lecturer in international relations at the University of Bristol and a proponent of critical security studies that challenge the
traditional realist concepts and to a degree the paradigm in security studies.

The book investigates the drivers and projected reasoning for defence measures against ballistic missiles since the 1950s. The author is clear about which lens he uses to see the world, which is helpful. The lens, according to the author, follows the philosophical tradition of the Frankfurt School and draws its theoretical framework from the writings of Antonio Gramsci. By clearly stating his viewpoint, the author does the reader a favour. It is far more enjoyable to read a book that states its viewpoint – so the arguments can be identified and thought upon. Readers who hold a different Weltanschauung from the Gramscian theoretical framework, of whom there may be a few, benefit from being confronted by another viewpoint and will enjoy the solid literature research.

The author puts emphasis on technology as an agent of change and throughout the book exemplifies the American techno-utopianism and the perception of an engineered solution to political problems, especially in chapter 2 (p. 46), but the question is whether technology itself is of such importance. Naturally, the explanation is ideal for neo-Marxist theory. The problem occurs when the interpretation periodically becomes normative, and driven by the author’s outlook. The picture of a fear-mongering military industrial complex, aligned with politicians, which drives the policy comes across as simplistic and unappealing, even if supported by the author’s brilliant intellectual dissection of past events and policy decisions. The book reaches its zenith when the author systematically reviews the arguments of several leading scholars, such as Colin S. Gray and Kenneth N. Waltz, and delivers a critique of established assumptions. The book is a good read and contains promising intellectual stimuli.

Jan Kallberg
(University of Texas at Austin)

Migration and Climate Change by Étienne Piguet, Antoine Pécoud and Paul De Guchteneire (eds).

This edited work approaches the controversial and questionable notion that climate change will affect migration by drawing on several disciplines such as anthropology, climatology, demography, geography, political science and law. It is one of the first attempts to bridge the conceptual gap between migration scholars and climate scholars to focus on empirical evidence about the links between them. From the outset, the editors highlight the problems of methodology – different in both fields – that have failed to consider the full array of environment factors and the complex root causes of migration.

The first part of the book explores the plurality of factors that could impact upon human movement. The contributing authors present evidence of the latest climate change forecasts that may cause human displacement and case study evidence from around the world, in zones potentially affected by sea-level rise, desertification, water shortages and floods. A recurring theme is that human and environmental factors (often independent from climatic factors) will be the main determinants of the impact of climate change, and this impact could be negated by proper public planning. In the second section, contributors examine the conceptual, legal and political tools vital to the debate on migration and climate change. Overall, the editors conclude that there is little evidence that climate change has so far caused large increases in migration: it is virtually impossible to identify groups of people who have already been displaced by climate change alone, as economic, political and cultural factors are also at work.

The book provides a valuable contribution to the debate on migration and climate change, first and foremost as it promotes dialogue across different disciplines and schools of methodology on the matter. It also serves as a warning to those who would like to exaggerate the linkage between migration and climate change for political purposes. Indeed, the final paragraph laments that the ‘past political confrontations about climate change migration have probably done more to hinder than to help the development of multilevel action strategies’ (p. 426). Despite the methodological difficulties clearly outlined in the book, the editors perhaps should not be so hasty as to rule out the possibility that future research could yield more convincing evidence. However, the practical policy-orientated approach of many of the chapters, based on the nuanced analysis of the phenomena of migration and climate change, ought to set the tone for confronting the challenges of human displacement that the future may pose.

Clare Sharkey
(Independent Scholar)

Branislav Slantchev’s Military Threats makes an impressive contribution to the crisis escalation literature. Motivated by the puzzle of how states credibly demonstrate their resolve during a crisis, the author focuses on how physical military moves affect state behaviour. These moves have informational consequences, as they can signal the credible resolve of a particular state. In addition, these moves have functional consequences, as they affect the probability of victory in a potential war. By endogenising the war pay-off, Slantchev reveals potent mechanisms that can explicitly or implicitly compel state behaviour. While there are several important theoretical results derived from the formal analysis, a major finding is that military moves can demonstrate credible commitments, but not on the cheap. This is especially troubling for militarily powerful states, who find that reputation can be a ‘curse for the strong’ (p. 93). If states can engage in costly mobilisation actions to demonstrate their resolve credibly, this can decrease the probability of war. However, military moves can also lead to increased situational instability of the crisis. In other words, physical military moves may escalate a crisis to a war, even when the states’ preferences favour peace.

Although largely a game-theoretic argument, Slantchev effectively makes his theory accessible to those less comfortable with formal methods. In addition, the author uses a host of illustrative examples and a longer case study to complement his theoretical assertions. His case analysis of the Korean War explains how China and the United States found themselves at war, although their preferences would have suggested otherwise. The author’s conclusion that China did not do enough in terms of military moves to deter the United States from crossing the 38th parallel challenges existing signalling explanations of this conflict.

One limitation of this study is that the implications for the author’s arguments are understated. Slantchev begins this analysis with a careful review of the existing crisis literature, and finds that these models do not fully account for credible signalling. This is especially true for audience cost models, which underpin a significant portion of the formal democratic peace literature. As a result, the reader is left wondering how Slantchev’s theory affects these predictions, or how military moves affect different regime types in general. Despite this omission, this work offers a rich theoretical foundation for future empirical research on the effectiveness of military moves in crisis bargaining.

Patrick Shea
(Rutgers University)


This book brings together a collection of essays written primarily by the leading American international relations theorist Jack Snyder. Featuring contributions from other eminent scholars such as Robert Jervis and Thomas J. Christensen, the book focuses on collecting liberal ideas of democratisation and realist ideas of anarchy and power politics. Like much of Snyder’s previous work, these essays seek to explore the relationship between the realist views of domination and security, with the liberal logic of progress and political development.

This collection therefore brings together much of Snyder’s contribution to IR since the early 1990s. While on the one hand these essays show Snyder’s outstanding contribution to political science, it is difficult to see the relevance of all of the essays to contemporary debates. As they have been published over a twenty-year time period, they are not all relevant to contemporary issues and a couple would perhaps have best been left out. However, most of them provide useful context and show the development of Snyder’s thought regarding the progress of democratisation and its impact on international power struggles.

Although Snyder is not the first scholar to try to bring together liberal and realist ideas, his focus on democratisation and power struggles could be particularly useful in regard to recent developments in Russia and the Middle East. The timely release of this book demonstrates how much of Snyder’s research will continue to be relevant for the foreseeable future, especially at a time when there are power transitions in many democratic and non-democratic nations.

Kevin Blachford
(University of Winchester)

The People vs the State is a collection of articles by Ramesh Thakur previously published in various newspapers worldwide, spanning 1999–2011. It details the evolution of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principle from the nebulous and selective ‘humanitarian intervention’ logic of the 1990s to a more concrete and specific rules-based norm of international law accepted by the United Nations today. It discusses the specific cases of Kosovo, Burma, East Timor, Darfur and Libya and their implications for R2P. Thakur explains how Kosovo set a precedent for intervention without UN authorisation which was used in part to justify the invasion of Iraq. The book also addresses problems that plague the United Nations, such as the need for Security Council reform, the credibility issues of the Human Rights Council and the sexual crimes committed by UN peacekeeping forces against the populations they were sent to protect. The book is also strongly critical of the foreign policy of former US President George W. Bush. It addresses how the Guantánamo Bay prison and the abuses of Abu Ghraib have damaged US credibility on human rights.

All of the articles are written for a general audience and put themselves in context. While this makes the book feel a little repetitive at times, as the same ideas are defined repeatedly, the articles could be read individually or in any order and still make sense.

Overall the book is very well written. Thakur uses clear and understandable language to address important issues. The author’s experience as a former UN Assistant Secretary-General and a member of the Canadian-sponsored commission that developed the R2P principle gives him an insider’s perspective on the subject. While it is obvious that Thakur is very passionate about the subjects he covers, and that he clearly writes from a developing country point of view, he uses logical and consistent arguments to back his assertions. Whether you ultimately agree with his point of view or not, Thakur’s book provides food for thought on a number of foreign policy issues facing the world today.

Ryan Boudwin
(University of Warsaw)

Comparative Politics


A pervasive phenomenon in contemporary democracies, the personalisation of politics has been an object of analysis from a multitude of perspectives within political science. Rather surprisingly, however, this topic has been substantially neglected by twenty-first-century electoral research. Such an unjustified gap has recently been addressed by two volumes published by Oxford University Press. The first is Kees Aarts, André Blais and Hermann Schmitt’s long-awaited comparative collection. Featuring an impressive team of international experts and an unprecedented wide range of data sources from nine Western democracies, Political Leaders and Democratic Elections provides answers to numerous empirical questions about the electoral effect of party leaders.

These questions are aptly summarised in the introductory chapter by Blais, which reviews the available literature and defines the theoretical framework for the various contributions. The first empirical chapter by Ohr explores in detail the role of television in the process of personalisation, and sheds new light on the connection between changing media strategies and the growing electoral relevance of political leaders. This is followed by one of the central chapters of the volume, where Holmberg and Oscarsson attempt to estimate the actual weight of party leader evaluations within the voting equation. As the authors show, leader evaluations emerge as a much weaker predictor of vote choice compared to party popularity itself. These conclusions, although valuable and in line with the available empirical evidence, appear nonetheless vulnerable to a recurring critique in electoral research – namely, the endogenous link between party and leader popularity that is likely to alter their estimated effect.

The electoral role of party leaders is further investigated in the two case studies by McAllister (Westminster democracies) and Wattenberg (United States),
whereas the remainder of the volume is devoted to the main contextual variables that are thought to enhance/constrain leader effects. Curtice and Hunjan show that majoritarian electoral systems do favour leader effects vis-à-vis PR systems. With respect to party size, Aardal and Binder demonstrate that leader effects are stronger for bigger parties. What does not seem to matter indeed are micro-level characteristics (e.g. age, gender) of both voters and leaders, as highlighted in Nadeau and Nevitte’s and Gidengil’s chapters. The final chapters turn to empirical democratic theory, reaching substantially reassuring conclusions. Aarts and Blais find that positive evaluations matter more than negative ones. Similarly, Ohr and Oscarsson demonstrate that voters’ evaluation of leaders is for the most part driven by politically relevant, performance-related traits such as perceived competence and integrity—an electoral asset in every political context taken into account by the authors.

The electoral effect of leaders’ traits is indeed at the core of Amanda Bittner’s Platform or Personality, an especially welcome contribution to the slowly emerging comparative literature on the topic. Bittner’s thorough empirical analyses, based on an astounding collection of national election studies from sixteen different democracies, challenge from the outset the consolidated paradigm that sees candidate-centred voting as a mere short cut for the less informed, unsophisticated segment of voters. Among the many merits of this book the author’s willingness to go beyond thermometer measurements of party leader popularity (as in various chapters in Aarts et al.) must be highlighted, opting instead for a more informed understanding of leader evaluations based on perceived personality traits. The difficulties in terms of cross-national comparability inherent in this strategy are settled through an unprecedented detailed investigation of the dimensional structure of traits. The results link well with existing research on the topic, and confirm that voters’ appraisal of leaders’ personality is based on a limited number of politically relevant traits, namely, character and competence.

The book also elaborates on the role of partisan stereotypes in driving voters’ evaluation of the personal characteristics of party leaders. As it turns out, voters perceive conservative leaders to have a particular strength on the competence dimension, whereas centre-left leaders are seen to have more character. In the crucial chapter of her book (ch. 6) Bittner moves traits evaluations to the right-hand side of the equation in order to assess the actual impact of perceived leader characteristics on election outcomes. Unfortunately, this analysis is restricted to a relatively well-studied case in the literature, namely the US, and so the results do not seem to add much to available knowledge. Nevertheless, the chapter remains valuable for pointing out the crucial distinction between ‘maximal’ and ‘real’ effect, with the former demonstrating ‘the incredible impact leaders could have’ and the latter reminding us that ‘leaders’ traits can and do still have a discernible impact on the distribution of votes in the real world’ (p. 114). This chapter also takes into account the role played by the political sophistication of voters themselves. It appears that leader evaluations are even more important for highly sophisticated voters. Leaders’ personality assessments help voters to choose wisely.

These volumes represent a substantial step forward in our understanding of the role of political leaders in democratic elections. A remarkable combination of empirical evidence and normative insights makes both Political Leaders and Democratic Elections and Platform or Personality a must read for scholars interested in the changing dynamics of voting behaviour in contemporary democracies.

Diego Garzia
(European University Institute)


Prime Ministers in Power is a detailed comparative study of John Howard, Australia’s Liberal-National Prime Minister between 1996 and 2007, and Tony Blair, Britain’s Labour Prime Minister between 1997 and 2007. Although ideologically and geographically from different hemispheres, Blair and Howard both operated in largely majoritarian systems, they both held office for a decade or so, they both faced favourable economic conditions, they both actively supported the US-led ‘war on terror’ and they both stretched the institutional capacity of their office. The similarities and differences in their styles reveal much about the difficulties of contemporary political leadership.

The book employs the ‘prime ministerial predominance’ model (associated with Richard Heffernan) as its
conceptual skeleton and examines how Blair and Howard skilfully married their institutional power resources with personal power resources in order to realise their potential for leadership. The heart of the book comprises five empirical chapters. Three of these examine the institutional resources at a prime minister’s disposal, including the cabinet, the party and the central coordinating structures of government, and two focus on prime ministers’ personal resources, specifically their skills and their prominent status in the media and public eye. A concluding chapter summarises the material and explores the trajectories of the two prime ministers’ personal capital.

Bennister knows his subjects well and makes good use of primary and secondary sources. Systematic comparisons of leaders’ political styles are few and far between, and this book provides some illuminating insights into how Blair and Howard used similar resources in different ways, such as their handling of cabinet. The structured comparative approach in each chapter works well, although there is some tendency to repetition in the summaries at the end of the chapters. Any limitations are chiefly sins of omission. It would be useful to know more about the concept of ‘predominance’, for example, and the extent to which it is a continuum or a category, and also how it can be operationalised. More might also have been said of Gordon Brown, both as a challenge to Blair’s predominance and as his successor; there are some references to the fortunes of Howard’s successors, yet very little is said of Brown’s ‘predominance’ or, indeed, David Cameron’s.

Overall, however, this is a good book that will be of interest to all students of Britain’s and Australia’s prime ministerships and to students of executive politics more generally. The cost may make it prohibitive to purchase, but it should certainly be read from the shelves of university libraries.

Nicholas Allen
(Royal Holloway, University of London)


All too often, political science scholarship pays too much attention to highly salient issues, assuming that most of the important issues are equally salient for electorates and accurately reflected by political parties and interest groups. In this book, Culpepper focuses mainly on takeover regulations, which often do not rank high on the political agenda, but have major political consequences such as mass layoffs or corporate reorganisation. By examining how four countries with different corporate control mechanisms – France, Germany, the Netherlands and Japan – have experienced takeover rule changes since the 1990s, he concludes that the political dynamic of low salience (‘quiet politics’) is different from high salience (‘noisy politics’).

Unlike other high-salience issues (e.g. wage bargaining rules or pension systems) which can usually be explained by variations in government partisanship or interest group coalitions, managerial preferences are key to understanding stability/change in low-salience issues. Although the preferences of managers on takeover rules vary from one country to another based on the strength of labour organisations, the central point is that managers achieve what they want. Given the absence of voters’ attention and the high technicality of this issue, both legislators and reporters are disincentivised to invest resources and, instead, simply defer to the lobbying capacity, media-framing ability and expertise of managers.

In proving the validity of his ‘quiet politics’ theory vis-à-vis ‘partisanship theory’ (e.g. Tiberghien) and ‘coalition theory’ (e.g. Gourevitch and Shinn), Culpepper adopts systematic process analysis which sets falsifiable predictions for each theory and tests the explanatory power of each in light of the quantity and diversity of observations. Although the overall methodology revolves around the qualitative comparison of four countries, he draws observable implications from both qualitative and quantitative sources. Particularly noteworthy is Culpepper’s selection of newspaper coverage across the political spectrum as a proxy for political saliency.

Although briefly described (p. 10, p. 46) the book would have benefited further from systematically incorporating ‘temporality’ and ‘complexity’ of policy saliency into the theoretical framework. In addition, given the comparatively early stage of scholarly application of systematic process analysis, the author would have helped readers by specifying its major advantages to other similar methods such as ‘analytical narratives’.
These shortcomings notwithstanding, the book is rich in detail and approachable for both academics and non-academics alike. Above all, the book successfully puts ‘quiet politics’ theory at the centre of the corporate governance literature and, from a broader theoretical perspective, further fine-tunes the ‘varieties of capitalism’ and ‘institutional change’ literature. In this regard, it will serve as a particularly valuable reference among students of political institutions, political economy and business.

Notes


Jaemin Shim
(University of Oxford)


Hans Daalder taught political science at Leiden University and was one of the founders of the European Consortium of Political Research and of post-Second World War comparative politics. This volume collects Daalder’s major articles on comparative politics, with a particular emphasis on processes of democratisation and the development of parties and party systems. Daalder was one of the first political scientists to adopt the comparative method to analyse party systems and evaluate their performance. His approach to comparative analysis was empirical as well as historical. He would use data to test a hypothesis and tease out explanatory variables. But he would also adopt the ‘thick description’ approach which would typically involve delving into the history of national case studies. With this approach Daalder not only described and explained the evolution of modern party systems but also provided the reader with a detailed historical account of the various cases.

Most of the articles cover three major themes: first, the different paths towards state formation. In one of his most well-known and cited articles, ‘Parties, Elites, and Political Developments in Western Europe’, Daalder demonstrates how political parties can be key agents in the development of modern, homogeneous, political systems. He compares the British to the French political system and shows how parties have been crucial agents of nation building in the United Kingdom, while they have been far less successful in France. Daalder contrasts British mass parties to France’s cadre type to explain how the former became genuine brokers linking the centre to the periphery.

Second, Daalder evaluates how patterns of pre-democratic political elite settings influenced the development of party systems. One of his main arguments is that countries that developed to mass democracy in a slow and gradual fashion have typically been more successful than those that faced the twin crisis of national integration and political participation at the same time, such as Germany and Italy. Third, he discusses the rise and merits of consociational democracy.

In a review article on smaller European democracies Daalder explains how thanks to political institutional engineering they have been able to achieve political stability despite very difficult social and cultural conditions. Lastly, in the preface Peter Mair contrasts Daalder’s scholarly generation to today’s, arguing that today’s students of political science are exclusively method driven and hence tend to produce works of a much more limited quality than those of Daalder’s generation.

Paolo Morisi
(Independent Scholar)


Robert Elgie has long been a proponent in the field of semi-presidentialism and has produced many scholarly books and articles on the subject. His latest contribution is Semi-presidentialism and Democracy, edited with Sophia Moestrup and Yu-Shan Wu, both of whom he has collaborated with before. Following up on earlier works including those on semi-presidentialism in Western Europe, Eastern Europe and outside Europe,
this volume aims to chart more fully than previous collections how semi-presidentialism was taken on by so many states and to explain this regime type.

Elgie’s introductory chapter gives an invaluable overview of not only what semi-presidentialism is, in the author’s view, but also how it compares to parliamentary and presidential systems and the literature that surrounds them. He also charts the historical beginnings, from Finland in 1919 to the present, describing 41 states as of 2009 fulfilling their definition of semi-presidential democracy, which is a state where there is a directly or popularly elected president and a separate position of prime minister who is responsible to the legislature. Along with this critical introduction there is a very useful chapter by Wu on the different clusters: West European, post-Leninist and post-colonial in the global distribution. This chapter serves to give an important regional and historical background to the institutional choices taken as well as pointing out differences such as the preponderance of francophone countries in the post-colonial cluster in contrast to the former states of the British Empire, which have largely ignored this regime option.

Aside from these chapters and the conclusion there are two other thematic chapters, while the rest of the volume concentrates on regional and country case studies. Of these Moestrup’s chapter on Africa and Yu-Chung Shen’s on Germany’s interwar Weimar Republic are particularly interesting. This book builds on the work already done by Duverger, Linz and Shugart on semi-presidentialism, but unlike them does not seek to define semi-presidentialism by the powers of the president, constitutional or otherwise vis-à-vis the other constitutional actors. This approach, though helpful in terms of definition, allows, for example, Ireland with its president who has very restricted power, to be in the same regime type as Sri Lanka where the president is the unquestioned power in the land, since both have elected presidents. Overall this book builds on the research already completed by Elgie and his project colleagues, and adds further value by giving the reader new and up-to-date comparative analysis and thematic assessment of the many states that elude being categorised neatly as parliamentary or presidential systems.

Harshan Kumarasingham
(University of Potsdam)


Defining democracy is a notoriously difficult task. In Democracy in the South, there is a clear intent to avoid this, as the editors state that ‘it is an essentially contested concept rather than conforming to a single universal model’ (p. 1). Moving away from models of democratic governance favoured in the global North, Democracy in the South is a collection of studies based on democratic processes in Africa, Latin America and Asia. This edited volume consists of nine case studies concerning Venezuela, Colombia, Argentina, Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana, India, Thailand and the Philippines, which transcend traditional perceptions of what is deemed to be democratic by some, especially because of ‘Western prejudices of commentators and the global media’ (p. 5). Furthermore, by offering contemporary perspectives on each country’s current political and democratic development, the essays provide a rich ground for discussion of the topics.

Each case study, as well as the introduction and concluding commentaries on democracy in the South, provide fascinating analyses of how the resolutions and actions of the North can have consequences for the politics of the South. The book’s emphasis on the rule of the people, participation and their limitations, as well as ‘choosing deliberately controversial case studies from the South’ (p. 13) paints a compelling picture. Instead of replicating democratic models of the North, the authors instead call for a ‘development of a local model of governance’ (p. 216). For these reasons, Democracy in the South would suit students and scholars of comparative and international politics, area studies and democratisation studies, as well as those who are interested in understanding cases of democracy in the South and the related emerging theories.

The book includes well-written case studies and commentaries on issues of democracy, participation and the issues facing their development in several countries, delivered with striking detail. Particularly useful is the range of different examples to draw upon, but the lack of in-depth analysis of any individual case may not provide enough for experts of those countries’ politics. Furthermore, the decision to include some countries
over others precludes greater debate into particular areas of interest for the themes of the book, such as democracy, participation and the state, particularly in the case of Latin America where leftist governments are collaborating in regional projects. Nonetheless, the volume is an adventurous collection of absorbing case studies providing a grounded representation of complex relationships within democracy from a refreshing perspective. *Democracy in the South* is an important addition to the literature on participation and democratisation.

Adam Gill  
(University of Liverpool)


In this ambitious and, at times, provocative book, Dutch academic and political commentator Paul Scheffer offers a reassessment of the effects of migration in a globalising world. Focusing primarily on urban communities of Western Europe and North America in the post-war period, and particularly the last two decades, the author offers a critique of multiculturalism from the perspective of both migrants and host communities. Highlighting the societal tensions created by mass inflows, he argues that the incorporation of migrants is characterised by three inherent stages: avoidance, conflict and accommodation.

Adopting a normative approach, Scheffer argues that multiculturalism has failed and that societies must find new ways of living together. Based upon self-reflection and the clarification of mutual obligations, reciprocity between migrant and host communities will create more open societies and lead to new forms of citizenship. He particularly emphasises the apparent dilemmas created by Islamic migrant communities in liberal democratic societies. Scheffer argues for tougher migrant selection criteria, greater transparency of immigration policies and a public debate regarding the nature and extent of an ‘open society’.

While this is a cogent and expansive treatise on the controversial issue of incorporation, its thematic argument that the impact of migration on social dynamics is manifested in a phased, linear pattern of avoidance, conflict and accommodation may be criticised as somewhat simplistic. It homogenises the substantial diversity of social and cultural experiences both of migrants and of host communities. Moreover, by privileging the apparent negative aspects of immigration, such as welfare dependency, inequalities, disparate levels of educational attainment and crime, Scheffer could also be criticised for unwarranted pessimism. Having offered a critique of multiculturalism, he proposes no practical alternative solutions other than a vague appeal for greater reciprocity and new forms of citizenship without explaining what these may entail or how they might be established. While calling, at times hyperbolically, for societies to move beyond multiculturalism, the book transmutes into an argument in favour of controlling and reducing migration.

This is a substantial piece of work that takes the form of an extended essay, drawing on historical, sociological, philosophical, journalistic, literary and anecdotal sources. The empirical component emphasises the experience of the Netherlands, but Scheffer also draws on examples from Britain, Germany, France and the US. Highly accessible, this book will be of interest to both a specialist and a general readership with an interest in this topical contemporary issue.

Caryl Thompson  
(University of Nottingham)

**General Politics**


In this volume, Manuel Arias-Maldonado unfolds a series of recommendations for achieving a green political praxis that is at once successful and realistic. Here, he argues against a tendency in green politics to highlight the ecological crisis, which he considers not only alarmist but also irrelevant in a period when nature has ended its existence as an independent entity. In this light, Arias-Maldonado recasts green ideas of interdependence to suggest that we are now dominant over and intertwined with nature, so that everything is socio-natural.

In particular, Arias-Maldonado associates green politics with a quite static view of classical environmental positions, like misplaced preferences for the preservation of different forms of nature, suspicion of technology and a bioregionalism. As a corrective, he posits that
green politics ought to de-emphasise ideas of human–nature relationships in favour of a citizen-sustainability approach. The latter approach would build on present liberal democratic forms bolstered by a principled commitment to an open sustainability, based on relative but not absolute natural limits. Key to Arias-Maldonado’s programming is this ‘open’ qualifier, which when integrated into liberal democratic practice would, contra green deterministic tendencies, not permit overly coercive measures while shaping sustainability in any given polity, allowing citizens to bring diverse commitments, creativity and expertise into the service of a realistic sustainability after the end of nature.

There are a number of tensions in this monograph. One is that Arias-Maldonado assumes that post-An Inconvenient Truth, the case for the necessity of a sustainable society has been generally accepted in liberal democracies. However, this is a dubious claim as evidenced, for example, by the North American political context. Further, as Arias-Maldonado acknowledges repeatedly, deep green thinkers will be unsatisfied with his arguments, including lingering doubts about his treatment of ecological limits, domination and biodiversity. Also the book’s style, with several moments of rather sharp commentary, can be distracting in relation to its more careful arguments. Perhaps most problematically, this monograph is shaded as a prescription for democratic green politics in contemporary liberal democracies. However, many members of green parties in such democracies will find much that is actually descriptive in terms of their policies and platforms, even though the latter rest on quite different foundations than the ones proposed in Real Green. Nonetheless, this last critique, taken in the best possible light, may serve to support Arias-Maldonado’s promising thesis that people with diverse commitments can come together to arrange sustainable societies.

Christopher Hrynkow
(University of Saskatchewan)


In an increasingly fragmented and challenging publishing environment the edited collection is under threat; far too often such collections seem to be justified on the basis that the contributors need to pad out their publications lists in the service of career management. Publishers like Ashgate have developed business models which allow them to prosper on the back of these strategies; thus I approached this volume with some trepidation. Apart from one person in Hong Kong and another in Canada all the contributors are based in the US, and as such the left-leaning analysis, while potentially quite radical in the writers’ home towns, in the context of European critical political economy seems either a little old-fashioned, or if I was to be particularly cruel, quaint. Indeed, much of the analysis, albeit historically situated, is relatively unsophisticated and while being self-avowedly ‘socialist’ in many cases seems to be working with an undifferentiated and crude depiction of global neo-liberalism.

More problematically, three of the chapters are extracts of books synthesised and edited by Berberoglu, although one can infer that Veltmeyer’s contribution, while synthesised, has not appeared in English prior to this version’s inclusion in Beyond the Global Capitalist Crisis. This editorial strategy reduces the original contributions (not including the editor’s introduction and conclusion) to merely five chapters. Of these, perhaps the most interesting – Epitropoulos’ discussion of Greece used as an example to discipline other states – has to some extent been overtaken by events, even if one might support the conclusion; always a danger when working close to the time horizon of crises.

Overall, this book is only really interesting as a social artefact of the state of left-leaning academic analysis in the US, and as such presents a rather sorry tale of a lack of engagement with developments in Europe. It also confirms that there is a transatlantic divide even in critical IPE, reflecting Benjamin Cohen’s more general distinction between American and European schools of analysis. Given the price of this volume, the lack of real sophistication in the general level of analysis and the availability of significantly better and more nuanced treatments of the contemporary crisis, I can see little advantage to colleagues in either reading or buying this book. Indeed, this represents exactly the sort of tired collection that has undermined the format of edited collections as a way of communicating new and vibrant work in the academy.

Christopher May
(Lancaster University)
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The relationship between media and participation has over time become obfuscated by vague interpretations across a diverse array of academic fields. Media and Participation: A Site of Ideological-Democratic Struggle offers a rich, interdisciplinary overview in order to amalgamate and address the diverging definitions from democratic theory, spatial planning, development, arts and museums, and communication studies. In each a struggle is exposed between minimalist and maximalist dimensions of participation: a constant dispute over whether participation is limited to representation within institutionalised systems, or whether it is part of a convergence of the political and social. Nico Carpentier maintains that power dynamics, and the struggle to minimise or maximise equal power positions (p. 11), are ubiquitous among the vying conceptualisations. By way of conclusion, he collates these findings within the Access, Interaction and Participation model (p. 130); access and interaction are crucial components that enable acts of participation, but are differentiated due to the power relationship within a variety of decision-making processes.

In the second part of the book Carpentier empirically examines this definition in relation to a number of structuring elements that play an enabling or disabling role in relation to the participatory process: identity, organisation, technology and quality. A number of mixed-method case studies are employed that mirror the minimalist vs. maximalist theme. For example, within the analysis of media organisations, Carpentier examines the BBC's Video Nation, an illustration of a power equilibrium between media professionals and citizens, and participation fostered through the sharing and discussion of user-generated content in the form of video submissions (p. 246). In contrast, scrutiny of the community radio network Radioswap offers a cautionary tale of how participatory organisational structures can in fact impede citizen influence and replicate embedded, hierarchical power structures (p. 259).

Fundamentally, Carpentier actively celebrates participation as a concept in flux: it is precisely the struggle over its definition that encapsulates the constantly evolving power dynamics (p. 352). However, the book is at pains to highlight the importance of definitional constraint, something it succeeds in doing through the introduction of the Access, Interaction and Participation model. The book offers a lucid yet exhaustive account, combining both intricate theoretical detail with prudent and informative examples. As a result, it makes for a thorough, historically contextualised introductory text for emerging scholars, while the empirical contributions should entice seasoned academics from a diverse range of fields including political theory, communications and political sociology.

James Dennis (Royal Holloway, University of London)


Political scientists who noticed this book for review might have been put off by the term ‘welfare’ in the title. In fact the ‘state’ in the title is as important, if not more so. The modern state is a welfare state, so the book is really about the modern state and its activities. It is a major work of reference on ‘welfare state studies’, providing a synoptic overview of the politics, sociology, economics, philosophy, evolution and structure of the welfare state. In terms of comprehensiveness of scope and coverage it is remarkable and no topic or issue of importance has been omitted. The scope is firmly comparative and interdisciplinary. The book is a tribute to the extent to which welfare, traditionally regarded as a rather humdrum affair, the province of experts and technocrats, has become a subject of mainstream academic interest. Such a work is largely self-recommending and hardly needs a conventional review. The contributors and editors are all scholars of the front rank in the field and the book is itself an example of multinational, global collaboration. Many, perhaps most, of the contributors are writing in a language that is not their first language, that is, English.

Esping-Andersen’s work on the identification and conceptualisation of welfare regime types is examined in more than one chapter. Other major themes explored in many of the chapters include the supposed ‘neo-liberal’ challenge to the welfare state, as well as issues of globalisation, marketisation and the role of the
private sector in welfare – all related phenomena to some extent. The view that globalisation does not imply a ‘race to the bottom’ in terms of social expenditure is proposed in several chapters. Many of the contributors endorse Paul Pierson’s (1994) argument that cutting programmes and spending is more difficult than expanding them, that the welfare state has proved to be remarkably resilient and has in many respects successfully withstood the supposed neo-liberal assault.

The Handbook exhibits a very high standard in terms of production values. It is, given its price, a work for libraries rather than individual bookshelves, but as a work of reference it will be of great value for many years.

Edwin Griggs
(University of Birmingham)


For this addition to the Routledge ‘Handbook’ series, Chadwick and Howard have assembled a total of 31 contributions on a wide array of topics within the research on internet politics and policy. Their authors came to this topic from a variety of backgrounds, from political theory to, among others, international relations, political economy and cultural politics. One of the most interesting things about this book is how differently the contributors describe and explain the changes brought about by the internet. Their methods are equally diverse, including qualitative, quantitative and comparative research. The book is held together well by its leading question: what are the implications of the internet for the political life of voters and candidates, and the inner and outer workings of political parties, interest groups, social movements, parliaments, governments and other political actors?

The book is divided into four parts: ‘Institutions’, ‘Behaviour’, ‘Identities’ and ‘Law and Policy’. Within these parts, the contributors identify the positive, negative and unexpected effects of the internet. In a positive way, the internet has multiplied the number of people able to publish and receive information on politics and discuss political events as well as validate statements by politicians and parties. Negative implications include a digital divide based less on access than on digital skills, excluding those unable to use the internet in a politically meaningful way. Other negative effects include attempts by states to filter online content in order to keep unwanted information from their citizens. Among the unexpected changes is the similarity between the internet strategies of political candidates, governments, parties, news media and non-governmental groups in different countries, despite their otherwise diverse political environment.

The Routledge Handbook of Internet Politics is a timely contribution since, as the editors write in the introduction, in the course of the last fifteen years, the ‘politics of the internet has entered the social science mainstream’ (p. 1). The book is not attempting to cover all facets of internet research or reach conclusions on the topic. Given the rapid empirical and theoretical development of this new field, this would be a hard goal to achieve for any longer than a few months. Despite its original publication as the first handbook of its kind in 2009, its findings remain far from outdated. Its deliberative and inclusive approach to the topic makes it recommended reading for anybody interested in the broad range of topics covered.

Johannes Fritz
(University of Erlangen-Nuremberg)


This book is not about ‘food’ as such but more about the industry that supplies and controls food at a global level. Importantly, this book helps to explain the recent ‘food riots’. Jennifer Clapp refers to this industry as the ‘middle space’ between contexts where food is grown and when it reaches the consumer. She analyses the increasing industrial control over the food industry and how this started early in the twentieth century, and significantly how this has mounted to astonishing levels since the 1990s. The important changes include the rapid growth of agricultural and food trade, the continued technological developments within food production and farming, the unequal trade rules, the control amassed by a few transnational corporations (TNCs) and the highly problematic nexus of financialisation, ‘land grabs’ and biofuel investments. The analysis places food in the context of the unfolding global economy, and while changes fit with the well-known narratives relating to globalisation, unfair trading rules
and economic liberalisation, there are nuances that make food a subject for greater ethical concern.

The book opens with a convincing chapter which gives an overview of the world food economy. There is some reference to a resistance and counter-argument to the dominant actors and these include alternative movements promoting 'fair trade', 'food sovereignty' and a transformation of the rules, regulations and policies that govern the global food system. The dominant narrative is a summary and synthesis of Clapp's research into the macroeconomy of the food industry including food aid, the US' dominance in governing food supply and production, the World Trade Organization trade rules and price volatility.

The book is a readable explanation for the significant levels of control over food that have occurred unwittingly. Clapp is balanced in her presentation which is illuminating and analytical but in terms of argument the book is remarkably non-committal. The explanation for the opposing and alternative movements is very brief and confined to the final few pages of the book. There is much for the reader to follow up in all the sections but there are surprising gaps: for example, the relative power and relationship between supermarkets and consumer society. There might have been more discussion on notions of alternative, radical and sustainable consumption. The environmental impacts of this 'middle space' of food production are pointed out but the profound and significant damage caused is not sufficiently acknowledged. The hope is for significant transformations to emerge from within the global food economy but Clapp does not offer much chance of this. Disappointingly, the alternative and radical approaches remain miniscule in comparison.

Nick James
(Open University)


Several avenues of analysis of electoral systems address the partisan face of representation. Despite the variety of classifications, the greater part of the literature refers to the above-mentioned approach as the one with greater explanatory power. The basic aim of this book, edited by Josep Colomer, is to overcome this approach by focusing on personal representation – defined as 'the personal quality of representatives' (p. 7).

The first chapter discusses the reasons why personal representation has increasingly become a neglected analytical dimension. From this perspective, Colomer draws up a new classification of electoral systems based on both party and personal representation, and distinguishes the latter within three broader categories: closed, semi-open or open. Each of these three forms is conceived by specific configurations of electoral system.

The book then deals with an empirical examination of the prior configurations: single seat, closed party list, preferential votes, ordinal rank and ordinal ballot (chs 3, 4, 7, 8 and 9). Chapters 2 and 5, in contrast, adopt a more general perspective, dealing with, respectively, candidate selection and primary elections. Chapter 6 provides a comparative analysis of the extent to which the proportional tier produces personal representation in mixed electoral systems. As regards the methodological approach, it is noted that although quantitative methods prevail, one chapter in particular (ch. 7), which is focused on preferential voting, adopts a qualitative approach based on comparative analysis.

Overall, the volume provides a comprehensive overview of methods that can ensure the voter's opportunity to affect personal representation. However, the most relevant aspect is the aforementioned classification; it groups the electoral systems according to the degree of party and personal representation they provide. Moreover, the book provides the reader with several research cues, by proposing useful empirical patterns of analysis (e.g. ch. 4). With respect to the empirical cases the most meaningful aspect is related to the first-past-the-post system. In particular, it seems very counter-intuitive that a system characterised by single seats falls within the category in which personal representation is underdeveloped. In supporting this thesis, chapter 3 presents – although unsystematically – quite innovative empirical data.

In conclusion, Personal Representation has the great merit of emphasising the need for a new perspective on electoral studies. Bearing this in mind, the book is likely to have a positive effect on research patterns into electoral studies.

Stefano Rombi
(University of Pavia)

This book consists of a series of chapters covering a multitude of different topics under the title Cyberspaces and Global Affairs. Split into three parts, the book examines: cyberspace and security; the challenges ICT poses for politics, society and the individual; and finally, the difficulties surrounding both the ‘information overload’ (p. 319) and the ‘digital divide’ (p. 239). The scope of each contribution varies greatly, with some concentrating on broad international topics such as cyber-war, and others focusing on how ICT has impacted on particular case studies including, but not limited to, corporations such as Google, a national comparison between China and India, and a regional study of the Middle East. Each chapter adds to the fundamental argument in its own particular way: that ICT, and in particular cyberspace, has had a tremendous impact, both positively and negatively, across several different domains. This book is aimed at ‘scholars, students and lay people with an interest in this emerging and increasingly salient field’ (p. xxi) and, due to its breadth, would be appropriate for anyone looking for an introduction to the political and societal impact ICT has had.

Reviewing this book as a whole fails to do the individual chapters justice. The book makes a compelling argument that ICT has played a significant role in changing politics and society. However, this in itself is not a particularly ground-breaking thesis. Additionally, read cover to cover, the different chapter formats and writing styles hinder the book’s flow. Hence, the editors stress that ‘this book is meant to be sampled’ (p. xxi).

Reviewed as the sum of its parts, several of the chapters succeed in making significant and thought-provoking arguments, utilising well-researched empirical data, as well as an engaging combination of different analytical and methodological approaches. The mixture of qualitative and quantitative research, case studies and opinion pieces (viewpoints) provide a refreshing outlook and will appeal to a large audience. Split into 27 chapters, this book is ambitious and the breadth of the study does mean that particular topics feel underdeveloped, serving more as introductions than in-depth analysis. The foreword acknowledges that this book ‘can be no more than a chapter in what must inevitably be an ongoing examination’ (p. xx) and it serves as a well-written and topical series of engaging introductory articles that will, hopefully, encourage the reader to pursue some of the topics in greater detail.

Andrew Whiting (Swansea University)


Anthony Duff’s multifaceted contributions – in particular his focus on the appropriateness of punishment and its moral justification – and the cohesiveness, richness and relevance of his work to the philosophy of criminal law over the past 35 or more years have left no criminal law scholars indifferent. It is therefore an important mark of respect for his scholarship that the editors of this book have brought together some of Duff’s most incisive critics and supporters, including Jeffrie Murphy, John Tasioulas, John Gardner, Alon Harel, Victor Tadros, Larry Alexander, Nicola Lacey and many other accomplished legal scholars. Their individual and collective task was to assess Duff’s major theoretical insights (published in his major works, e.g. Trials and Punishment in 1986, Intention, Agency and Criminal Liability in 1990, Criminal Attempts in 1996 and Answering for Crime in 2007) and assess their strengths and weaknesses under four major headings, each representing a distinct part of the book, namely: punishment as communication, responsibility, criminal attempts and criminalisation.

This has been achieved with unparalleled honesty, intellectual rigour and in a manner that will provide Duff with material to ponder for years to come, especially on the points with which he still finds himself in disagreement, as indicated in his concluding response.

Each contributor took an aspect of Duff’s theoretical insights as a point of departure from which they expanded critically, either to suggest ways to improve the rigour and completeness of his analysis, or to force him radically to rethink the rationale and force of his argumentation. This is a dense, well-written book that
would appeal to criminal law experts and those with an appropriate legal background interested in understanding the foundational aspects of criminal law in liberal states better. For those who have no grounding in the philosophy of criminal law and the work of Duff, this is not, in my view, the book to read to become first acquainted with either. Overall, the editors have done a superb job; this is no hagiography, but a serious and professional engagement with the work of a leading criminal law scholar.

Stéphane Lefebvre  
(Carleton University, Ottawa)


Unintended consequences may fulfil the initial intentions of policy initiators or, on the contrary, frustrate the original aims and backfire with unexpected negative results. Aiming to raise awareness about negative policy outcomes, this edited volume inquires about unintended consequences of security governance.

The first four chapters explore international interventions and reform programmes. Kohnstall’s chapter on the World Bank’s involvement in Egypt’s higher education reform demonstrates the ambiguity of donors’ aid to authoritarian regimes, in which the aid was redirected to reinforce the incumbent regime. Penksa analyses the negative unintended effects of foreign military interventions in domestic law enforcement in Kosovo and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Focusing on international state building, each of the contributions by Scheneckener and Schroeder suggest that policy initiators need to develop more sophisticated assessment mechanisms for dealing with unintended negative externalities that are recurrent by-products of the application of Western policy frameworks to non-Western societies.

The remaining five chapters analyse the consequences of sanctions and a partial privatisation of security. Shedding light on the criminalisation of the Balkans at the end of the 1990s, Andreas argues that it was due to economic sanctions that a powerful underground economy emerged. Eriksson’s analysis of targeted sanctions enlightens the reader about human rights violations, negative economic developments and missed opportunities for dialogue as some of the negative unintended consequences of sanctions in target countries. Biersteker’s contribution uncovers the possibility of positive unintended consequences. The formation of the counter-terrorism financing regime, he argues, has created the mechanisms employed in anti-money laundering and anti-tax evasion initiatives. Friedrich warns that positive unintended consequences are unfortunately ephemeral. Positive externalities of private armed forces may eventually undermine public security. Buckland emphasises that policy initiators often sacrifice negative externalities, however grave they may be, to reach a particular positive outcome. He provides evidence that the securitisation of migration-oriented counter-trafficking policies was successful in curtailing migration, but also criminalised migrants and pushed them into illegal migration channels.

As the volume gathers contributions by leading experts in the field, little space is left for criticism. Some suggestions should, however, be articulated. If one does not open the black box of domestic policy making, what is the most appropriate way of studying intention? Are negative unintended consequences more likely to follow policies adopted by fragile states or by more developed and institutionally stable societies? What mechanisms guide the formation of unintended consequences?

Overall, the book is undoubtedly an important contribution to understanding the complexity of security governance. It is a piece of easy-to-read specialised literature that sophisticated and experienced readers in academia and policy making will certainly appreciate.

Yuliya Zabyelina  
(University of Trento)


The popularity of academic terms often leads to conceptual ambiguity and the loss of their explanatory value. Despite its position as a subject of intense academic interest, ‘civil society’ has suffered from such a lack of conceptual clarity and integrity. The Oxford Handbook of Civil Society fills this lacuna and successfully
attempts to ‘break apart the confusion’ in the contemporary usage of civil society and to develop ‘a coherent set of theories, policies and practices’ (p. 7).

Edited by Michael Edwards, a leading authority on studies of civil society, this volume consists of 38 chapters divided into seven sections, each written by preeminent scholars, including Theda Skocpol, Craig Calhoun and Donatella della Porta, among many. Each section is devoted to a different facet of the phenomenon in light of the forms, norms, spaces and achievements of civil society, geographical perspectives and support for civil society. Except for an introductory chapter on the intellectual development of this phenomenon, Edwards seems to have consciously avoided devoting the work solely to the history of civil society and overburdening the text with the intellectual debates surrounding the concept.

The Handbook’s sections on the forms and norms of civil society deserve special attention. The book offers a conceptual map and draws the boundaries of civil society in relation to its forms, which have also been characterised as the non-profit sector, non-governmental organisations or grassroots organisations. Analyses of the norms of civil society, such as civility, equality and diversity, are also significant contributions to overcoming the often problematic nature of this term.

The book discusses civil society in diverse settings, from Latin America to sub-Saharan Africa and goes beyond other studies in the West – often ethnocentric in their concerns. Moreover, it includes articles on civil society’s relation to several phenomena such as public journalism, the digital age, poverty and the public sphere. Yet the book lacks critical studies of civil society, as the work rests mainly on the belief in the emancipatory power of civil society.

While Edwards champions civil society as the ‘big idea’ for the twenty-first century, he also concludes that ‘there are no final words on civil society, because civil society is constantly being reinterpreted and recreated’ (p. 490). Nevertheless, with its empirical and theoretical breadth, this volume offers the most comprehensive, systematic analysis and will serve as an important stepping stone for anyone pursuing a deeper study of civil society.

Hakki Taş
(Altın Koza University, Ankara)

Rory Shand
(Plymouth University)

The Rise and Demise of the Capitalist World System is an unconventional book. Originally written as an extensive essay for Hartmut Elsenhans’ Festschrift, the text represents an introductory sketch to the author’s forthcoming six-volume series with the same title.

Elsenhans offers an impressive analysis of the historical emergence of capitalism and its expansion on a global scale by interweaving insights from social anthropology, political economy and global history literatures. Rejecting stadial and narrowly defined cultural conceptualisations of socio-economic development, he situates the rise of capitalism at a specific spatio-temporal juncture in which successful labour resistance to the pre-existing forms of exploitation in feudal Europe constitutes the genesis of the capitalist mode of production. For Elsenhans, the elimination of rent (‘surplus appropriated on the basis of market imperfections and/or political power’ [p. 25]) and the empowerment of labour through full employment paved the way for the transition to capitalism, but the systemic structuring does not automatically engender the same circumstances in different societies; hence the thorny issue of capitalist development on the peripheries.

While the exhaustive utilisation of world history as a canvas with which to trace the historical origins and conditions of capitalist development bolsters the proposed conceptual framework, Elsenhans’ attempt to design a grand theory comes at a price. The multi-linear narrative often devolves into a hastily drawn synopsis incapable of providing substantial engagement with a plethora of historical developments. The reader frequently faces sections where the discussion moves rapidly from one period to another; thus the distinctions between different epochs and social formations become increasingly vague. It also prevents the author from unpacking some of his more provocative arguments such as his rejection of Luxemburg’s capital accumulation thesis (pp. 98–9). This can be justified on the grounds that the original text was written as a preamble for a larger project, but The Rise and Demise of the Capitalist World System on its own suffers from an overextended scope of analysis.

Elsenhans’ introductory ‘essay’ provides an immense outline that captures the heterogeneity of socio-economic development by breaking down the barriers between bifurcated departments of social science research. The drawback of his stunning range of analysis is the relative paucity of empirical and conceptual depth with which to substantiate all of his hypotheses. The present material, however, is captivating enough to rouse anticipation for the forthcoming multi-volume opus.

Note


Cemal Burak Tansel
(University of Nottingham)
Part II starts with a chapter by James Fishkin reflecting on the insights into deliberative polling gleaned over several decades of experimentation. Graham Smith offers a practical illustration of Fishkin’s deliberative theory via ‘mini-publics’ and concludes ‘that there is practical and theoretical value in evaluating mini-publics in light of developments in democratic theory’ (p. 107). The value of exploring deliberative democracy in social movements is emphasised in Dieter Rucht’s chapter.

Part III aims to compare democratic innovations. The section feels premature, but is nevertheless useful. Ken Newton, Brigitte Geissel and Julien Talpin each contribute a chapter that brings various innovations into the conversation. While the volume runs to over 200 pages, a few more chapters might have been included. Additional chapters (complementing Dieter Rucht’s chapter) that address horizontalism in social movements including the Arab Spring and Occupy Wall Street would be welcome.

Readers will find further insight into democratic innovations by consulting Dryzek (2010), Smith (2009) and Goodin (2008).

Notes


Jeffrey D. Hilmer
(Northern Arizona University)


The book under review provides an insightful conceptual historical analysis of the origins and development of the idea of democracy at the United Nations. Departing from a ‘practice-focused’ perspective (p. 7), Kirsten Haack, from Northumbria University, delves into the conceptual trajectory that helps to understand how the organisation has been able to support and even promote democracy internationally, most especially via peace-building initiatives, despite the fact that democracy assistance is usually regarded as an intrusive practice that undermines state sovereignty. In doing so, the author places a special emphasis on the role played by successive UN Secretaries-General, particularly Boutros Boutros-Ghali (1992–6) and Kofi Annan (1997–2006), in fostering a discourse favourable to democracy promotion within the world body.

As democracy is such a contested concept, the author proposes a ‘democratic continuum’ (p. 16) to situate different understandings of democracy and to serve as a framework to evaluate the UN’s own interpretations of democracy against the backdrop of the mainstream Western theories of democracy. Four differing meanings are thus located on a spectrum: democracy as civilisation, as elections, as good governance, and developmental democracy. Each one contains not only visions about what democracy is, but also what democracy should be. As such, the author concludes by raising questions about the extent to which the UN will be able to foster a democracy agenda based on a substantial understanding of democracy. Although the questions raised do not lead to straightforward answers, Haack rightly ascertains that debates over democracy will remain part of the world body agenda in the years to come.

The book is very accessible and presents a wealth of historical information about the United Nations throughout the years under analysis, which should appeal not only to students of international organisations, international relations and political theory, but also to the informed public interested in the history of the organisation. From a more theoretical perspective, there is one aspect of the book that could have been explored at greater length. In fact, although the author departs from a ‘practice-focused perspective’, she does not discuss the meaning of this option in depth or how this perspective relates to other developments related to the so-called ‘practice turn’ in the social sciences and international relations, for instance. Hence, addressing the strengths and shortcomings of the proposed approach or how it related to current theoretical debates would have made the book more robust and relevant theoretically.

Fernando Cavalcante
(University of Bradford)
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This Handbook is a comprehensive collection of texts from more than 50 world-renowned scholars which will be useful to both experts and academics. The main goal is to provide the reader with a complete understanding of the puzzle of national security. The means of doing this are contentious and involve to some extent partisan explanations of the phenomenon. A conclusive example for this would be the fact that it mostly analyses the challenges of the US intelligence system.

This volume, despite being very comprehensive, is addressed to both specialists and educated non-specialists, aiming to ‘provide a state-of the art assessment of literature ... often referred to as “strategic intelligence”’. By presenting it as a handbook, the editor targets the book from the beginning at specialist readers; this is not tailored to newcomers.

The editor manages to assemble a broad collection of studies from authors with diverse backgrounds. The chapters are well organised, following the pattern of introduction, analysis and conclusion, the main arguments being clearly emphasised. The main asset of the book lies in the contrasting backgrounds of the contributors, who bring an exhaustive amount of information and analysis.

A shortcoming of this book is the absence of a conclusion to the volume offering a concise summary of the 49 articles. Although most handbooks do not follow the same pattern as monographs, a conclusion would have been useful to evaluate further whether the objectives of the work had been fulfilled.

This volume is fundamental reading for academics and professionals interested in security and intelligence studies. The editor manages to assemble the work of highly renowned experts which become key assets of the work. The chapters are well chosen and seem to be part of a continuous flow in perfect congruence, each being introductory to the following one. This makes it an exceptional starting point for research in the field and it is highly recommended for academia and intelligence professionals.

Andrei Alexandru Babadac (Université Libre de Bruxelles)


An impressive collection, New Directions in Genocide Research maps out interesting new research paradigms that challenge how genocide is generally conceived and studied. The first section, devoted to theory, breaks down the conception of genocide as something categorically unique and instead examines it within a broad range of social practice. Especially insightful is Christopher Powell’s chapter on ‘genocidal moralities’, in which he observes that ‘for genocide to take place, it is not always the case that people’s moral sensibilities must simply be neutralized or overpowered. Sometimes individuals’ moral dispositions are activated and strengthened through their involvement in genocide’ (pp. 37–8).

The second section, on themes, equally confronts one’s preconceptions. For example, Paula Drumond offers a critique of UN gender policies relevant to the ongoing crisis in the Congo, noting that the UN marginalises male victims despite the documented targeted killing of men specifically and the forced recruitment of civilian men and boys by the militias, while Adam Jones, whose chapter moves away from the usual state-centric orientation of genocide studies to examine issues of structural violence, makes a compelling case for labelling as genocide such phenomena as global poverty and the sanctions imposed upon Iraq in the 1990s. Finally, the third section offers a variety of representative case studies ranging from an account of the exterminatory war against the Tolowa Indians in nineteenth-century California and Oregon, to a piece providing broader ethnological context for the ongoing violence in Darfur, one that breaks down many of the popular media narratives regarding the situation there.

In his introductory chapter, Benjamin Lieberman observes that studies of genocide have classically been focused upon outcome – the attempted or successful destruction of a group – rather than causes and goals, which can be multiple, and therefore they have suffered ‘from a tendency to establish historical boundaries that artificially demarcate genocide from other events’ (p. 7).

This exciting volume not only serves as a corrective to such tendencies but also, by contextualising genocide within a range of other social practices, provides a useful background for those studying other instances of
collective violence, such as terrorism, lynching or even austerity and privatisation programmes. Media-driven narratives may hold genocide to be an evil most incomprehensible, but the various contributors to New Directions in Genocide Research, through their clear theoretical frameworks and analyses, provide the tools to comprehend the phenomenon more ably and, therefore, hold out the possibility that genocide can actually be prevented.

Guy Lancaster
(Encyclopedia of Arkansas History & Culture)


Krippner is a brilliant example of a political economist who understands both the economic and political aspects of financialisation. She contributes to its explanation by providing an extremely useful historical institutional analysis of the policy shifts in the US that contributed to a macroeconomic environment conducive to the current version of financialisation, starting from the post-war period and extending – unfortunately – until 2001. Since the book effectively manages to raise the visibility of some crucial processes that led to financialisation, as well as some profit data that establish the phenomenon, its methodological tools could serve as a platform for future research agendas for other countries, or as a component for more encompassing, critical or causalistic research.

The originality of the book is that it focuses on the role of the state and its interactive relationship with finance. Being conscious of the complexity of the phenomenon, Krippner is explicitly ‘highly selective’ in the policy shifts that led to the deregulation of financial markets, expansion of credit and the subsequent rise of financial profits as a percentage of GDP. It is this last characteristic that serves her as an indicator of the structural change in the US economy, rather than changes in employment or the contribution of financial products to GDP. This accumulation-centred view is very well justified in her analysis, even though it obliges her to omit the government sector and self-employment, which as a consequence narrows her scope of interlinkages, and is probably not as useful a method if applied to other economies where self-employment has a much more significant blueprint. Yet it is one of the assets of Krippner’s book that the existence of financialisation is not taken for granted, but is empirically established.

A central thesis of the author is what she calls ‘an element of inadvertency’ on the part of politicians, meaning that politicians did not want the unlimited expansion of credit or the rapid growth of the financial industry. In other words they did not consciously lead the economy to financialisation, but rather they wished to convey difficult distributional questions of the post-affluent US society of the mid-1960s to anonymous markets, whom everybody could blame, but nobody envisaged. They thought, Krippner asserts, that ‘we will always live in a credit-short and capital-starved world’ (p. 59, p. 82) and the market will provide a much more effective and difficult-to-hold-accountable disciplinary device than the state. Even though this conclusion is based purely on the public discourse of politicians, the author does not question its truthfulness, probably because, as she clearly states, her analysis is descriptive and conceptual rather than causal. Yet accepting that their actions were unintentional already trespasses on the boundaries of description and conceptualisation.

Cleo Politof
(Panteion University, Greece)


Laver and Sergenti are impatient – so they say. However, given the book’s preparation time, I would say they do not lack patience. Focusing on party competition in elections, a classical topic of political science, they used agent-based models (ABM) in their analysis. The study of complex and dynamic systems is made with different and recent tools. All computational tests completed are available to somebody with an internet connection and some basic notions of NetLogo. Why is this important? This is for several scientific reasons: replicability, confidence and learning from the examples presented.

The authors demonstrate that ABM can be used to reflect accurately a functioning political system. They verify that politicians with modest vote shares have a higher probability of performing well and winning
more votes than candidates looking for higher vote shares. They point out that politicians who give more attention to their personal preferences when establishing a policy have greater success than the ones who are only worried about voters’ preferences. And politicians with some distinctive characteristics have advantages in election results.

The authors deal with the following points: (1) development of a party competition spatial model considering the agent notion; (2) interaction of different decisions and rules with various agents; (3) citizens’ ideal points of multimodal distribution; (4) consideration that there are special and important candidate’s valences not directly related to policies and party competition; (5) endogenous emergence of new parties; (6) evolutionary combination of decision rules; (7) advancement of new decision rules; (8) endogenous preferences of citizens; (9) scrupulous characterisation of computational models’ outputs.

With the use of an innovative methodology, giving rise to new features about old party competition theory, mainly related to ABM’s fragilities, there are still aspects to improve in this approach. A recurrent criticism is ABM’s individualistic vision of the world. Taking out agents from reality (a simulation) and dealing with their interactions permits the study of their behaviour and outcomes – giving an insight into the situation, but also signalling a possible reality’s non-reflection. ABM should not be used without theory-oriented visions and commitments (which does not happen in this work).

In a well-written book, I agree with the authors’ arguments and the acknowledgement that there are holes in the path initiated here. But I trust that these gaps will be bridged in future by varied research. I am enthusiastic about what ABM might bring to political science investigation or, as Laver and Sergenti would say: ‘I am impatient’.

Patrícia Calca
(University of Lisbon)


Henry Milner returns to the topic of his 2002 book Civic Literacy which traced differences in political participation back to societal efforts at material and non-material (intellectual) redistribution. In The Internet Generation, Milner focuses on civic education, and the impact of the internet on the generation growing up with it, as the dominant tool for information and communication.

Especially in North America and the UK, conventional political participation at elections and in political parties by those under 30 has declined, despite global challenges such as climate change. Unconventional political activities are unable to fill the gap. Milner argues that if pollsters and political scientists analysed the political knowledge of young people instead of their general attitude towards politics, they would notice the growing number of political dropouts, defined as those ‘inattentive to the political world’ and ‘lacking the minimal knowledge to distinguish and thus choose among parties or candidates’ (p. 24).

While the impact of political knowledge on actual turnout remains unclear due to limited data, Milner describes some institutional designs and forms of civic education inside and outside the classroom as promising to make sure young people make an informed political decision at the ballot box. While compulsory voting or lowering the voting age alone would result in increased turnout, they would not suffice to reduce the number of those outside the political system due to their limited knowledge of politics. Fixed election dates, the possibility to register as a voter on election day and an electoral system of proportional representation are better suited to clarify the connection between voting and achieving certain political results. The ultimate goal is to increase the long-term attentiveness of young people to public affairs. In any form of civic education, the political world needs to be presented as close to the life experience of young people. This includes using the internet as the favourite medium of that generation.

Milner offers an unadorned view of youth political participation in many countries. His refusal to accept alternative ways of political participation which disguise the decline in conventional and, in the end, politically significant participation, is impressive. His arguments are founded on an extensive summary and review of relevant research and surveys. As the content ranges from a cross-national comparison of the reasons for declining political activity to the direction civics classes should take, the target audience of this book is wide
and it is recommended reading for academics and educators alike.

Johannes Fritz
(University of Erlangen-Nuremberg)


This book is a collection of essays which analyse several case studies of the emergence of new forms of citizenship and migrant activism in regimes that restrict migrants’ rights and mobility. The aim of the authors and contributors is to investigate how migrants act and create new forms of political engagement, in order to conceptualise the effects of the politics of movement on citizenship issues.

The main arguments of editors Peter Nyers and Kim Rygiel are: (1) the experience of mobility produces new forms of citizenship and of being political; (2) people lacking formal citizenship status are involved in practices and ways of engaging in citizenship when they claim rights to it; and (3) the politics of mobility and movement has significance for the spaces and forms of citizenship.

Among the contributors there are both scholars of migration and citizenship studies and activists of migrant rights associations. However, they all share a deep knowledge of critical theory about migration, citizenship and security, and they all start from the assumption that migration is a creative and constituent force which is able to redraw the map of power relationships at local and global levels.

The book is aimed at students and scholars, but many essays may provide useful methodological suggestions and good practice for activists of migrant rights associations and policy officers.

It provides good coverage both of the geographical areas of the case studies (host countries and provenance of migrants) and the typology of the status of non-citizen migrants (refugees, regular and undocumented migrants), all of which is analysed in the book. Besides being well written, all the essays are interesting and provide useful information about the way migrants and migrant rights organisations behave; that is why I would say that the book succeeds in investigating the themes on which it focuses. But I cannot say that it provides significant advances at a theoretical level, since all the chapters have a descriptive approach: groups and movements are described and interpreted in the light of pre-existing literature, but without innovation. Moreover, some of the contributors’ arguments are not verified, because they are rather intuitive. For example, saying, as Jean McDonald does in chapter 7, that when services are made accessible to people with precarious status then governmentalised borders can be circumvented (p. 127) is nothing but an obvious remark. Despite this the book may be a good starting point for more fruitful research, from a theoretical point of view.

Angelo Scotto
(University of Pavia)


The United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 was adopted in 2000 with peace building and peacemaking at its core. The aim was to get women into the process of post-conflict reconstruction and to include a gendered dimension to violence. It is now over a decade since its birth, and its implementation has been a source of debate. This book goes straight to the heart of the implementation problems of UNSCR 1325 by discussing reasons for the gap between policy and practice. Funmi Olonisakin, Keren Barnes and Eka Ikpe, and the contributors to this volume are ambitious in their aims as they try to explain why UNSCR 1325 fails in terms of making a real impact at national and regional levels. Most of the contributors adopt a narrative approach, seeking to illuminate the complexities and dilemmas that stand in opposition to the advancement and success of the resolution. The chapters are well organised into two case study sections. The first section introduces the implementation of UNSCR 1325 in different countries, while the second section provides regional case studies.

Most of the sections adopt a similar theme that introduces UNSCR 1325 in various contexts, explains the challenges and dilemmas and provides conclusions that seek to provide alternatives to the current practices of the resolution in their case studies.

The editors and authors miss an opportunity to discuss an innovative approach to the implementation
of UNSCR 1325, which is the inclusion of masculinities. With the exception of E. Njoki Wamai, who mentions the failures of the resolution to include men in the implementation process in Liberia, none of the authors or editors recognises the absence of masculinities as a dilemma in translating the policy of UNSCR 1325 into practice. The book relies on and furthers the traditional divide that conceptualises women as peace-makers and men as warmongers.

Nonetheless, *Women, Peace and Security* offers an insight into some of the practical problems with implementation of UNSCR 1325. It suggests plausible alternatives, for example the development and integration of civil society into the implementation strategies of UNSCR 1325. The case studies examined are thought provoking and the bottom–top analytical approach provides solid arguments. Last but not least, the editors provide recommendations for the real challenges in the translation of the principles and values of the resolution. Although these recommendations are not necessarily new, their reiteration highlights negligence on the part of the UN to bridge the gap between policy and practice with regard to UNSCR 1325.

Esther Mana Akanya
(University of Nottingham)


The editors of *Left Parties in Governments* bring together a remarkable mix of scholars with the aim of exploring the left parties’ choices regarding the issues and factors that shaped their decision to join government coalitions. They examine their performance once in office, and most importantly the impact that governing, as well as their journey towards becoming ‘coalitionable’, has had on their ideological profile and electoral results.

The editors employ a wide approach in the definition of left parties so as to include all parties to the left of social democracy. Using the conceptual framework of the ‘policy-vote-office’ trichotomy of party goals, the editors aptly indicate that incumbency is the only way, for left parties, to remain politically relevant in contemporary politics. The working premise is that research on left parties, a much neglected field by mainstream political studies, can give insight into the understanding of the phenomenon of coalition governments.

Drawing on the contributions from nine exceptional case studies in Europe of parties that have supported or taken part in government, the editors argue that party system factors which encourage participation in government coalitions include: (a) the ideological distance between left and social democratic parties: the smaller the distance the better; nevertheless, even policy differences do not pose an insurmountable barrier; (b) coalitions between left and social democratic parties are considerably easier whenever the former is not too strong vis-à-vis the latter (electorally speaking). The presence of a green party is no absolute obstacle for left parties to be invited to join a government coalition; however, it definitely complicates left parties’ choices. With regard to the direct electoral impact of government participation, the editors find that it leads to electoral losses and often to schisms and divisions; participation simply costs too much for most of them, for when they leave office they usually tend to re-ideologise. However, incumbency compensates by bringing experience and credibility.

The inclusive approach taken in the definition of left parties once again demonstrates the inherent problems of any type of classification. Even though the editors exclude what is probably the most distinctive example of radical left governing parties, the Cypriot AKEL, the volume succeeds in providing constructive knowledge and new aspects on the study of left parties – a much neglected actor in party politics.

A well-written, empirically rich and theoretically informed volume, articulated along cohesive research questions, *Left Parties in Governments* provides insight on and illuminates the primitive Marxist question of power holding. The volume is a welcome addition to the field of radical left parties and should prove invaluable to students and scholars with an interest in party politics.

Yiannos Katsourides
(University of London)


Throughout academic literature there is concern for widespread political apathy among citizens in Western democracies; this is despite the omnipresence of politi-
A Private Sphere attempts to conceptualise how digitally enabled, self-motivated, private acts can have a public political effect. The private sphere is a descriptive theoretical hypothesis that reframes the spatial construction of where political acts occur, and details how public civic engagement can be enabled through media interactions located within an individual’s own private, personalised space. The private sphere highlights the unique spatial hybridity of digital media, as it possesses both the familiarity and autonomy of the private space, but with the potential audience of a public act.

This is exemplified through a number of mechanisms: the proliferation of social networking sites has enabled the networked individual to interact with multiple audiences; self-expression through narcissistic blogging contributes to the plurality of political discussions; and social news aggregation (e.g. Reddit) offers a potential challenge to dominant political narratives. It is the combination of these networked activities that provides the basis of a widespread participatory culture, one that Papacharissi suggests may have democratising consequences. Despite this the book does not fall into the utopian trap of many contemporaries. The author employs a critical eye throughout, detailing the limitations of the technologies, such as access inequalities.

While the book often teases the reader in its judgement of what effect this convergence is having on democracy, this does not detract from the unique theoretical framework the private sphere offers for future empirical work. Furthermore, the book offers a fresh, evolutionary approach to the conceptualisation of democracy and citizenship. Seasoned scholars with a pre-existing interest in cultural studies, media studies and political communication will find A Private Sphere an innovative approach to the ongoing debates surrounding the democratic value of new media tools, while students will appreciate the extensive conceptual overview of citizenship and the public sphere.

James Dennis
(Royal Holloway, University of London)


In this second volume of The Official History of Privatisation, David Parker examines the development of the privatisation programme in the UK in the years between the Conservative Party’s third successive election victory in 1987 and the return to office of the Labour Party in 1997, a period that saw the electricity and water industries (among others) transferred into the private sector. Taking each industry in turn, Parker traces the process from the decision to privatise through to the eventual sale(s). Providing a central focus of the book are the problems government encountered in restructuring industries ahead of potential sales, and the challenges of devising suitable regulatory instruments for companies that were in several cases monopoly suppliers. Another central feature of Parker’s account comprises the challenges inherent in pricing the industries in question, and the measures the government used to encourage the general public to buy (and retain) shares in the newly privatised industries. Parker also examines the growth of public–private partnership (PPP) and public finance initiative (PFI) arrangements during the Major years, emphasising the extent to which at least some Conservative ministers saw those programmes as being of a piece with privatisation (p. 378).

Relatively little attention is paid to those groups that opposed privatisation, and readers seeking an exhaustive account of the various merits and demerits of public ownership will not find it here. Parker notes that the trade unions and the Labour Party had ‘an ideological leaning towards state ownership’ (p. 321) but never specifically discusses the arguments in favour of public ownership (a position with which he evidently has little sympathy). These issues are, however, clearly beyond the scope of the book, which focuses mainly on the mechanics of privatisation and the difficulties involved in transferring an industry into the private sector.

As an account of the privatisation process, of the motives that informed it and the challenges that had to
be overcome, the book promises to be an invaluable resource for years to come. Aside from the fact that few of the archival resources consulted by Parker are currently in the public domain (and some may not become public until the 2020s), the depth and detail of the analysis will make both volumes of the *Official History* essential reading for all those interested in privatisation, or the histories of the industries concerned.

Matthew Francis  
(University of Nottingham)


A work of philosophical history, *Common Sense* is a refreshing study of the politicisation of a subject that seems to defy scientific scrutiny. Wrestling with the abstract and yet quaint definition of what passes for common sense is only one challenge taken up by the author in an effort to explain how central the concept is towards understanding modernity. Hannah Arendt's work provides the frame for Rosenfeld's appreciation of the relationship between common sense and democratic politics. Rosenfeld rightly recognises that words do have power and that concepts are often revealed contests over deeper visions of social reality.

The monograph is organised around a series of particular philosophical and epistemological contests that serve to deepen the richness of the investigation into what seems like a basic idea. In tracing the history of common sense as both a ‘thing’ and an ‘idea’, each chapter adds an additional layer of politicisation and contestation to the seemingly commonsensical understanding of what passes for ‘common sense’. In the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, the beginnings of the liberal world are both challenged and given validation by different threads of thought based on who is capable of successfully deploying common sense. It is here that the seeds of a particular intersubjectivity are imbued into the term as a consequence of the acquisition of a clearly political dimension. This occurs in concert with the rise of Enlightenment thinking and the elevation of the individual as portrayed in the traditional liberal accounts. However, common sense has its own story to tell and, along with the cult of reason, provides a fuller narrative of the key concepts that underpin modern political life.

Christopher M. Brown  
(Arcadia University, Philadelphia)


Oil and democracy do not mix. Exploring why has become one of the most interesting areas of comparative political analysis over the last few years. The two volumes under review are good representatives of the different types of study in the field.

Michael L. Ross’ *The Oil Curse* qualifies standard arguments about the negative impact of oil by showing that its effect on democratisation, conflict and violence, and growth is moderated by other forms of economic development and by the structure of the oil industry. Ross’ approach is to blend large-N statistics and focused small-N comparison. The oil curse, he argues, can be offset where a state has other income streams and where ownership of oil does not lie with the state. Where other sources of income are low and governments control oil there is less chance of democracy developing, since social pressure for it is low. Ross finds that economically the effect of oil is
not to destroy growth completely; rather there is less growth in oil-rich countries than there should be. Oil-rich countries are also much more prone to conflict, as either separatists try to take control of oil-rich regions or rebels use oil money to fund their wars. The importance of state ownership in making oil a curse means that oil’s negative impact has been particularly severe since the oil nationalisations in the 1960s and 1970s.

Ross’ book is a useful and very clearly written corrective to some of the more ambitious claims about the influence of oil that can be found in the literature. His book is a good and accessible guide to the oil curse thesis. This does not mean that his conclusions are incontestable. The argument that the oil curse for democracy begins in the 1970s with nationalisation in the developing world may be true to the statistical tests to which Ross subjects the data, but it is highly questionable. Oil production was largely in the hands of international firms before nationalisation. Earlier efforts at nationalisation and/or a fairer distribution of profits by weak democracies and hybrid regimes were often thwarted by these firms and their state sponsors (think Iran under Mossadegh).

This weakened democracy’s appeal and bound nationalism (and nationalisation) to authoritarian and militaristic forces. Unlike weak democrats these forces were able to take and hold oil resources and curb the depredations of oil firms. They were also able to pump more oil since they were freer of the oligopolistic interests of the oil firms. They therefore had more resources to hold on to power and also looked more wasteful of oil’s economic potential. Arguing that the oil curse only begins in the 1970s ignores the transnational politics of oil before then. The 1970s did see the end of regimes that had democratic institutional architectures or that were hybrid systems in some oil-producing states, and their replacement by unambiguous autocracies. But if these democracies and hybrids were not sovereign in their own lands because they were manipulated by foreign oil firms and governments, how could they be democratic in the sense of embodying popular sovereignty? Arguably, all the 1970s witnessed was one type of oil curse – being prey to big oil and Western governments – replaced by another.

The essays in John-Andrew McNeish and Owen Logan’s edited volume support the idea that the curse of resource dependency varies from place to place and over time. The collection is a series of small-N or single case studies, and the approaches taken are resolutely qualitative and include cultural and sociological methodologies. McNeish and Logan and their contributors recognise that hydrocarbons do not support democracy, peace or growth, but their approaches do not exclude the possibility that the hydrocarbon problem extends beyond the global South and the former USSR.

Flammable Societies offers a refreshing recognition that oil and gas impact on the politics of all societies that are large-scale energy producers, and that even the best-managed oil economies have problems due to their resource wealth. Consequently alongside the usual suspects in a book on energy and politics – Russia, Azerbaijan, Venezuela and Nigeria – there are pieces on Britain, Norway and Bolivia, and chapters that look comparatively at struggles for control over energy resources, law and energy, and the cultural political economy of hydrocarbons. The faults of the book are stylistic. Some chapters are a bit sketchy and underdeveloped due to lack of space; some chapters are jargon-ridden. That said the book is a useful reminder that the politics of energy is global, extends beyond questions of ‘energy security’ and requires the application of a broad range of analytical approaches if it is to be a more positive politics than it has been in the past.

Neil Robinson
(University of Limerick)
tered in that city, as well as the number of business hotels located in each, and business events occurring there.

Casting this wider net is notable, though when the top results are reported, the top global cities are indeed essentially the same as in all other global cities research. The core of the book is driven by a different index which accounts for all branch locations of Forbes 2000 companies, divided into different sectors (financial, legal, advertising and so on). The comprehensive nature of this measure (being calculated for 525 cities) does give credence to this study being a deeper look at a certain kind of global connectivity than past research. However, I find the measure troubling as it appears to me to focus ultimately on connectivity within global firms rather than between them – and this still falls somewhat short as a comprehensive measure of global city interconnectedness.

Perhaps more troubling, this approach assumes that cities (particularly those well outside the developed core) are connected primarily through the presence of (potentially quite marginal) Forbes 2000 branches, when it might be more likely that the Forbes 2000 companies would be working with and through local companies, which go unmeasured. This invisibility is particularly true of legal services in India and Pakistan, both of which are almost completely detached from global legal firms. Clearly a better measure of capital flows between global firms, and between global and local firms, is called for, though how realistic it is that these data can be gleaned is a different issue. On the whole this volume presents a new and thorough way of examining the connectivity of global firms in a comprehensive way, but the analysis comes across as overstating the actual importance of this measure relative to other measures, even their own city place power measure.

Eric Petersen
(Senior Transport Planner, TransLink)


Karen Zivi eloquently and persuasively argues that it is the democratic character of the process of making rights claims that underlines the continued and increasing popularity of human rights talk as a language of political reform. She argues that ‘it is through the making of rights claims that we contest and constitute the meaning of individual identity, the contours of community, and the forms that political subjectivity takes’ (p. 7). Her particular way of making the case is to apply the notions of performative utterance and performative practice to human rights, and to apply these to both how we think about and theorise human rights and the political activity of making rights claims. Zivi locates the process of making rights claims in a broad rights culture which she sees as ‘an ever changing conglomeration of stories, rituals, beliefs and practices’ (p. 11). She argues that it is important to focus on ‘the kind of activity that rights claiming entails’ (p. 14).

Performative theory – drawing on J. L. Austin, Derrida, Cavell and Butler – proves in Zivi’s hands to be a powerful and insightful way of understanding the often confusing multiplicity of ways in which people use rights language.

In the first part of the book Zivi makes her case that a performative understanding of rights claiming illustrates the democratic character of this process. Over two chapters, she takes us from H. L. A. Hart’s classic definition of what it means to have a right, through the common conception of ‘rights as trumps’, to an understanding of rights claiming as persuasion (with innovative and accomplished readings of Arendt and J. S. Mill). The paradox of rights is that – as with the ‘rights as trumps’ approach – rights are often employed instrumentally to end debate and identify secure winners; yet at the same time, rights spill out beyond these narrow instrumental uses and take on a life of their own. Their performance is not instrumentally controllable, and leads to ongoing political engagement, often in unexpected forms.

This dynamic is illustrated well in the second part of the book, which examines closely two cases in which rights claims are made: the same-sex marriage debate (as it plays out in the US, and particularly California); and AIDS policies in the US and South Africa regarding mother-to-child HIV transmission. In both of these cases, Zivi effectively argues that a performative understanding of rights claiming can change our expectations about what rights claiming can mean for us as democratic citizens.

Anthony J. Langlois
(Flinders University, Adelaide)
Britain and Ireland


The intention of this book is threefold: to focus on the immediate impact of the November 1985 Anglo-Irish Agreement on Irish politics; to consider how the Agreement subsequently influenced perceptions of the Northern Ireland problem; and to discuss the ‘momentary impact’ of the Agreement as well as the claim that it was an ‘enduring moment’ of political change.

The principal argument in this text is that a number of crucial premises about the Agreement have been forgotten, primarily in the wake of the peace process as it developed from 1993 onwards, and furthermore that many contemporary accounts do not reveal enough about the importance of the Agreement 25 years after its signing.

The authors adopt a framework which is adapted from an approach outlined by Bruce Ackerman’s *We the People, Vol. 2: Transformation* in which he posited the argument that there were exceptional incidents of ‘transformative deliberation’ where the subsequent political framework was subject to the view that political perceptions and expectations were dramatically altered, perhaps for good. This approach provides a firm basis for chapters on British government and sovereignty, the role of the Irish government and the way that the Agreement provoked public and political reactions in Northern Ireland. The book also focuses on the political strategies and tactics of the unionist, nationalist and republican communities – as well as the various loyalist paramilitary groups – in the wake of the Agreement. Europe and conflict theory provide the final two chapters in this text, the latter arguing that the Agreement has been largely overlooked by conflict analysts because academics could not quite decide at the time whether it could be seen as a success or a failure.

The authors are convincing in their argument that the Agreement did not merit the low-key celebration of its 25th anniversary in November 2010 through a carefully considered analysis of its impact across a range of political and constitutional topics. At the same time the authors maintain the realistic recognition that the Agreement was considerably overshadowed by the Good Friday Agreement of 1998 which they admit had evolved within a different set of political calculations on the part of those involved.

Aughey and Gormley-Heenan and their co-contributors have provided a closely argued text and an innovative approach which will appeal to those who continue to be interested in judgements about the legacy and impact of the 1985 Agreement.

Note


William Stallard
(University of Bristol)


*Accounting for Ministers* is a theoretically informed exploration of accountability and performance in British central government. It provides a detailed micro-level analysis of ministers’ careers, including their backgrounds, how long they spend in government and the circumstances that lead to their exit. A principal–agent framework, with the prime minister as principal, provides the book’s conceptual underpinnings. A unique data set of ministers from 1945 to 2007 provides the empirical foundations.

The book ‘uses the tools of modern political science to model the relationships between the prime minister and her ministers, and among the ministers as a collective organ of government’ (p. 5). Two chapters serve as a prelude to the analysis: one provides an accessible overview of principal–agent relations in government, the other an account of the structure of British government. The empirical meat then follows. One chapter describes ministers’ backgrounds and their spells in government; another tests conventional wisdom about prime ministerial styles in the hiring and firing of ministers. The remaining chapters introduce ‘resignation calls’ as an indicator of ministerial performance – the logic being that such calls provide signals to prime ministers about ministers’ capabilities – and then introduce these measures into a model of ministerial tenure. Ministers may survive lone calls for their resignation; they are much less likely to survive multiple calls.
The approach taken in Accounting for Ministers is not one that all students of Britain’s core executive will appreciate. The presence of ‘hazard model’ equations may dissuade some (wrongly, not rightly), and the reliance on resignation calls as a measure of ministerial performance is open to question. Indeed, the principal-agent framework sometimes leads the book to adopt an excessively prime ministerial point of view. The idea that the tenure of ministerial spells ‘approaches optimality’ (pp. 85–6) may be true for a prime minister seeking to pursue his or her preferences, but it may not be true for the civil servants who frequently have to adapt to new ministerial masters.

Yet the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The book’s logic is impeccable, and the analysis is very easy to follow. More importantly, the book offers a number of real insights into the dynamics of ministerial survival and the reality of individual and collective responsibility. It also highlights the importance of characteristics that are fixed before ministers enter office. Politicians with an Oxbridge background are especially likely to enjoy a long ministerial life, a finding with obvious normative implications. Accounting for Ministers should be read by all students of British central government. The sooner a paperback copy appears the better.

Nicholas Allen
(Royal Holloway, University of London)


This book aims to understand and evaluate the process of feminisation in the contemporary Conservative Party. It focuses on the period 2005–10, framing feminisation as part of David Cameron’s ‘modernisation’ agenda. Noting the virtual absence of gender from mainstream analyses of Conservative modernisation, the book’s overarching claim is that ‘to underplay the importance of feminization to the Cameron project ... is to limit one’s understanding of Conservative Party change over the last five years’ (p. 5).

This claim is convincingly supported over the book’s four sections, covering theories of representation, descriptive representation, substantive representation and feminisation and party strategy. These illustrate the centrality of feminisation to many of Cameron’s major reforms, including the parliamentary candidate selection process and the formation of more inclusive policy. The impression of the extent of feminisation is mixed. As a direct result of reforms, there are more female Conservative MPs, and the party in 2005–10 was ‘much more competitive on the women’s terrain’ (p. 15) in terms of policy. Nonetheless, problems with selection remain, while the Conservatives’ liberally feminist emphasis on ‘choice’ for women may come to look increasingly hollow operating in tandem with other policies, notably if budget cuts that disproportionately affect women result in restricted choice in practice (p. 234). As the authors recognise and the varied and sometimes hostile responses from some of the book’s focus group data illustrate, feminisation remains very much a work in progress and it remains to be seen how this will unfold in the wake of the 2010 general election. Nonetheless, this book provides a solid basis from which to consider future developments.

Sex, Gender and the Conservative Party provides a welcome and much-needed addition to the existing gender and politics literature, which tends to focus on the Labour Party in the British case, and left-wing parties more broadly. It is recommended to anyone with an interest in the contemporary Conservative Party. It also speaks to wider debates regarding the process of women’s representation by looking at how this might take place in right-wing parties, where there is perhaps a greater chance of ideological tension than in those of the left. It thus represents an important contribution to the gender and politics literature. The book is well written and accessible, providing a clear introduction to key debates around women’s representation, as well as a nuanced assessment of gender and the Conservatives.

Elizabeth McEnhill
(University of Huddersfield)


The 1911 Parliament Bill began more than a century of Lords reform, examined by Peter Dorey and Alexandra Kelso in this book. Their aim is to ‘investigate why some
reforms have been successfully introduced, while others have stalled, been abandoned, or defeated’. Their central argument is that reform produces too many divisions, once there is no immediate problem to be overcome.

The book discusses the six key set-piece battles: the 1911 Parliament Act, the 1949 Parliament Act, the 1958 Life Peerages Act, the 1963 Peerage Act, the 1969 Parliament Bill and the 1999 House of Lords Act. But it also looks at the assorted skirmishes that occurred in between: cross-party commissions and committees set up in (usually forlorn) attempts to get agreement. Drawing on a range of sources, from memoirs and biographies to parliamentary debates and manifestos, in accessible language, it provides a detailed examination of what reform has managed and where it has failed. The result is relatively little new evidence, but rather old evidence re-examined.

The literature on House of Lords reform has tended to focus on the contemporary position (asking the question: where to now?) or has looked at a single reform asking whether it was successful in its stated aims. What Dorey and Kelso do is look at the overall process, analysing levels of change through the move towards a politically appointed chamber as a result of the expansion of life peers, the growing professionalisation following increased remuneration, and the repositioning of the Lords as a constitutional safeguard. They also show how the process of reform has changed, from being a reaction by the government to one in which there is no consensus.

The evidence for the arguments is well presented, and the focus on process is refreshing. But the reform debate is approached, primarily, from the point of view of what governments wanted, with the response of the Lords often discussed only in passing, and more focus on the behaviour in the Lords – such as the divide between the ‘hedgers’ and the ‘ditchers’ in 1911 – might have been useful.

More could also have been made of their discussion of the Lords’ legitimacy, an issue that is left until the conclusion. Dorey and Kelso argue that the often-cited question of legitimacy is frequently confused with democracy. Much of the Lords reform debate, they argue, is almost self-defeating until the constitutional positions of the Lords and the Commons can be agreed.

Fiona Williams
(University of Nottingham)
responded effectively to varying favourable or unfavourable circumstances can then be assessed.

The book would be of interest to students or academics, particularly in the field of opposition or leadership studies, but also to those with an interest in the development of post-war British politics more generally.

Elizabeth McEnhill
(University of Huddersfield)


Britain’s first post-war coalition government is likely to create a cottage industry in assessments of the new administration. This volume of essays on the Conservative Party’s return to power is one of the first. Loosely structured around the major themes of Bulpitt’s notion of statecraft – specifically winning elections and governing competently – the book provides an overview of public policy, electoral performance and party management during the coalition’s first year in office. The politics of deficit reduction looms large throughout, touching upon questions not only of economic policy but also social policy, ideology and governmental cohesion. Other policy areas covered include immigration policy, foreign policy and European policy. The book also discusses relations between the centre and the Celtic nations, Conservative modernisation, feminisation and electoral opinion. Although not ostensibly about the Liberal Democrats, the junior coalition partner is never far from the discussion throughout.

Recent years have seen an increase in edited volumes on British politics, mainly flowing from conferences and workshops. The strength of these books is that they bring together an array of authors with different perspectives who can offer early appraisals of new governments. Their weakness is that these appraisals may be premature. The Conservatives enjoyed a fairly serene first year back in office but their second year has turned out to be much rockier, with the phone-hacking scandal, a double-dip recession, a botched budget and heavy losses in the local elections. None of these developments is covered in this volume. There is always the risk that such books will quickly look dated. Books that offer retrospectives of governments over a longer time period, especially after they have left office, are less prone to these problems.

A further drawback with these collections is that the policy chapters often end up being very descriptive, recounting events and decisions, but light on analysis. Perhaps that is related to the greater inclination of political scientists to focus on party competition than on public policy. That tends to characterise this book, although the policy chapters are certainly informative. However, the best chapters are the final four, which deal with coalition cohesion, Cameron’s style as prime minister, Labour in opposition and possible future developments in party alignments. Each is more analytical and less descriptive.

Overall, this volume offers a useful if unavoidably incomplete first impression of the Conservatives’ return to government. It is bound to be supplemented with many others.

Thomas Quinn
(University of Essex)


Andrew Pearmain’s interesting book is structured in two parts. The first, ‘Gramsci and His Legacy’, looks at the specific legacy of his writings in Britain. The second, entitled ‘Critique of New Labour’, seeks to undertake ‘a Gramscian analysis’ of New Labour via a focus upon ‘ideologies, cultures, interests and principles; terms that Gramsci himself would have deployed to gain an intellectual hand-hold on the phenomenon’ (p. 19). But this is not a work on Gramsci’s political theory per se. Readers without a detailed knowledge of Gramsci’s substantive ideas will not gain one. Instead, this is a work of first, history and second, analysis – the two elements broadly mapping on to the aforementioned parts.

The first part offers a clearly written history of the uptake and influence of Gramsci’s writings in Britain’s Marxist intellectual sphere – _New Left Review_, the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB), the euro-communists clustered around the journal _Marxism Today_ and so on – through to the revisionists surrounding Neil Kinnock’s leadership and what would become New Labour. Sections of this intellectual history are
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whizzed through, and much has already been written on parts of the subject. (Geoff Andrew’s history of the CPGB Endgames and New Times: The Final Years of British Communism 1964–1991 and Alan Finlayson’s excellent Making Sense of New Labour, for example, have covered the impact of the Marxism Today debates on New Labour’s formation/formulation.) Pearmain wears his politics on his sleeve; his work is unapologetically polemical. This can mean, however, that the narrative becomes obviously slanted; it is surely time to dispense with the de rigueur howls of personal disgust about Laclau and Mouffe for their allegedly ‘essentially hollow jargon’ and ‘pompous quotation marks’ (p. 98), etc.

After such a long run-up, the second part, the actual analysis of New Labour, feels short-lived. Here Pearmain applies Gramsci’s ideas on technology, ‘Cae-sarism’ and class struggle, for example, to his subject matter, producing a left-wing critique which, while framed in Gramscian terminology, will be broadly familiar and probably sympathetic to many. Applied analyses of the development and affective history of ideas, as well as the rigorous analytical application of individual thinkers to subjects, is possibly somewhat lacking in the ‘Brit Pol’ literature presently. This easy-to-read book will, it is therefore hoped, provide a gateway to readers, especially undergraduate, to grasp not just Gramsci, but the role of ideas – rather than simply personalities, party mechanics and media spin – in British politics today.

Notes
1 Lawrence & Wishart, 2004.

David S. Moon
(University of Liverpool)


This book provides an important evaluation of how mainstream political parties select and eject their leaders. The roles of institutions, candidate likeability and contextual divisional issues can each have a significant impact upon the process of leadership selection. Spanning the mainstream political parties, Quinn provides an insightful appraisal of the processes utilised, showing how and why parties select and eject their leaders. Clearly the means by which this process is conducted is by no means universal, and the author provides a thorough exploration of institutional distinctions surrounding these differences.

As a propensity, division and unity frame aspects of the leadership selection process. A divided party may gravitate more towards a leader likely to span those divisions (towards garnering unity), while an already united party may look towards more pragmatic electoral considerations. An example of this can be found in the election of Michael Foot, whose appeal extended to moderates on the left and right (standing in opposition to those on the extremes of both). Inversely, at a time of unity, the Labour Party selected Tony Blair, seen to be more favourable with the mainstream electorate. This reflects the importance of divisional context upon leadership selection.

Furthermore, tied to a slow growth of democratic process across the parties since the mid-twentieth century, leaders are now assumed to hold more of a mandate than former less democratically appointed figures, such as Alec Douglas-Home. Subverting expectations, this enhancement of the democratic process can scarcely be said to have opened up leadership elections. Indeed, within the mainstream parties such elections continue to draw out elite rather than rank-and-file leadership candidates.

A consequential value of this book derives from the broader contribution it provides to existing scholarship on leadership elections. Given that the focus of this work spans all the main parties rather than any specific indicative ideological sampling, the book contributes an important evaluation of cross-party leadership elections. In terms of audience, it will be of significant value to students of British politics and leadership elections, although this does not preclude a wider appeal. Indeed, students of Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democratic politics will find much to interest them here. Although this book provides a significant contribution, it must be seen as the continuation of a longer-running debate on the subject rather than as a conclusion, which implies that a follow-up assessment may well emerge as parties continue to refine their leadership selection processes.

Andrew Scott Crines
(University of Huddersfield)
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The principal argument of this book (p. 3) is that, despite being unable to put it into practice by virtue of being out of office for sizeable chunks of time, ‘there has been a discernible Labour Party foreign policy throughout the twentieth century, and this can most helpfully be categorised as “internationalism”’. Chapter 1 considers the six beliefs that underpin the Labour Party’s internationalist outlook, which sometimes but not always overlaps with British foreign policy as thought about and practised by the Conservative Party. Chapter 2 surveys developments in the 1950s, with new wars and conflicts such as Korea challenging the party’s approach to rearmament and nuclear weapons in and outside Western Europe. The national humiliation of Suez and increasing Cold War tensions over Hungary illustrate how fast Britain was falling from the ‘top table’ of power and influence in this decade.

Chapter 3 covers the Harold Wilson years, 1964–70, emphasising Anglo-American tensions over British troop commitments to the Vietnam War, debates about the British defence role ‘east of Suez’, as well as Rhodesia and the failed Labour bid to take Britain into the EEC to prop up its ailing economy and sense of self in the wider world. Chapter 4 outlines developments during the Edward Heath years, particularly on the Cold War and détente, Britain’s EEC accession and the problems this caused Labour in identifying something to oppose, hence the renegotiation of the terms of entry and the 1975 referendum on EEC membership. It moves on to study the swing to the left in Labour foreign policy thinking on defence under the influence of the (then) mightily influential National Executive Committee.

The fifth chapter examines the product of this radical shift – unelectability in the 1980s. The 1983 and 1987 manifestos receive prolonged treatment as lenses through which we see these disputes becoming the public face of the Labour Party, the response being Neil Kinnock’s post-1987 policy review. Chapter 6 sees the culmination of the policy review leading to the modernisation of the Labour Party, slowly under John Smith and then rapidly under Tony Blair and New Labour from 1994. The Blair years are covered in terms of Robin Cook’s controversial but not-at-all-new and politically suicidal ‘ethical dimension’, the Kosovo intervention of 1999, British–European relations and international development. Before the conclusion, chapter 7 is themed around Blair’s increasingly volatile approach to the conduct of Britain’s external policy after the shock of 9/11, the onset of the war on terror and the ambition to change the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq. Finally, the transition from Blair to Brown brought a more cautious, pragmatic approach to foreign policy.

All in all this is a readable and well-researched account which should be of use to scholars and advanced researchers of foreign policy and contemporary political history, and to students taking courses in British politics and British foreign policy.

Oliver Daddow
(University of Leicester)

Political Participation in Britain: The Decline and Revival of Civic Culture by Paul Whiteley.

Paul Whiteley has conducted some of the most important research on British political culture over the last generation. This short book draws heavily on his research to provide a synthesis of what we know about the changing culture. It sketches in turn the changing nature of political values and attitudes; of participation among the population at large; of participation among the special segment that belongs to political parties; of volunteering and social capital; and of the media and participation. Two chapters address the big questions of where Britain sits in comparison with other democratic societies, and of the relationship between effective government and the character of civil society. Almond and Verba’s classic study provides the benchmark for measuring change. The tone is measured and Whiteley sticks close to the detail of the data, but the message is clear: change is afoot, and it is all in the direction of weakening the civic culture. ‘Revival’ in the title refers to Whiteley’s hopes, not to what is presently taking place.

This is now the standard work on the subject of participation and political culture in Britain; it will be plundered endlessly by textbook writers and by teachers of British politics. It is also an impressive rejoinder
to those media commentators who allege that professional political science is saying nothing of importance about wider social conditions. In some respects, though, Whiteley has been wrong-footed by events. His discussion of values, in particular, is largely about the world before the great economic crisis, in part because he is wedded to the data provided by big international surveys which proceed at a stately, slow pace. The next edition (and there surely will have to be one) needs to grapple with the world since the Great Moderation was exposed as an illusion. Whiteley is also surprisingly sceptical about the new world of activism in such forms as boycotts, and surprisingly elegiac about the decline of such things as party membership: ‘surprisingly’ because his own research first exposed the importance of unofficial activism, and documented the decay of the old hierarchical parties. Yet that latter world, in its pomp, reduced most citizens to minor functionaries, at the most extreme to makers of coffee and organisers of jumble sales. It is not obvious that, for the health of democracy, it is better to brew the coffee than to boycott the coffee.

Michael Moran
(Manchester Business School)


Religion and Change in Modern Britain takes a fresh look at religious change in post-war Britain. The book examines how it has affected society, focusing on shifting constructions of the sacred and secular forms of religious practice, and the place of religion in the public sphere. The authors suggest that the secularisation framework is not sufficient for understanding all the complexities of religious change. Instead, they use a multidisciplinary integrating approach. Three parts of the book consolidate chapters on the development of forms of religion and spirituality and their relation to societal change.

The forms of religion that have embraced market opportunities and new media have become more influential in causing a decline of traditional Christianity, although it still enjoys cultural and religious significance. As a result of greater religious plurality, non-Christian religions and alternative forms of spirituality have increased their impact on the wider society. This shift of power has determined the emergence of more flexible forms of religion and the significant development of ‘old’ religions. The authors examine religion’s relations with different aspects of social life, focusing on media, welfare and education, as well as legislation and political engagement. They argue that religion cooperates with society. Examples of successful collaboration between the two include youth culture and popular music, faith-based organisations providing social services, and faith schools.

The integrated approach used in the book makes the content consistent, yet does not diminish the value of its separate chapters which are constructed as self-standing units. Empirical case studies support the argument and validate theoretical claims, also making the research largely empirical, which is rare for a study of religion. Even though the book largely deals with practical aspects of religious change in Britain, it also suggests cultural and sociological theoretical explanations. However, focusing on societal facets of religion the book would benefit from a more detailed reflection on political engagement of religious minorities and the place of religion in politics as well as in the public space.

All in all, Religion and Change in Modern Britain presents a truly collaborative work which is consistent in its main argument and benefits greatly from the expertise of scholars from different disciplines. It is essential reading for those who are interested in religious studies and societal change. Largely targeted at students and scholars, the book is written in a light and comprehensive style, which is a remarkable achievement for a collaborative piece.

Ekaterina Kolpinskaya
(University of Nottingham)


Intellectually accessible, this important book provides an analysis of the 2010 general election from the perspective of media commentators. Given the emerging range of other works on the election, this book appropriately avoids a broad discussion on a par with the Nuffield series. Rather, its focus is on a single aspect of
the election campaign, that of the communicative context.

The core of the book revolves around the prime ministerial debates, their organisation, their impact on the election and future impact upon British politics. This is appropriate given their clear defining role in the general election. This evaluation is coloured by contributions from figures such as Adam Boulton, Greg Cook and Chris Rennard, who inject the benefit of a personal perspective, enhancing the book’s readability. This, however, is appropriately constrained by an academic evaluation, which ensures that the validity of the work for scholars is maintained. However, the use of non-scholarly authors in an academic work has a propensity to risk a journalistic analysis, potentially curtailing the book’s objectivity.

In addition to this, the new media are also considered. As Garber argues, the shift in electioneering is increasingly away from the traditional forms of canvassing vis-à-vis the battle bus, and more towards new media outlets such as Twitter, which play an increased role in the democratic process. This, however, is subverted by research revealing that fewer members of the mature electorate—the demographic most likely to vote—use such technology. As such, an over-reliance on new media is potentially harmful to the electoral process, legitimising an approach consisting of new and traditional methods.

Importantly, this appraisal is connected to academic evaluations of the necessity for effective political rhetoric and oratory, although these are not evaluated in detail. The focus of the book is on the practicalities of elite rhetoric and manipulation of the media. This work should make excellent reading for scholars of elections, the process of securing support, and the shifting use of media in British politics. The absence of a theoretical basis of political communication, however, deprives the book of an awareness of the wealth of communicative methods. As such, students of that aspect of political communication may find little of value. Rather, the importance of this book comes from its focus on media impact upon the 2010 general election, making the book of particular interest to scholars of that aspect of political communication, loosely defined, and British politics more generally.

Andrew Scott Crines
(University of Huddersfield)


A detailed case study of the 2011 Welsh referendum, in itself, is a highly valuable prospect, overlooked almost entirely, as it was, outside Wales. But Wyn Jones and Scully’s excellent, readable book offers so much more. Its wider focus is probably best encapsulated in the authors’ contention that ‘The referendum was important because the process by which this rather bizarre vote came to occur encapsulates so much about characteristic pathologies of Welsh political life’ (p. xi), a declaration they subsequently succeed, wonderfully, to demonstrate. In so doing, the titular referendum, while the central focus of this text, plays a wider role in centring a general overview of the politics of devolution in Wales from the late 1970s to 2011, covering the three Welsh national referenda.

But this book is about not only the referendum’s lessons for politics in Wales, but also its lessons regarding referenda in general. Specifically, it contends that the 2011 referendum ‘offers a useful negative role model to the rest of the democratic world: it was an example of How Not to Do It’ (p. 167). Covering all this, Wyn Jones and Scully’s comprehensive research encompasses insights from political history, reports on (intra-) party politics, an explication of post-devolution governmental structures and detailed analysis of referendum results and data on identity.

In discussing the development of devolution, the book is, by nature, largely a discussion of intra-party power plays within the hegemonic force in Welsh politics, the Labour Party in Wales. I take issue with one point here: discussing Labour’s 2007 special conference to debate entering the ‘One Wales’ coalition with Plaid Cymru, the authors recount, from ‘anonymous sources’, how Neil Kinnock’s (anti-coalition) ‘oratory was received very coolly by the delegates’ with vocal support ‘restricted to a small band of hard-core followers’, labelling this a ‘humiliation’ (p. 25). Having attended the conference myself this is an unreasonably skewed account of an event at which the majority who spoke did so against the deal (regardless that a ‘yes’ vote was a known arithmetic certainty beforehand). Furthermore, the attendant judgement that entering ‘One Wales’ signalled that Labour had ‘finally embraced...
devolution’ (p. 25) conflates the largely anti-nationalist sentiments expressed at the conference with anti-devolution ones – a normative narrative that simplifies the complexity of intra-Labour ideological antagonisms. But this is, regardless, the best text on Welsh devolution I have read in a long time. Highly accessible, it deserves not only a place on course reading lists but a readership beyond academia.

David S. Moon
(University of Liverpool)

Europe


Hilary Appel offers a comprehensive account of tax policies in Eastern Europe in the post-communist era. Her book explains in detail the construction of capitalist tax systems in former communist states and provides an analysis of how specific forms of taxation were driven by domestic politics on tax policy. Her central argument is that most taxes, such as corporate income taxes and all forms of consumption taxes, have been influenced significantly by important constraints deriving from regional and global economic integration, while some taxes remain politicised.

The author explains in depth the influence of EU competition law on the establishment of acceptable taxes on profits and convincingly shows that the EU accession process had a lasting and strong effect on the individual tax systems established in the region. On the contrary, there was little interference from Brussels on corporate income taxes, which were more driven by the need to remain competitive in the world economy and to establish Eastern European countries as a production base. The author convincingly argues that the choices taken by decision makers in the tax area were largely based on the need to attract foreign capital to their country.

The book itself provides a broad sweep of the issues: chapter 2 identifies the main challenges of creating capitalist tax systems after communism, chapter 3 examines the impact of European integration on taxation, chapter 4 looks into corporate taxes, chapter 5 examines personal income taxes in Eastern Europe, and Russian taxation in light of the previous chapters is contextualised in chapter 6, while chapter 7 presents the conclusions of the monograph.

The comparison with Russia allows the author to segregate effects of European integration from other external factors that influence the development of taxes in Eastern Europe (e.g. globalisation, domestic political pressures). In this way, the author elegantly overcomes the methodological trap of identifying everything as Europeanisation of Eastern European tax policies. In contrast, she is able to identify the various factors in play and examines them in depth. This approach is certainly also transferable to other transition studies, in which countries that integrated into the EU could be compared to other countries that did not do so. In addition, the author uses clear and precise language. The book is suitable for anybody who would like to know more about the dynamics of transition, in particular in the tax area.

Michael Steffens
(Independent Scholar)


The Politics of Means and Ends focuses entirely on the relevance of policy instruments in a supranational context and analyses the reasons why ‘political actors choose certain policy instruments to attain their desired policy goals’ (p. 3). Holger Bähr’s comparative assessment of European Union (EU) environmental and social policy produces a thought-provoking argument appropriate for policy analysts and academics alike about the relationship between ‘situational structures’ and policy instrument choices.

Bähr uses a most similar systems design to contend that the usage of particular policy instruments depends on the interaction of various policy-making actors, who base their instrument choices on beliefs and interests. In any given policy area there are naturally ‘horizontal’ and ‘vertical’ cleavages between the actors that shape the policy-making environment (p. 163). Environmental advocates, EU actors and social equity groups represent one side, supporting command and control instruments and hard law because they ensure more complete compliance with formulated rules.
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On the other side, national actors, business groups and employer associations prefer suasive instruments and soft law because they ensure flexibility and competitiveness. Similar cleavages exist in European environmental and social policy. Yet the application of policy instruments in these fields is ultimately decided by their unique ‘situational structures’ – institutions, the politicisation of policy problems and external events (p. 179). Bähr illustrates this differentiation in his empirical chapters and shows that advocates of every instrument lobby European policy makers.

The detailed and thorough attention that Bähr pays to each of his case studies strengthens the causal claim he identifies. Each chapter is logically structured and provides ample evidence to support the underlying claim. However, sections occasionally lose focus by going into excessive detail. Throughout his two empirical chapters Bähr illustrates how the situational structures of both environmental and social policy contain contentious and favourable institutional environments, highly and mildly politicised issues, and influential and irrelevant external events. However, this nuanced appreciation is not carried into the comparison and concluding chapters where Bähr makes inferences that are unsupported by his earlier discussion. Nonetheless, the author maintains the theoretical focus he underlines in his introduction and demonstrates aptly that studies of policy instruments are applicable in a supranational context.

Graeme Crouch (University of Victoria, Canada)


Oldrich Bures’ book offers a welcome analysis of the European Union’s counter-terrorism strategies. The volume critiques EU counter-terrorism measures, offering an interesting account of the value-added offered by EU-level agencies and policies. Bures argues that EU counter-terrorism policy has the scope to become a real tiger but two fundamental weaknesses stand in its way: lack of implementation of measures by member states and lack of collaboration between EU agencies and national agencies.

Part I provides an overview of contemporary terrorist threats in Europe, highlighting the differences between public perceptions of the terrorist threat across member states. Bures identifies this as one of the major obstacles when considering whether an EU policy will be successfully implemented and argues that EU measures should be representative of all member states. Part I also provides a concise overview of the evolution of counter-terrorism policy and makes a case to show that EU counter-terrorism policy has not been widely applied by member states. Part II analyses the roles of Europol, Eurojust and the EU Counter-terrorism Coordinator to provide case studies for establishing how effective EU policies are in influencing change in member states. Overall, Part II shows that the effectiveness of existing counter-terrorism institutions is limited by the role and power granted to the EU by member states.

Part III looks more specifically at the European arrest warrant and the EU’s fight against terrorism finances, exposing the shortcomings of the EU’s efforts as well as suggesting ways for such policies to improve. Part IV begins by looking into the familiar debate surrounding counter-terrorism legislation of freedom versus security, which encapsulates concerns already discussed in the academic literature and brings them into the EU context. Bures determines that while to date EU counter-terrorism policies tend to work more in terms of persuasion than as an enforcer on member states, there is a clear need for EU-level orientated action as global terrorism cannot be fought nationally. In response to the title of his book, Bures answers that while it is clear that EU counter-terrorism policy is predominantly a paper tiger, he does not support the view that ‘EU-level action cannot offer any value-added in the fight against terrorism’ (p. 258).

EU Counterterrorism Policy: A Paper Tiger? is an informative volume which can be recommended for both students and scholars alike. It will be of importance to those interested in Europe’s role in the fight against terrorism, and those who question the EU’s role in securing EU member states against contemporary security threats.

Lella Nouri (Swansea University)


Immigration and Conflict in Europe is an interesting book for everyone interested in migration issues. To begin it provides the reader with a general overview of existing
theories on migration and conflict where the author explains her conceptualisation of immigrant–native and immigrant–state conflict. This is followed by Part II, where patterns of immigrant conflict in Great Britain are described. The dynamics of racist violence are portrayed in the next part. All this sets the scene for the exploration of data on racist violence in Greater London’s 32 boroughs, proving that the immigration of politically powerful South Asian migrants reinforces violent attacks towards them. In contrast, the migrants from Africa and the Caribbean, who are far less politically powerful, are not subjects of such attacks. The author demonstrates that this is due to the differences in economic conditions between the neighbourhoods.

In the next section she argues that the racist violence against migrants is not only a product of immigrant–native conflict but that it is part of the bigger ‘fabric of such conflict’ (p. 19). Part III tests this theory by analysing chosen boroughs in London (Tower Hamlets and Ealing) and two Midlands cities (Birmingham and Leicester). Working with samples of immigrants from different backgrounds Dancygier states that it is the economic conditions and the immigrants’ political behaviour more than their ethnic origins that tend to cause conflicts. The fourth part focuses on national differences in immigrant conflicts, taking Germany and France as examples. Dancygier argues that the policy regulations that define immigrants’ arrival, stay and economic entitlements are the factors most responsible for causing immigrant conflict. To highlight her points, the author analyses immigration and conflict across selected countries.

This book provides readers with an impressively high standard of research and clear arguments which show that migration conflict has its roots in the economic dimension of immigration regimes and migrants’ political behaviour. Overall, the volume is highly recommended to readers who wish to explore the subject of migration and conflict in Europe comparatively.

Bozena Sojka
(Swansea University)


This book consists of five essays on two central issues of the constitutional theory of the European Union: (1) the nature of European Union law; and (2) the nature of the European Union as a political community. The chapters by De Witte, Halberstam and Krisch deal mainly with the nature of European Union law. De Witte updates with great legal finesse the case for considering EU law as an experimental kind of public international law. Halberstam revisits pluralistic constitutional theory, which couples the characterisation of Union law as a constitutional order with a non-hierarchical and dialogical understanding of the relationship between the supranational, the national and the regional legal orders. Krisch takes pluralistic constitutional theory a step forward by considering it as the key tool to reconstruct the manifold constitutional orders in the post-national constellation he alleges we now inhabit.

In his turn, Walker largely dwells on the polity question, offering an analytical template to help rethink the role of law in European integration. Finally, De Búrca ties the two questions together by considering what we can learn about the nature of the European Union as a polity by studying the case law of the European Court of Justice (ECJ) (and outstandingly, the recent rulings on the Kadi cases) on the structural relationship between EU law and public international law. The five essays are framed by an intentionally provoking introductory chapter by Weiler – in which he puts forward a defence of political constitutionalism, the collective purpose of politics and the hierarchical dimension of democratic law – and supplemented by an epilogue consisting of five ‘dialogues’ between Weiler and each of the authors.

The book is important, but its overall influence on constitutional public discussion may be somewhat hampered by the excessive ‘structural’ character of the arguments and the avoidance of ‘substantive’ issues. Such issues are treated largely en passant (p. 50, economic freedoms), or in a way that seems to reflect very preliminary thought (p. 239, the OECD’s fight against tax havens). Halberstam largely avoids discussion of the substantive fundamental rights concerns underlying the Kadi ruling (and on p. 174 refers uncritically to the ‘global war on terror’) while De Búrca limits herself to considering the extent to which the ECJ’s ruling was not actually dictated by a concern with the subjective rights of the plaintiffs. The only exception is Walker’s chapter, where the socio-economic dimension of European constitutionalism is considered (pp. 90ff.); but
even in this case, the arguments fail to consider in depth the substantive implications of the constitutional transformations of the European Union.

Agustín José Menéndez
(University of Léon)


The book asks what explains the diversity in national patterns of institutional reform in post-Second World War Britain, France and Germany. With the ‘varieties of capitalism’ tradition as a starting point – and drawing on a combination of historical institutionalism and behavioural economics – Fioretos’ answer is that when governments aligned national and multilateral institutions in ways that were incentive compatible and ensured that adaptation losses were small and maladaptation costs low for pivotal sectors of the business community, governments were able to construct sufficiently broad coalitions within the business community to implement successfully their economic reform agendas. In other words, the manner in which governments reconciled domestic reform with their multilateral commitments shaped the outcome of domestic reforms in the three countries.

Arguing that the comparative capitalism literature has tended to treat national economies as closed systems of governance, Fioretos emphasises the independent effect that multilateral designs have in building coalitions of business interests in the domestic setting. Central to his argument stands the so-called ‘design problem’ which concerns how national economic institutions are integrated internally within a state and how they are externally integrated into the international environment. As argued by the author, ‘the broader implication of the design problem is that the degree to which institutions at the national and multilateral levels are incentive compatible affects the long-term willingness of domestic groups to support the national economic reform agenda of governments’ (p. 172).

In his case study of structural economic reform in four areas of economic governance across six decades in Britain, France and Germany, Fioretos shows how the institution of multilateralism protects some features of national models while at other times it undermines key features of domestic reform programmes. The primary contribution of the book lies not so much in claiming that the EU mattered for the economic development of its three most important economies – that would hardly surprise anyone – but rather in providing a new set of theoretical lenses through which to analyse how the multilateral commitments of governments profoundly shaped the institutional evolution of economic governance in Britain, France and Germany. The book takes a number of important questions head on, for example: why economic governance changes incrementally or dramatically; how governments gain elite support for their reforms; and how the domestic and international levels are interdependent. In the effort to answer these questions the book is – on both an empirical and theoretical level – ambitious, comprehensive and rich.

Martin B. Carstensen
(Copenhagen Business School)


The Hour of Europe is Josip Glaudirić’s contribution to the study of the Yugoslav crisis of the late 1980s, and Western diplomacy’s response to it. Bearing in mind that the issue of the dissolution of socialist Yugoslavia has been a point of contention among scholars for a number of years now; Glaudirić’s volume is very much aimed at shattering misinterpretations that still find their way into academic literature on this topic.

In that respect, the author’s main arguments concerning the Western diplomatic engagement and the Yugoslav crisis are: first, that ‘lack of political will’ of major Western actors was demonstrated in the impotence of these actors in stopping the war in the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY); second, that discord over the crisis in the SFRY among major Western powers, predominantly in the European Community camp between France and the UK, on the one side, and united Germany, on the other, was significant and had to be gradually reduced; and third, that the post-Cold War rhetoric of the West, although it recognised a beginning of a new international relations agenda following the break-up of the USSR, the fall of communism and the unification project in Europe
embodied in the creation of the EU, in the case of the SFRY remained but a verbal statement not followed by action. Therefore, Glaurdić’s work succinctly underlines how ineffective and divided the responses of major Western actors actually were, for their rhetoric of a peaceful and united Europe was in dissonance with their inherently Cold War-inspired policies aimed at keeping the SFRY united, and thus indirectly assisting Milošević’s project, at the expense of the republics of Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

To conclude, Glaurdić’s volume is a well-researched book written in a manner appealing not only to scholars but also to a wider audience interested in the topic of the Yugoslav crisis and dissolution. However, the book itself does not offer any innovative approach to the crisis and ensuing war, but rather tends to communicate, albeit in a different manner, analysis already expressed in studies by, for example, James Gow and Sabrina Ramet. This does not necessarily mean that this piece on Yugoslavia is not a valuable contribution, but just that this may be considered a disadvantage in the academic world. Regardless of that, I warmly recommend this book as an excellent source of information on late-1980s Yugoslavia, and a rather appropriate reminder that the unfortunate state of affairs in Western diplomacy of that period had an overwhelming impact upon the Yugoslav crisis and war that in many aspects horrified the world.

Vladimir Đorđević
(Masaryk University, Czech Republic)


Welfare state change in an era of austerity is strongly needed, but politically impossible to realise. ‘Eppur si muove’ (p. 2) – and yet it moves – is Silja Häusermann’s answer and the focus of her ambitious book. She sets out to explain whether, why and how socio-economic changes led to policy reform. The starting point of Häusermann’s argument is that post-industrialisation led to new conflicts within society. Contrary to the new politics view, she argues that the emerging multidimensional policy space does not impede but creates the opportunity for successful reforms. Under some circumstances governments and policy makers should be able to design reform packages that achieve the support of cross-class coalitions.

Analysing pension reform in three continental welfare states (Germany, France and Switzerland) between 1970 and 2004, she provides compelling evidence for her argument. Even in the least likely cases, like continental pension systems, far-reaching reforms are possible and welfare states are able to adapt their pension systems to financial austerity and new social risks. Multidimensional reform politics, coalitional engineering by policy entrepreneurs and a favourable institutional context allowing for coalitional flexibility and compromise are the main conditions for successful policy change.

The precision of the theoretical argument and the concisely laid out evidence demands considerable attention. But it is worth the effort, and not only for experts in the field of pensions. For those interested in theories on welfare state reform the book provides a novel framework to conceptualise the effect of gradual socio-structural changes as the drivers of reform. What is most exciting about this book is how successfully it supports its theoretical insights with a comprehensive and rigorous empirical analysis. The methodological section is a brilliant example of how to combine a quantitative analysis of actor positions with in-depth case studies. Its success will, it is hoped, encourage further mixed methods research – a more often requested than actually performed line of research.

Elias Naumann
(University of Mannheim)


In Political Communication in European Parliamentary Elections the editors have gathered a significant collection of articles covering the 2009 European Parliament (EP) elections in depth. While previous research has mainly focused on analyses of election coverage in print media, this publication provides a more inclusive approach, taking not only the media into account, but also party election campaigns and the resulting effects on voters. Contrary to other studies that often criticise a lack of Europeanness in European Parliament elections, it is argued that EP elections possess a ‘hybrid character’ (p. 5) comprising European and national
characteristics at the same time. Consequently, European elections and their campaigns do not necessarily follow the same logic as national ones.

The aim of this volume is to test whether theories that have been developed in the national context hold true at the European level. The individual articles are mostly based on longitudinal and cross-national approaches, but also include single-country studies. The data are frequently drawn from content analyses of campaigning material, television spots and newspaper articles in addition to surveys. Hence the book is aimed at anyone interested in (comparative) election research and political communication.

Overall, the volume gives a comprehensive account of the 2009 European elections in terms of their historical development, the party and media campaign. While some chapters follow the classical patterns of media analyses (topics, actors, valence, etc.), others provide new insights into EP campaigns in different EU member states. As in many edited volumes, there are cases of repetition, for example when comparing the mediatisation and framing of the election in thirteen member states, this is followed by a similar examination of 27 countries.

Even though it is stated that European elections are a hybrid that possesses national and European elements, the starting point of some studies is the ‘second-order elections’ hypothesis. Nevertheless, the book offers new and innovative findings. In particular, the final section puts the previous results into perspective and highlights the importance of European political communication for an active European citizenry and for the democratic legitimacy of the European Union. Political Communication in European Parliamentary Elections demonstrates that European elections provide a unique opportunity for innovative, longitudinal and cross-national research in political communication and is, therefore, highly recommended.

Stefanie Walter
(University of Mannheim)


This is a book that aims to shed light on the least researched group of states in the European Union (EU), namely the small states group. Small states are defined as states that have less than average voting power in the Council of Ministers. The book thus focuses on the role of small states in negotiations at EU level and analyses the role of nineteen member states in working parties and COREPER (Comité des représentants permanents) where the majority of EU policy decisions are made. The author argues that small states face a number of difficulties in order to participate actively and effectively in EU negotiations, such as minimal bargaining power and lower number of personnel to prepare negotiations.

Nevertheless, not all small states perform similarly in shaping strategies and influencing negotiations. In order to explain these dissimilarities a mixed methodology is employed that encompasses a multivariate quantitative analysis and two qualitative case studies. The two case studies concern negotiations for the adoption of spirit drinks regulation and the regulation of pesticides. The book aims to contribute to EU-related literature on intergovernmental negotiations, to Europeanisation literature and to liberal international relations scholarship. It demonstrates that good domestic coordination is the key to active participation in EU negotiations and thus in influencing EU policies.

The author succeeds in analysing small member states’ strategies for active and effective participation in EU decision-making processes. Diana Panke also enlightens us on the significance of the lack of clear preferences from the side of the member states’ central governments for effective participation in EU mechanisms. These empirical findings make the book interesting not only for an academic audience but also for practitioners working in EU institutions, central governments and other international organisations.

A less developed aspect of the book is the analysis of these different patterns in small EU member states, in order to understand processes of divergence within the EU. A more elaborate theoretical discussion combining historical and sociological institutionalist arguments with the existing rationalistic theoretical observations would be beneficial. However, the mixed methods employed are a good example of a solid methodology which could offer interesting findings if applied more often in European studies. All in all, this is a well-written book, worth reading because it offers significant comparative material on the obstacles that small states face due to size in EU negotiations.

Stella Ladi
(Panteion University, Greece)

This book provides a welcome addition to the literature on energy security. Filippos Proedrou focuses on importing nations’ (EU) energy security in the natural gas sector. Nevertheless, this book also explains how energy exporters’ perspectives influence the EU’s energy policy. The EU–Russia energy relations receive special attention throughout the book. Additionally, Proedrou briefly describes the EU’s energy partnerships with Norway, Algeria, the Middle East and the Caspian states. The book is divided into seven chapters: chapter 2 discusses the main trends in global energy markets, chapters 3 and 4 focus on the EU’s energy policy dilemmas while chapters 5 and 6 look at relations with external energy suppliers. The concluding chapter summarises the main findings and suggests different scenarios for future EU energy policy developments.

The book provides a useful starting point for scholars and students interested in European energy security. Proedrou’s work draws on an extensive body of literature and succeeds in mapping the debate on the European energy strategy. He points out that there is a clash between the internal and external dimensions of EU energy security. Internally, the EU prioritises the liberalisation and integration of the energy market. However, the external energy suppliers are worried about the potential negative influence of the EU’s liberalisation project on their energy security, and are developing strategies for demand diversification. Proedrou also underlines the lack of solidarity among EU member states. He argues that the EU institutions (instead of national governments) should have more power in dealing with energy challenges. Furthermore, he recommends enforcing interdependence with the external suppliers and cautious diversification policies. This argument is illustrated with an example of successful cooperation between Russia and a number of EU member states (e.g. Germany and Italy).

Given that many of the issues raised in this book are not new, the most interesting contribution of Proedrou’s work involves placing the EU’s energy security into a global context and its comparison with the strategies of the other major energy importers. The author argues that the growing energy demand from the developing world poses an additional challenge to the EU’s energy security, because ‘the EU in general does not promote energy projects with the same determinism and effectiveness that the US and China does’ (p. 43). The book’s main conclusion is that the EU may face a significant supply deficit unless it reconsiders its energy policy. Overall, the book is well written and offers a good summary of the EU’s energy policy dilemmas.

Olga Khrushcheva
(Nottingham Trent University)


The central thesis of this book is that the European Union’s regulatory successes within and surrounding its borders are due to a recursive process of framework rule making and revision by both European-level and national-level actors. Labelling this as ‘experimentalist governance’ the book’s main claim is that the EU has moved into a new form of governing, constantly changing and adapting to the needs of governance as judged by the most adequate accessors in every aspect of the policy field.

The book begins by investigating the effects of enlargement on the European Union. Looking at expansion, globalisation and demographic change, the authors investigate the EU’s attempts to create a single market by constructing a strong framework for governance in the member states through various health and safety issues. The authors attribute the regulatory success of the EU to the strength of the policy deliberators (civil servants, scientific experts and interest group representations) into strong epistemic communities that regularly factor their presence into the European Union’s policy operations.

Following an initial general assessment, the book investigates four different areas of policy to serve as a case study analysis of how governance has been involved in issues relating to privacy, financial, industrial and energy regulations. Finishing with a general overview of the various institutional changes that occurred...
in different sectors, the book presents a strong case that the European Union has incorporated change into its institutional nature.

This book provides a well-supported argument for the assessment of the European Union’s strength in overall governance. For European policy researchers, the argument that the EU has developed a unique form of governing is one that is currently dominating the debate on European policy issues. However, for students of general policy studies, the issues presented in the book may be slightly unwarranted in their analysis. It lacks an explanation of emerging arguments in governance, and perhaps an explanation of what good governance entails. By explaining the context in which the argument takes place, the book would be stronger as a defence of good European governance. However, the case studies presented display a clear evolution in the institutional nature of the European Union. For students of European studies, this book presents several case studies that warrant further investigation, specifically in showing the extent to which the evolution in governance has occurred in the EU.

Katrina Kelly
(University of Nottingham)


This book, edited by Hermann Schmitt, has the challenging aim of evaluating the impact of the Eastern enlargement on different aspects concerning European Union politics. For this purpose the authors have analysed the data concerning the 2004 European elections. The different chapters are grouped in three distinct sections: the first analyses East–West differences in citizens’ attitude towards the European Union and towards the idea of European identity; the second investigates the impact of the enlargement on the European party system and the election campaign; the third focuses on the electoral participation and the elements that influence voters’ choice. The main question that connects all the three parts is: what changed in the EU with the 2004 elections? To understand if the Union has faced a major transformation, the book tries to comprehend how citizens’ attitudes and the political systems of the new member states are different from the ones of the old members of the EU. The chapters are all empirical-analytical and are based on the data of the post-election surveys of the 2004 European Election Studies (EES) or on the results of content analyses of party manifestos.

Thanks to the large amount of data provided by the surveys of the 2004 EES, this book represents a very useful contribution for scholars of the European Parliament, especially for those interested in the evolution of the European party system. The different chapters allow us to gain a clearer view of the situation of the European party system after the enlargement: the major empirical result is that the enlargement had little impact on the format of the EU party system, concerning both the groups’ cohesion and the election campaigns.

As regards support for European integration, a judgement seems to prevail in Eastern countries that voters’ judgement is connected to economic performance; that is, a positive economic situation is linked to greater support for the Union. The other aspect that emerges is the enforcement of the process of identity formation in the EU: this sense of community is more developed in the oldest countries than in the new members from Eastern Europe, creating a situation for which ‘the farther away one gets from the core of the Union in both geographical and temporal terms, the weaker this sense of community becomes’ (p. 8). In conclusion, this volume represents an important contribution to measuring the impact of the enlargement to Eastern Europe on the political structure and political processes of the EU.

Eugenio Salvati
(University of Pavia)
The Americas


The American National Election Studies (henceforth ANES) are the gold standard of election studies, providing researchers with a wealth of data with which to analyse political behaviour. Deciding what items to include or not include in the survey is a monumental task and has a profound impact on the scope and direction of political science research. Some avenues of research may be opened while others are forever closed based on whether the ANES includes particular survey questions. Furthermore, how these items are implemented – question wording, branching techniques, response sets, etc. – is just as significant as the inclusion or exclusion of items themselves. Reliability and validity are omnipresent concerns in survey research. Thus the ANES routinely tests new and alternative items for possible inclusion in a future iteration of the survey in its pilot studies.

In their edited volume, Aldrich and McGraw detail the outcome of a concerted solicitation of new and interdisciplinary proposals for the ANES, which included the use of an ‘Online Commons’ where scholars could present proposals and discuss ideas. Their book presents a wave of studies developed using the new items included in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study, many of which were adopted for the 2008 ANES. It is divided into five substantive sections on major topics in political behaviour which include non-political individual characteristics as determinants of political attitudes, political orientations and the media, perceptions of political institutions and groups, and political issues.

The individual chapters break along two dimensions: (1) new items for behavioural topics not included in previous ANES studies; and (2) new item formulations for current ANES topics. For an example of the first, scholars in the first section implement studies from items based on the Schwartz framework of basic personal values. For the second, Zigereell and Rice assess new items measuring abortion attitudes intended to correct validity issues with the standard ANES abortion items, leading to a more nuanced perception of public views on abortion (ch. 17). Of note as substantive contributions are the studies on self-monitoring, political trust and value constellations, while the studies on religiosity, abortion attitudes and media measures stand out as incremental improvements to the survey instrument.

I highly recommend this volume for students of political behaviour as a contribution to the broad literature on political behaviour, as a source for contemporary avenues of behavioural research and survey methodology, and as an overview of the substantive changes to the ANES Time Series Study introduced in 2008.

Donald M. Gooch
(Stephen F. Austin State University, Texas)


In Bolivia: Refounding the Nation, Kepa Artaraz sets out to make sense of the social, political and economic transformations currently taking place in Bolivia and to make them accessible to the layperson. He achieves his aim, exploring the many different but interlinked facets of the country’s process of change. The first part of the book identifies the origins of the transformation: chapters 1 and 2 lay out the economic and political problems the Bolivian population was subjected to from the beginning of the 1980s, resulting in a dual crisis of legitimacy. Chapter 3 is concerned with the process of change. It describes the social mobilisations leading to the election of Morales in 2005 as well as the writing and implementation of a new constitution, approved in 2009.

The ensuing chapters focus on the consequences of this new constitution, comparing aspirations to realisations. Chapter 4 considers the rise of civil society in the country and the blurred boundary between social movements and the government, further blurred through the new constitution. Chapter 5 explores the implications of the new constitution for the daily life of particularly the poorer and indigenous population and presents the National Development Plan. Chapter 6 deals more closely with the country’s post-neo-liberal development model. The final two substantial chapters are concerned with Bolivia’s place in the international sphere. Chapter 7 considers the country’s relations with the United States both before and after the transfor-
nformation, whereas chapter 8 looks at Bolivia’s place and role in the regional integration process taking place throughout Latin America.

Throughout the book, Artaraz aims to challenge Western thinking on issues such as citizenship, political participation and development in a comprehensive and sympathetic if not uncritical account of the processes and policies in the past 30 years of Bolivia’s history. The book’s strength – the wide overview of the processes in Bolivia – may also be its main weakness. Although admittedly not one of the aims of the book, the vast amount of information makes it difficult to identify a clear argument speaking to the literature of social and political change beyond the case of Bolivia. The book’s academic contribution would have benefited from situating it more clearly in the theoretical and/or comparative debate. Overall though, the book remains a very good introduction for anyone interested in Bolivia and its recent history.

Anaïd Flesken
(University of Exeter)


Goldfrank has constructed an excellent and timely empirically grounded study into the emergence in the late 1980s and early 1990s of Latin American participatory innovations which resulted from attempts to deepen democracy by decentralising the vote for city mayors to the electorate. Efforts were made by the Workers Party in Porto Alegre, Brazil (1989–2004), by the Broad Front in Montevideo, Uruguay (1990–2011), and by the Radical Cause in Caracas, Venezuela (1993–5), to implement participatory initiatives that ‘focused on creating new institutions to give citizens influence over government spending’ (p. 2) at the local level. This approach provides Goldfrank with rich country-specific data from which to draw upon in several case study discussion chapters.

The book reflects on factors that counted towards the longevity of some participatory innovations over others, as well as asking ‘why only some experiments succeeded in enhancing the quality of local democracy’ (p. 1). The focus of the work rests mainly at local community and government level, as Goldfrank identifies how some participatory innovations worked successfully, and what caused others to create only limited changes. The book would ideally suit students of Latin American politics and development studies, as well as scholars interested in participatory democracy and its relationship with institutional design and the state.

Deepening Local Democracy in Latin America provides an insight into the development of the left as a result of decentralisation and participation, by providing a detailed, comparative account of how they were opposed, badly designed or successfully supported by a range of government parties. Furthermore, the extent to which the quality of democracy varied across the three cases is explored through the degrees to which participatory innovations were decentralised, the degree of opposition they had, and whether they had an open, regulated or restrictive design (p. 221). In its empirical approach and theoretical underwriting, the work succeeds in providing a convincing insight into the various issues facing citizen participation in Latin America. Where the work might have benefited even further would have been an expansion of the discussion of, and theoretical application towards, the more recent scenarios in which countries have adopted contemporary participatory innovations as a means of development. However, as Goldfrank applies his understanding of participation in Latin America more recently in the conclusion, his work stands as an excellent statement on deepening democracy in Latin America, as well as the obstacles this process can encounter.

Adam Gill
(University of Liverpool)


This book covers nearly every topic related to the politics of Latin America. Although the reader can choose and read in any order the topics in which they are interested, it is noteworthy that the reader can relate the chapters within the same parts to have a broader and better understanding. The first part of the book deals with democratic governance and political institutions. Apart from much-studied subjects like democracy and executive–legislative relations, this part also covers
some rather nascent topics for Latin Americanists such as decentralisation. The second part of the book deals with development. Even though this part deals mainly with economics, the arguments are clear and they are of much interest for all political scientists.

The third part concentrates on actors and social groups and focuses not only on social movements and civil society but also includes very important but highly understudied actors such as business groups. The fourth part is a must for every international relations student. It covers inter-state relations in Latin America, inter-state relations of Latin American countries with the US and Latin American countries’ relations with international institutions. Chapters in Part V cover theories and methods and begin with general explanations before discussing examples of the uses of these theories and methods in Latin America-related research. The sixth part provides researchers with the opportunity to reflect critically on the most important topics and also to discover understudied topics for future research.

Compiling a volume like this of course has the downside of not being able to go into too much detail on some of the topics but this is not the aim of the editors. This handbook is probably one of the best I have ever read in the field of political science. As a graduate student with a strong and growing interest in comparative politics and especially Latin American politics, I would recommend this book to undergraduate students who have very little knowledge on the topic. It is also useful for graduate students and will help them consolidate their general knowledge and discover new issues and opportunities for research about Latin American politics. Likewise it is useful for experts to have a well-written state-of-the-art book on the subject and to get new ideas for research questions about the politics of this most interesting region of the world.

Direnç Kanol
(University of Siena)


Martijn Konings argues that the institutional edifice of American finance is much more coherent in its construction and resilient against recurrent crises than is normally granted by much research in international political economy. Moreover, the author takes issue with what he perceives as a Polanyian mainstream logic of market disembedding and re-embedding that he argues understates the very considerable structural power of American finance, because it is ‘premised on the idea that markets and institutions are governed by their own distinctive logics’ and thus unable to capture how ‘markets and their properties might ... be institutional constructions that can potentially function as vehicles of state power’ (p. 3). Instead, Konings proposes to conceptualise market expansion as involving ‘the creation of new social forms and linkages and so putting in place the foundations for new patterns of institutional control over the dynamics of human interaction’ (p. 3).

Through twelve relatively short chapters, empirically based on a comprehensive survey of a large number of existing studies in economic history, Konings takes us from the American colonies all the way up to the present-day sub-prime crisis. Here he emphasises the point that the financial system that emerged in America during the late nineteenth century did not represent a variation on a general model of liberal finance but should instead be understood as a complex and highly specific historical construction, driven by its own institutional logic. Later, as a central part of the New Deal programme, finance was capable of integrating a wide variety of popular interests and ambitions, after which followed a dramatic financial growth that occurred not through a retreat of the state but through the expansion of public and civic authority. Finally, Konings understands post-Second World War financial globalisation not as a re-emergence of international finance but rather as a process whereby the long-standing dynamics of American financial expansion began to assume global dimensions, which – as we know all too well – played a very central role in the sub-prime crisis of 2007–8.

Two short critiques: first, the theoretical argument of the book is both interesting and compelling, but at times it seems overly complex and rather convoluted, and more could have been done to integrate it more clearly in the empirical analysis. Second, the book is quite short for a history of American finance. In my view, it would have gained significantly from being at least twice as long.

Martin B. Carstensen
(Copenhagen Business School)
Asia and the Pacific


With the Asia-Pacific emerging as the focus of strategic attention from the United States and China, a serious study of conflict management in the region is invaluable. Jacob Berkovitch and Mikio Oishi offer an overview of the region’s most contentious conflicts: the perennial Korean Peninsula problem; the issue of independence for Taiwan; tension between India and Pakistan; and the ambiguous status of the Spratly Islands. Although pessimistic about eliminating conflict, the authors provide several examples of effective conflict management in the region.

The introductory chapter takes a broad view of trends in global conflict. Quantitative measures provide a sobering view of conflict in the twentieth century by charting the staggering number of fatalities suffered in the Asia-Pacific. The data presented here should give pause to those who think violent conflict is becoming obsolete. It is a shame, however, that the rest of the chapters are not as captivating as the book slips into the trend of being heavily descriptive.

Each case study follows the same pattern: a general history of the conflict is given from the post-war period until the present, followed by an outline of the specific attempts made to manage the conflict such as deterrence, external intervention or mutual self-restraint. Commendably, the authors recognise the diverse causes of conflict: territory, ideology, security, independence, resources and ethnicity, and record how each conflict has transformed over time. Nevertheless, the book fails to advance any theoretical framework or introduce new concepts to the literature on conflict management. While the authors offer some brief lessons or glimpses of the future for each case, the lack of a central argument makes the book more like a general guide to conflict in the Asia-Pacific rather than offering a new way to think about resolving conflict in the area.

The book also represents a missed opportunity to consider how the shifting balance of power in the region will affect the outcomes of these conflicts in the future – will an increasingly powerful China take a more aggressive stance towards Taiwan or the Spratly Islands, for instance? Furthermore, the concluding chapter simply recaps each case, only dedicating three pages to extrapolating general trends about conflict in the Asia-Pacific.

The book’s clarity of prose and structure makes it easy to recommend to those looking for a general introduction to conflict in the Asia-Pacific. For scholars seeking a novel theoretical argument, however, there may be disappointment.

James Whibley
(Victoria University of Wellington)


The post-Soviet trajectories of Central Asian states have perplexed a number of observers. There are many reasons for confusion. First, with few exceptions these countries continue to be ruled by individuals who were part of the former Soviet elite. Second, the so-called transition of the Central Asian countries has defied any of the frameworks dominating the literature. At the same time, political, social and economic life in the region has been pervaded by resilient informal patronage networks. These are some of the dynamics that provide the point of departure for Eric McGlinchey’s book. In this respect, his analysis provides a rare and discerning account of the forms of authoritarian governance that have come to dominate the region. Looking at the experience of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, McGlinchey draws a vivid picture of the interaction between patronage networks and the emergence of authoritarian regimes in the region.

A key aspect of McGlinchey’s argument is the acknowledgement not only that the post-Soviet transition of Central Asian states cannot be called democratisation, but also that democracy is a prospect that external observers and commentators should not be expecting any time soon. Perhaps unsurprisingly, stating the obvious has liberated McGlinchey’s investigation from the need to ponder what Western international organisations and actors should do in order to increase the likelihood of Central Asian democratisation. Instead, the book directly delves into the reasons that can provide an explanation for the variations in the models of patronage practised in the region. For
McGlinchey, the key factors are: (1) the varying patterns of Moscow’s intervention in Central Asia during the perestroika period; (2) the different economic endowments of Central Asian states; and (3) the dissimilar degrees of Islamic revivalism in the region.

The interplay between these three issues informs the careful process of tracing the authoritarian ‘chaos’ in Kyrgyzstan (p. 80), ‘violence’ in Uzbekistan (p. 114) and ‘dynasty’ in Kazakhstan. In this context, McGlinchey provides one of the most thoughtful accounts to date of the differences in the post-Soviet trajectories of the Central Asian states. His book demonstrates that it is through a determined contextual examination that a veritable account of the multiple and often contradictory processes underpinning the alterations in social, economic and political dynamics of the region can emerge. It is expected therefore that McGlinchey’s investigation will be welcomed not only by students of Central Asian affairs, but also by all those interested in post-Soviet transitions and comparative politics.

Emilian Kavalski
(University of Western Sydney)


This book is the tenth volume of the Routledge ‘Malaysian Studies’ series. It is edited by Johan Saravanamuttu, who has lived in Southeast Asia for a long time and is familiar with the culture and political environment of this strategic region of Asia. He has ably assembled a team of specialists to compile this book. Nine detailed articles by eight prominent scholars examine political Islam in both majority and minority Muslim countries in Southeast Asia and eight contributions also endeavour to present the situation of Muslim communities within both democratic and authoritarian polities in the region.

Following on from the editor’s fully developed introduction (ch. 1), five chapters elaborate the connectivity of political Islam and authority with democracy in majority Muslim countries, that is, Malaysia and Indonesia. The fundamental arguments in these five chapters concern the disinclination of Indonesia to become an Islamic state, while on the other hand, political Islam in Malaysia would not be successful without relying on the authoritarianism of state powers. The three remaining chapters focus on the three minority Muslim countries of Thailand, Philippines and Singapore. These chapters provide readers with two different messages: (a) political Islam in Thailand and Philippines brings violence, struggle and even death for their Muslims; (b) in contrast, Singapore successfully manages political Islam, and local Muslim organisations are able to meet the state’s expectations, and vice versa.

The book is a well-written work and its readers, who would mostly be Southeast Asia scholars, sociologists and researchers of politics and religion, never lose the logical threads of the discourse. Other notable features of the book are the diversity of issues covered in each chapter; a complete list of abbreviations; and the presence of a knowledgeable author for each chapter. The book has an interesting cover image entitled ‘Judgment Day’, which shows the diversity and unity principles together on a green background and includes pointers to the content of this work.

But despite these strengths, a key component that is missing from the book is the theory of Sultanism. The book also fails to deal with the status of Brunei as a majority Muslim country and Burma as a minority one. Yet overall, Saravanamuttu’s lucid and well-researched work makes a significant contribution to our understanding of the positive and negative role of political Islam in Southeast Asia.

Majid Daneshgar
(Academy of Islamic Studies, University of Malaya)


Sonja van Wichelen’s book is the fourth volume of Routledge’s ‘Research on Gender in Asia’ series, which is aimed at scholars of political science, cultural studies, gender studies, Asian studies and religious studies. The volume begins with a chapter introducing Muslim politics and democratisation and ends with a discussion of sexualised bodies and morality. The book mostly considers the socio-cultural transformations and political changes in Indonesia as the world’s most populous Muslim majority nation, after the downfall of the Suharto administration in 1998 and the introduction of the ‘New Order’. Wichelen examines four key topics in
the book, namely female leadership, veiling, polygamy and sexuality.

The first chapter clarifies the process of Islamisation and democratisation in post-authoritarian Indonesia and expands the debate regarding both Islam and gender. The second chapter looks at female leadership and explains the significance of female social power in the new democracy. This chapter deals with Megawati Sukarnoputri when she announced that she wanted to be president. Wichelen makes a connection between the issue of female presidency and female veiling (wearing the hijab) in the next chapter. In fact, chapter 3 discusses the importance of ‘new veiling’ in the social atmosphere of contemporary Indonesia.

The fourth chapter, entitled ‘Contesting Masculinity’, takes a specific approach to the issue of polygamy. It does not examine polygamy’s occurrence but investigates what is involved in defending, justifying or defying polygamy, as promoted by the campaign (p. 71) that was initiated by the wealthy entrepreneur Puspo Wardoyo. The final chapter explores the debate among politicians, Islamic clerics and feminists on the issue of female sexuality and women’s presence in society. This begins with a discussion of Inul Daratista, a young Indonesian singer and dancer.

For me, although the book is about religion, politics and the issue of gender in Indonesia, a comparison with Malaysia as a majority Muslim country with many aspects of Islamic development would have been useful. However, the book is a well-written piece of academic research which focuses on the connections between religious and political developments and socio-cultural movements after Suharto’s demise.

Majid Daneshgar (Academy of Islamic Studies, University of Malaya)


In his book China and Orientalism, Daniel Vukovich states that there is a new form of ‘orientalism’ – compared to Edward Said’s ‘orientalism’ – in the area of China studies. The so-called ‘Sinological orientalism’ widely affects the production of knowledge about the People’s Republic of China (PRC) from the outside. Vukovich argues that although Sinological orientalism makes a shift from the belief of ‘essentially different’ to ‘China’s becoming sameness’, it actually inherits the positional superiority from old orientalists. Sinologists are obsessed by the idea of finding out the missing parts from Chinese institutions, culture or politics. They seem to believe that if those missing parts were fulfilled, China would become normal and nice just like ‘us’; the only obstacle is the Chinese Communist Party. Vukovich uses texts from academic papers, novels, films and journals to illustrate this superiority-positioned but dominant form of knowledge production in the area of China studies.

As a critique against the Sinological orientalist tradition, Vukovich calls for the approach of adopting the Foucauldian notion of discourse and power in order to understand the PRC (political and communist China). To be specific, he claims that one needs to understand Maoist discourse first before demonising the Cultural Revolution, or the Great Leap Forward, or the Tiananmen incident in 1989. Vukovich argues that rather than the terrifying madness and irrationality that many Sinological orientalists describe, there is actually internal coherence, logic, normality and complexity within those events which can be understood. There is evidence that indicates the imbalance in terms of knowledge production between West and East.

This book is especially valuable for Western readers who want to understand China’s behaviour during the Maoist era, though it is not easy to read for those who have little background knowledge about Maoist China. It provides many insightful analyses – even for Chinese scholars – on Maoist discourse as well as the Cultural Revolution, the Great Leap Forward and the Tiananmen incident.

Vukovich makes considerable efforts to compare Western orientalist knowledge with Chinese self-understanding of Maoism and its related events. He successfully demonstrates that there are huge gaps in the area of China studies. The only critique may lie with Vukovich’s selection of research materials on Maoist discourse. One may doubt how representative these texts (which are a small sample) might be to the general self-understanding of Chinese people during the Maoist era, even though that evidence perfectly supports Vukovich’s arguments.

Yu jia Zhao (University of Nottingham)

This work is about the new scramble for African resources and, to some extent, African markets by what Carmody refers to as the old economic powers comprising Britain, France, the European Union, the United States of America, Japan and South Africa, and the so-called new powers comprising Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC). Carmody emphasises the importance of the role of African leadership in determining the future of Africa in the new scramble, which he also refers to as ‘a scramble in Africa’ to distinguish it from the scramble for Africa of the late nineteenth century, which was characterised by European military rivalry and markets, and in which the rules for the division of Africa were established at the Berlin Conference of 1884–5.

The book’s central argument is embedded in the contradictions between the growth of the global economy and the fixed amount of natural resources. Carmody further argues that the old and new powers are scrambling for African resources in a global economy that is technologically dynamic and expansive, and wherein multinational companies seek out low-cost labour sites for assembly operations to reduce costs and raise profits (pp. 6–7). In essence, the book moves beyond looking at Africa as a ‘dark continent’ with nothing to offer, and a continent to be civilised, as characterised in the literature of the late nineteenth century on the scramble for Africa.

Besides this opportunity in which African leadership can negotiate advantageously for Africa (p. 191), Carmody warns against the past and present gloomy exploitative strategies of the old and new powers. He points out that African economies were structured to meet the demands of industrialising Europe by producing raw materials. This extroversion of Africa, whereby its economy was oriented to meet the needs of other people in other places, continues. Three-quarters of what Africa exports are unprocessed primary commodities such as oil or copper, and many of the biggest companies exploiting African resources are foreign owned – so profits mainly flow elsewhere (pp. 2–5).

The Politics of Sub-national Authoritarianism in Russia by Vladimir Gel’man and Cameron Ross (eds), Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010. 229pp., £55.00, ISBN 9789544678885

Vladimir Gel’man and Cameron Ross’ edited volume examines political, social and economic trajectories at the sub-national level in Russia. Unlike other research on Russia’s political evolution which focuses predominantly on national political trends and developments, this volume productively shifts the avenue of inquiry and argues that sub-national political conditions will, to a large degree, direct the future course of national-level politics. The volume demonstrates that Russian authoritarianism at the national level is not sustained uniformly across regions, but rather is reinforced through some regional institutions and practices, while eroded through others. Uncovering the sources and consequences of this regional variation is the aim of the volume.

The twelve chapters survey an array of topics and offer a range of significant conclusions, from Tomila Lankina’s chapter connecting the historical legacies of Western immigration to current variations in regional political competitiveness, to William Reisinger and Bryon Moraski’s, which explains regional variation in deference to the Kremlin across time, and the federal centre’s concomitant dependence on the country’s ethnic regions. Each chapter employs a research design appropriate for the subject matter; for example, case studies and process tracing are used to examine con-
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trasting regional experiences with the introduction of managerial patronage (ch. 5), and survey data are exercised to explore the connection between Russian civil society and authoritarianism (ch. 7).

From the perspective of future social science research, Rostislav Turovsky’s chapter is the most practical of the contributions because he offers a new analytical framework for comparative regional-level research that fully grapples with the variation between regions while systematising research through the development of quantifiable variables. While much of the literature on Russian politics is not explicitly informed by other veins of political science, various chapters in this volume unexpectedly and interestingly draw on the well-established literature on American politics to ground the authors’ discussions on political machines, patronage and the relationship between pluralism and democracy.

One lacuna in the volume is the absence of a discussion concerning the specific mechanism(s) through which meaningful sub-national political change could occur without preceding changes at the federal level. For example, a chapter analysing existing or potential processes of diffusion between more and less politically competitive regions would be a constructive addition. Overall, social scientists of many stripes will be interested in this well-written volume which clearly surpasses in breadth other current literature on Russian politics.

Allison C. White
(University of Texas at Austin)


The New Cultural Climate in Turkey includes important analysis of Turkey’s development in the public and private realms, media, politics, culture and intellectual life after the 1980 military coup. The questions ‘What is the importance of the 1980 military coup in Turkey’s recent past?’ and ‘What makes it different from other periods of repression?’ are answered using concrete examples. The main theme of the book is the dissolution of the boundary between the private and public realms after the military coup. Each part has its own sub-topics: the mediation of private life, the change in language from that used before the coup in the public realm, and the impact of the free market economy on both public and private spheres.

The sub-topics, which are related to each other, are explained using examples of media and some books: Sennett’s The Fall of Public Man, Flaubert’s Madame Bovary, Recaizado’s The Carriage Affair and Tanpınar’s A Mind at Peace. George Simmel’s sociology is also mentioned, notably the psychological effects of industrial revolution on public and private spheres in modern society. Another topic that the author emphasises is the rise of groups that had been repressed and that were provincialised before the military coup: Islamists and Kurds. The book is aimed at readers who are interested in the politics and recent history of Turkey.

The author achieves her goals by using concrete examples to explain the points she makes. These make the book empirically worthwhile, but there are some missing issues, such as the effects of Turkish foreign policy and of the early republican era on the topic. This causes problems with the book in an empirical sense. The reasons for the rise of socialism before the military coup and for the rise of Islamists and Kurds after the military coup are not discussed convincingly. This brings us to the question of plausibility and methodology of the book. The author also fails to discuss the differences between the life of people in Istanbul and in other Turkish cities. The aspects of life that are mentioned are mostly valid for people in Istanbul. However, the book gives us important clues to help us understand Turkey’s recent history.

Engin Koca
(Fatih University, Istanbul)


Somalia is always presented negatively in the news. The country is often seen to have one of the ‘worst reputations’ and has been regarded as the ‘epitome of a failed state’ (p. 1) since 1991 (p. 3). In Getting Somalia Wrong? Mary Harper analyses Somalia’s history. She attempts to clarify misconceptions about the ‘images and labels’ (p. 2) created by the media which the international community accepts.

Harper describes for readers the ethno-social configurations of the Somalis. She claims that Somalia’s ‘potential for disintegration’ (p. 4) began even before the fall of Siad Barre with problems brought about by the clan system, Ethiopia and the roles played by different
groups in this troubled nation’s political landscape. In the book’s introduction, Harper identifies the ‘misunderstanding in international policy’ when the Union of Islamic Courts (UIC) took power in Somalia, but not much later, in the ‘Western narrative’, was seen to be an affiliate of al-Qa’eda (p. 5). This ‘inability or reluctance’ of the global powers, dominated by the US, to appreciate Somalia’s background is a disaster, argues Harper (p. 44).

The author criticises the UN’s mission in Somalia in 1992 (p. 60). She discusses the role played by President Bush when unfortunately ‘US forces became increasingly aggressive’ (p. 61) and hundreds of Somalis were left dead. This should be equated with the missions led by the US in places like Afghanistan which even American analysts regard as disastrous.

The book considers an interesting analysis of the ‘expensive conferences’ which became a ‘major industry’ (p. 64) and were used chiefly as conduit pipes of corruption to receive funds from foreign nations. Harper stresses that Somalis are benefiting from the unending crisis. It is true, as she states, that there was a ‘sudden explosion of violent Islamism’ (p. 74) contrary to Somalia’s adherence to ‘Sufism’ (p. 75) and that ‘the USA and allies misjudged events in Somalia’ (p. 103) as bad policies have shown (p. 166). The author suggests the need ‘for foreign powers to engage with the Union of Islamic Courts’ (p. 174) or rather al-Shabaab and if possible design a ‘traditional form of social and political organisation’ (p. 134) in the interest of all Somalis and the Horn of Africa.

Harper’s book in my judgement provides a glimpse of why it is necessary for the global community to understand Somalia’s shattered status rather than seeing it as just a ‘failed’ state. The images created hinder this understanding. Ironically the book’s cover, which shows two AK47s facing each other, adds much to Somalia’s bad image.

Kawu Bala
(High Court of Justice, Bauchi State, Nigeria)


Reading Patrick Seale’s academic writings and journalism on the Arab world is always highly instructive as one can expect to find a combination of lifelong learning on Arab affairs combined with sound judgement and compassion. His latest book is no exception and serves in many respects as part of a trilogy that includes his earlier monographs on The Struggle for Syria (1965) and Asad of Syria: The Struggle for the Middle East (1988).

In the current book, Seale takes up the life history of Riad el-Solh (1894–1951), a Lebanese Sunni politician and Arab statesman, to tell the story of the emergence of the Lebanese state in the broader context of pan-Arab anti-colonial nationalist struggles. Riad el-Solh served as the first Prime Minister of independent Lebanon and is best known for his role as one of the two signatories – together with the Maronite Bishara al-Khoury – of the Lebanese National Pact of 1943. The National Pact (pp. 505–9) established a political compromise between Maronites, Sunnis and other groups based on power sharing which scholars such as Arend Lijphart have subsequently presented as one of the paradigmatic examples of consociational democracy.

The scope of Seale’s study is broad. The early sections of the book describe the decline and fall of the Ottoman Empire. Seale is at pains to stress the exceptionally close relationship between Syria and Lebanon due to their long history of economic and social integration under the Ottomans (pp. 577–85). Next, Seale analyses how the French colonisers used the League of Nations Mandate to carve out Greater Lebanon from Syria and explains how Riad el-Solh reconciled his pan-Arab nationalism with support for Lebanese statehood, hoping to create a synthesis between both objectives.

The author makes a significant contribution to different fields of study. First, he analyses how the British and French managed their respective geopolitical objectives in the Arab world under the Mandate and during the Second World War. Second, the book focuses primarily on the struggle for Lebanese independence (the title being somewhat misleading here). Seale appears to suggest that shortcomings of the Lebanese system of power sharing – such as the focus on agreement between communal leaders based on competing coalitions that tend frequently to realign – were present from the very beginning. Third, the book is required reading for students of post-colonial nationalism in explaining the Arab leaders’ failure in terms of effective state building and in their efforts to oppose the Zionist colonisation in Palestine.

This book focuses on the development of post-apartheid South Africa. Though the political transition is encouraging, the question is whether South Africa’s future trajectory under the African National Congress (ANC) will mirror that of Zimbabwe and Kenya.

South Africa’s success to date has depended on contingencies of restraint in leadership, and though the new South Africa has inherited a sizeable skilled community, which bodes well for the future, and though the authors admit that there are a few cases in which a nationalistic liberation movement, originally aimed at overthrowing an oppressive regime, has managed to move positively, many of the essays reflect serious pessimism.

Though fiscal policies have been a resounding success, there is a clear failure on the part of the government to address significantly the extreme levels of poverty and inequality. It could be argued that the two actually worsened in the first five years after apartheid and, though the ANC has managed to foster various forms of democratic legitimacy since 1994, fundamental institutions, such as the electoral system, need to be changed to foster deeper citizen participation in, and legitimacy of, the democratic system.

In a country that now has one of the highest HIV prevalence rates in the world, Mbeki’s AIDS denialism has hampered the use of antiretrovirals. And though the new South Africa has made an explicit commitment to the supremacy of the constitution and the rule of law among other impressive laws, important exceptions to this overall positive picture are the laws dealing with whistle-blower protection and public access to information. With eleven official languages, language policy has in practice been a disappointment, and hence the English language continues to disempower black South Africans. Thus, although South Africa has made great strides, looking forward, daunting problems still face the country, making the overall picture mixed.

The contributors to the book analyse the strides that the young South Africa has made and its missed chances. The book is aimed at people interested in South Africa’s history and it is relevant to historians, economists, socialists and political scientists as well as those interested in South Africa in particular and Africa at large. The contributors certainly succeed in their goals, for the book lays bare the historical and social-political issues still affecting the country, and the only gap or anomaly in its scope or coverage is that it should be part of a series, not a single book.

Moses Kibe Kihiko
(Independent Scholar)
world revolution. While the ‘double legacy’ of the Holocaust has kept some of the older intellectual left in the pro-Israeli camp (e.g. Sartre), post-colonial leftists were more inclined to ignore the complexities of the new political situation in the Middle East and fully embrace the Palestinian cause.

The book is clearly written, and many of the historical resources analysed are interesting and thought provoking. It is fascinating to see, for example, the degree to which early debates over Zionism differ from contemporary ones only by substituting ‘America’ for ‘the British Empire’. The author covers an extensive range of subjects and political movements, from the different variants of Zionism, the Bund and Israeli political parties to socialist and communist movements in Europe, though the focus is clearly more on the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB).

The overall thesis, unfortunately, is less convincing. In particular, the controversial claim that a just peace between Israelis and Palestinians will ‘deprive some of the far Left of the ability to utilise a situation abroad to serve the cause of revolutionary change at home’ (p. 278) requires, at the very least, more evidence than is provided in the book. It is also not clear why one cannot claim that Israeli policy in the last 40 years has changed dramatically to cause the attitude shift in the European left. Nevertheless, the book remains a valuable resource for readers interested in the complex relationship between the Jewish state and the left, both as a historical account and as a commentary on current affairs.

Lior Erez
(University College London)
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