Effectively, then, Connelly follows Collingwood's exclusion clauses, as he also does Ryle's dictum that coming to terms with a philosopher means finding and reflecting on the philosopher's 'big worry'. In this respect, Connelly's near encyclopaedic work is a history of Collingwood's 'big worry' and the many problems of interpretation that it has provoked. *Metaphysics, Method and Politics* is an invaluable guide to these refined exegetical controversies because it tells us, in clear terms, exactly why some accounts of the often meandering development of Collingwood's thought are unconvincing, and why it is essential to read Collingwood in the round. If this point of view is expressed a little too forcefully at times, we should consider this as a small price to pay for the compelling reconstruction of Collingwood that Connelly provides. Connelly's book is an object lesson in how to read published alongside unpublished work. Collingwood's 'big worry' — the nature of the unity of thought and action — could not have found a better or a more discriminating analyst.

Peter Johnson

University of Southampton, UK

Hope and Memory: Reflections on the Twentieth Century

Tzvetan Todorov (translated by David Bellos)

Atlantic Books, London, 2003, xxvii + 337pp.

ISBN: 1903809479.

Contemporary Political Theory (2005) **4**, 94–97. doi:10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300161

Tzvetan Todorov's new book, like his several recent works, is an important contribution to moral and political debate. Todorov, who lived under communism in Bulgaria until the age of 24 (he left for the West in 1963), is one of France's most interesting intellectuals. In his widely acclaimed book *The Fragility of Goodness* (2001), Todorov shows the role of civil society organizations in saving Bulgaria's Jews during the Second World War. In *Imperfect Garden* (2002), Todorov analyses the works of major humanists to argue that humanism can help us rescue universality and reconcile human liberty with solidarity and personal integrity. These books, like the one under review, are accessible to the general reader, eloquent and wise works that got noticed and reviewed in mainstream journals and newspapers.

In *Hope and Memory: Reflections on the Twentieth Century*, Todorov focuses on the moral and political history of twentieth-century Europe, particularly on the conflict between totalitarian and democratic systems. Arguing that totalitarianism was the great innovation of the past century, he illustrates

the lessons we can draw from the conflict between totalitarianism and democracy by painting portraits of six extraordinary people whose lives were affected by totalitarianism and who passed on their memories to others in writing: Vasil Grossman, Margaret Buber-Neumann, David Rousset, Primo Levi, Romain Gray and Germaine Tillion all shared a way of thinking which Todorov calls humanism. They all understood that there is a 'grey zone' between good and evil behaviour and accepted the inseparability of good and evil.

The original French version of the book was published at the end of 2000 and since then the terrorist attacks of 9/11 have changed the scene. Hence, Todorov in *Preface to the English Edition* relates these new developments to the general framework of the volume. According to him the novelty of the 9/11 attacks consists of the fact that Americans have now joined the rest of the world in a common plight: being the potential targets of an external attack. The 9/11 attacks also showed the increasing power of individuals and small groups and the crucial role of the religious factor for the operatives, that is, people who are directly involved in carrying out this type of action. Todorov argues against the clash of civilizations thesis, since the ideology which inspires the hard-line terrorists is not Islam *per se*. He also points out that the differences between these neofundamentalists and their threat to democracy and the dangers embodied by the totalitarian states of the 20th century are far more significant than the similarities: 'whereas now, you have the exaltation of religion and the cult of the past, earlier you had the rejection of religion and the cult of the future; whereas now you have the action of stateless individuals and the willingness to sacrifice oneself, earlier you had the action of all-powerful states and the willingness to sacrifice the lives of others' (p. xiv).

Alongside the examination of the emergence of totalitarianism, its opposition to democracy and the opposition between the variants of totalitarianism (fascism and communism), Todorov explores the issue of memory. The second theme of the book is an analysis of such questions as: Is memory necessarily a good thing? Does the past always help us to understand the present or can it serve to confuse our view of the here and now? Are all uses of the past permissible?

Identifying the origin of totalitarianism in the people's need for salvation and the absolute, and placing the roots of its utopianism in the ideology of scientism, Todorov stresses the monism of totalitarian systems. Although he notes that the list of differences between communism and fascism could be extended *ad infinitum*, he also suggests that it is very enlightening to call these regimes 'totalitarian' to distinguish them from what they were not. For Todorov, the opposite of totalitarianism is an ideal type of democracy, which fosters an individualistic society and a humanistic philosophy constituted by

the conjunction of two separate principles: collective autonomy and individual autonomy.

Moving on to discuss memory, Todorov argues that the role of memory in systems allows us to distinguish totalitarianism, which sought to achieve a total control of memory, from democracy, which uses images of the past in pluralistic ways. He argues that memory is neither good nor bad itself and that the ways in which we can forfeit the value of the past relate to the uses we make of the past and the manner in which we reminisce. Since to judge the act of putting the past in the service of the present requires 'to have more than a truth of correspondence and a truth unveiling' (p. 134), such an act needs to be evaluated in terms of good and evil. In other words, argues Todorov, following Levinas, moral values can be attached only to actions that benefit others. Todorov, therefore, rightly argues that memory of the past can be useful for us if it hastens the reign of justice. The right use of memory is one that serves a right cause, not one that merely reproduces the past. Todorov also brilliantly illustrates the negative consequences of both the sanctification and trivialization of the past.

In discussing the perils of democracy, Todorov compares the sense of righteousness that was behind the West's intervention in Kosovo with the justifications for the crusades and for colonial conquest. The risks for democracy are not only connected with the fact that it has a tendency to see itself as the incarnation of moral good, which expresses itself in a claim to a right of interference that allows it to impose its good intentions on others by force. Apart from its moral correctness, democracy faces risks connected with an excess of identity politics, which happens when 'a collective identity overrides the essential democratic values of the individual and of universality' (p. 314), and risks of over-instrumentalization, which consists of focusing exclusively on the means and instruments for achieving a goal without stopping to think whether the goal is a legitimate one or not (p. 316). Todorov argues that over-instrumentalization is a danger specific to democracies because democracy 'gives no prior definition of the ultimate good and allows all its citizens to pursue their own ideals' (p. 316). These threats have, of course, been discussed by others, but Todorov's personal and passionate voice speaks with exceptional conviction and wisdom.

Despite the fact that there is not much original material, not much is added to our understanding of communism or fascism and the book's lack of sociological insight in its discussion of memory, Todorov's concentration on moral issues and his preference for personal memories is enlightening and unique. His moral stand and his call for struggle against 'the certainties of people who claim always to know where good and evil are to be found' (p. 217) resembles the voice of Bauman, another admirer of Levinas's 'unconditional responsibility'. For Bauman, as for Todorov, the Holocaust triggered ethical

concern and the conceptualization of morality as the necessity to make choices and assume responsibility. Bauman's emphasis on the culpability of modernity also corresponds with Todorov's argument that the existence of totalitarianism shows that progress is not a continuous and cumulative process.

Todorov's lack of engagement with other scholars' theories, which would have benefited the book, narrows the scope of his argument. Nonetheless, despite the book's addressing a non-academic audience, social theorists will have much to work with in the author's provocative thesis that in international relations 'the difference between totalitarianism and democracy is not as clear as in the domestic sphere, since both types of regime seek world hegemony' (p. 290).

Barbara Misztal
University of Leicester, UK

Liberals & Cannibals: The Implications of Diversity

Steven Lukes

Verso, London & New York, 2003, x + 180pp.

ISBN: 1 85984 595 9.

Contemporary Political Theory (2005) **4**, 97–99. doi:10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300162

Steven Lukes's prose is robust, and his lively and eclectic approach to his subject makes this book a highly enjoyable and thought-provoking read. In this collection, Lukes centres on the dilemmas of liberalism in the face of multiculturalism, and considers how liberals should respond to the challenges this presents. He examines the claim that liberal values are universal and the counter claim that posits them as particularistic, thus placing liberalism as one among many competing value systems. The related questions of incommensurability and the legitimacy of distinctive communities are also considered. The fundamental difficulty here is that many of the answers are ultimately reducible to the ethnocentric assertion that, put baldly, liberals are right and non-liberals are wrong. Lukes seeks to move beyond this unsatisfactory position, rejecting both cultural imperialism and the relativism of leaving cannibalism for the cannibals.

In each of the thirteen essays, Lukes approaches his subject from a different perspective. In the first four, the focus rests on the claim to universal morality and rationality, and considers the truth of the accusation that liberalism represents Enlightenment hegemony spread globally over time. The following three see a shift of emphasis to the local and particular, and the question of plural, incompatible or relative values. In Chapters 8 and 9, Lukes continues