In short, *The Politics of Jurisprudence* is a highly original work that will no doubt benefit new students of legal philosophy immensely. I recommend it without reservation.

Thom Brooks
University of Newcastle, UK.

Chinese Marxism

Adrian Chan

Continuum, London & New York, 2003, vi + 218 pp.

ISBN: 0 8264 5033 4.

Contemporary Political Theory (2005) **4**, 349–351. doi:10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300207

In a selective and distorted political tract, Adrian Chan argues for the continuity and appropriateness of a Chinese interpretation of Marxism, extending from Chen Duxiu and Qu Qiubai, the first two leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, to Mao Zedong and Zhang Chunqiao, a member of the Gang of Four. As the leading theorist and practitioner of Chinese Marxism, Mao is the most important of these figures, but Chan asks us to see Mao as carrying forward the projects of his predecessors and as providing a radical endowment for his successors. Chan admires and defends the Great Leap Forward and Cultural Revolution, but denigrates Deng Xiaoping's Socialism with Chinese Characteristics and Jiang Zemin's attempt to co-opt the new Chinese entrepreneurs into the Party through his doctrine of Three Represents. Chan complains that these reform-era developments undermine the democratic legitimacy of Communist Party rule through the dictatorship of the proletariat and foresees that they will replace Marxist socialism with a form of 'national socialism'. It is unclear whether he means to associate the reform programme with Hitler's national socialism or with the Chinese democratic movement of the same name founded by Zhang Dongsun in 1934. In either case, the claim is intended to be a slur.

In Chan's view, neither Marx's central analysis of the historical development and fate of modern industrial society in *Capital* nor the experience of Soviet Marxism provided a single correct model for revolutionary social transformation. In particular, Chan holds that Chinese Marxists understood local conditions in the light of Marx's *Civil War in France* and Engels' discussion of subjugated peoples. They saw that successful revolution would be possible in China, a society with rudimentary industry and a weak proletariat, because the Chinese peasantry gained revolutionary potential by being enmeshed in

capitalist social relations as a *proletariat foncier*. For Chan, the growing interpenetration of factory ownership and land ownership in China established this crucial extension of capitalist social relations to the countryside. In addition, from the start Chinese Marxists understood the need for cultural and intellectual revolution to enable and complete political, economic and social revolution. This aspect of Chinese Marxism, culminating in Zhang Chunqiao's call for permanent revolution, was again influenced by Marx's writings on France.

Of course, it is wise to use Marx's analysis as a flexible tool of enquiry rather than as a fixed dogma and to eschew determinist versions of Marxism that eliminate any role for human understanding and agency in the process of historical development, but Chan never takes seriously internal Marxist criticism of the central motifs of Chinese Marxism. He rejects the absolute priority of the economic base over the legal, political and cultural superstructure and the dominance of forces of production over the relations of production within the base, but does not explore the possibility that Mao, in particular, bet too much on the possibility of altering the superstructure without changes in the base and altering the relations of production without suitable development of the forces of production. Chan takes sides in these disputes, but offers little help in assessing whether he is correct. Further, he places great emphasis on Mao's theory of knowledge, theory of action and theory of culture. Unfortunately, in all cases Chan focuses on slogans and does not even begin to justify his claims that the theories are correct or even that they are theories. Furthermore, he is partisan in his assessment of historical events. Chan speaks of the 'tragedy of Tiananmen Square' under Deng, but only of the 'lean years' of the massive famine that followed the Great Leap Forward under Mao. He holds that a significant reason for the failure of the Cultural Revolution was the choice of the wrong slogan. He praises Mao for his doctrine of antagonistic and nonantagonistic contradictions in forming popular fronts and in dealing with divergent opinions within the Party, but does not recognize the mistrust generated by a leader who could change any disagreement into an antagonistic contradiction. On this basis, Mao could toy with colleagues and comrades as artfully as Stalin.

Chan is no more helpful in dealing with disputes between Chinese Marxism and other trends of modern Chinese intellectual history. He does not explore the pre-Marxist radicalism of social Darwinist, Nietzschean and anarchist thought in China. He systematically diminishes the role of the liberal intellectual Hu Shi in the New Culture Movement and does not explore Liang Shuming's theory of rural reconstruction as a rival to Marxist views of the transformation of the peasantry. He fails to explore Chen Duxiu's doctrines after his expulsion from the Chinese Communist Party. He treats the great writer and social critic Lu Xun as the Marxist idol that he became after

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