



his death rather than as the object of Marxist criticism that he was in his lifetime.

Chan rejects rival interpretations of Western historians of Marxism, especially those of Stuart Schramm, ‘the doyen of contemporary MZT scholarship’ (p. 132), and John Fairbank ‘the doyen of modern Chinese Studies’ (p. 132), as corrupted by Cold War perspectives. He similarly rejects contemporary Chinese reform theorists as being too close to their western counterparts, without finding the chorus of western radical approval that greeted the Cultural Revolution as similarly compromising. Someone with Chan’s commitments could have written an honest and reflective assessment of Chinese Marxism. Sadly, Chan has not accomplished this task.

Nicholas Bunnin  
Institute for Chinese Studies,  
University of Oxford, UK.

### **From International to World Society: English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation**

Barry Buzan

*Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004, xviii + 294pp.*

*ISBN: 0 521 54121 2.*

*Contemporary Political Theory* (2005) **4**, 351–353. doi:10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300208

The attempt to reconvene the so-called ‘English School’ of International Relations has generated considerable interest, both within Britain and abroad. This book represents a flagship statement for this broader project by one of its most prominent exponents. It makes a number of important contributions to the English School tradition and IR theory more generally.

The first major contribution offered by Buzan is to collapse the distinction between ‘international system’ and ‘international society’ that has been central within the classical English School literature. The issue of exactly where the boundaries between systems and societies of states lie is an issue to which Buzan has given sustained attention in a previous work (Buzan, 1993). However, he now recognises the importance for English School thinking of Wendt’s argument that international systems are defined in terms of the socialization dynamics that they embody. States do make interest-based calculations, but the way they define their interests depends on the cultural norms that they have internalized through their mutual interactions. By harnessing the power of



Wendtian constructivism to the international society framework, Buzan clarifies important ambiguities within it, and sets its distinctive contributions apart from the rationalist literature. This injection of theoretical rigour both invigorates the international society tradition and sharpens its analytical utility considerably.

Buzan's second major contribution is to bring world society into a much more prominent role within English School theory. Many classical English School authors were sceptical about globalization and its significance for international relations. Buzan, however, stresses the importance of world society to the English School framework. The maturation of international society cannot be understood apart from trends at the world society level, and there is therefore a strong case for seeing international society and world society as complements rather than opposites. This helps bridge the gap between the literature on globalization and English School theory. It also shows how, in order to properly understand the political framework within which globalization takes place, it is central to analyse the logic of development within the system of states. Furthermore, Buzan demonstrates that the constructivist framework is not necessarily as narrowly state centric as Wendt himself has been encouraged to accept. Indeed, through a process of 'friendly critique' (p. 2), Wendtian constructivism can be improved considerably by integrating it with an account of world society.

Buzan's third major contribution is to refine English School thinking on the pluralism–solidarism debate, and link the resulting framework to regional trends in international society. Buzan argues that pluralism and solidarism should be viewed as positions on a spectrum rather than as being mutually exclusive categories, and that solidarism should be kept distinct from world society. Bull was ambiguous about solidarism, equating it either with an ambitious system of collective security between states or some form of cosmopolitan global order. Buzan proposes a more modest understanding of solidarism that refers to the 'thickness' of international society in terms of the institutionalization of shared interests and values, and acknowledges that solidarism need not necessarily imply collective enforcement of shared rules. He uses this discussion to build upon English School analyses of the expansion of international society whilst breaking with a strongly pluralist orientation. Uneven development may lead to 'vanguard' clusters of solidarism emerging, producing considerable geographic variation in the degree to which the norms and values that underpin international society are internalized. This raises interesting questions about how the global and subglobal levels interact, and the mixture of mechanisms (coercion, calculation or consent) through which states in the periphery come to accept the norms being pioneered by entrepreneurs within the vanguard region or regions.

The greatest achievement of Buzan's book is that it both acknowledges and makes an attempt to systemically address what have been important areas of weakness and ambiguity in English School thinking. The result is that it is able



to provide a powerful new analytical framework for the study of international relations, which nevertheless also retains the unique qualities and advantages of the classical English School tradition. By making the English School more theoretically self-conscious and situating its contributions within more recent developments in the International Relations literature, Buzan has turned a tradition, whose fortunes had arguably been languishing, into a vibrant research programme, which will have considerable appeal to a younger generation of IR theorists.

## References

Buzan, B. (1993) 'From international system to international society: structural realism and regime theory meet the English school', *International Organisation* 47(3): 327–352.

Ewan Harrison  
The Queen's College, Oxford, UK.

## Justice in the Risk Society

Barbara Hudson

*Sage Publications, London, 2003, xvii + 258pp.*

*ISBN: 0 7619 6160 7.*

*Contemporary Political Theory* (2005) 4, 353–355. doi:10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300209

Imagine Seyla Benhabib standing in for Jerry Springer, or Jurgen Habermas standing in for Oprah Winfrey, or Judith Butler standing in for Judge Judy. Imagine Michael Walzer presenting *Neighbours from Hell* or Carole Pateman presenting *Wife Swap* or Iris Marion Young presenting *Crimewatch UK*. These possibilities might spring to mind when reading Barbara Hudson's *Justice in the Risk Society* because they capture the central problem the book establishes and explores. In the 1980s and 90s, sociologists such as Ulrich Beck observed that for a range of reasons the contingency of modernity had become reflexive. Because nothing could be guaranteed, life became a matter of more risk and less trust. Thus, if, for one reason or another, individuals reject the guarantees which the state and its institutions provide for them, they will have to bear the consequences themselves. Unfortunately, such an imperative has been very difficult for most people to swallow categorically. Instead, unregulated social life is generally viewed as a matter of getting caught or getting away with it. Above all, the trick is to find someone else to blame, and thus the moral advantage of someone else to fear.