on Plato, Aristotle, Augustine and Jesus. It isn't really until we reach the early modern thought of Machiavelli that a clear set of themes begins to work through the succeeding chapters. However, the question of coherence wouldn't really matter so much if the book hadn't made very strong claims for itself in the Introduction. This brings me to my second reservation, although the Introduction to the book raises certain key questions which the book as a whole sets out to answer, it isn't wholly clear either how some of the chapters relate to these questions at all, or how the arguments of the different chapters taken together provide a response. In particular I was disappointed not to have a better sense of Carver's answers to two of his initial questions: how does consideration of political theory contribute to contemporary gender studies and feminist political and social theory? And, what does the distinction between apparently de-gendered and overtly gendered discourse in classic theoretical texts contribute to political theory? (4) In addition, there are two other questions which haunt the text but which are not addressed by Carver: what is the relation between feminist theory and critical masculinity theory? And, how should gender, in particular the concepts of masculinity and femininity, be theorized? It is of course always easy to chastise authors for not doing what you want them to do, but given the concerns of Carver's book, and the plethora of work from feminist scholarship on gender, it seems odd that these questions did not receive more direct consideration.

Overall, Carver's book is to be welcomed. I suspect it will be one of the first in a growing literature which brings together masculinity studies and political theory. It may even help to make *gender* something that political theorists cease to identify with *women*. The questions this book raises are crucial ones, and even if they do not get answered, Carver's discussion certainly highlights their significance and offers a great deal of lively and provocative discussion on the way.

Kimberly Hutchings

London School of Economics and Political Science, UK

Homelessness, Citizenship, and Identity: The Uncanniness of Late Modernity

Kathleen R. Arnold

Suny Press, Albany, NY, x + 212pp.

ISBN 0 79146111 4

Contemporary Political Theory (2006) **5**, 351–354. doi:10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300244

Homelessness, Citizenship, and Identity is an ambitious and multi-layered account of political inclusion in late modern societies, focusing especially on

the charged question of homelessness (mainly) in the United States. The book provides a wealth of insight into a range of pressing issues in contemporary political theory — citizenship, social inclusion, cosmopolitanism, the politics of identity/difference, justice, agonistic democracy to name but a few — by focusing on the figure of ‘the homeless’ as an emblem of Otherness in late modernity. The concept of homelessness captures both the literal ‘physical dislocation experienced by the homeless, poor immigrants, and refugees’, as well as the more symbolic ‘political dislocation’ that occurs when people are uprooted or estranged from their homelands and ‘nation-states’ (p. 129), the latter requiring a reconceptualization of political space in general given the increased dislocatory rhythm of the contemporary globalized world.

Arnold takes as her interlocutors and opponents in this project conservative ideologues (such as Newt Gingrich), as well as empirical research and public policies about the homeless, which ‘position the homeless as Other and fail to consider the concept of home sufficiently’ (p. 4), showing how the latter are complicit with non-democratic forms which she likens to Foucault’s notion of ‘panoptic power’. Here the book examines two dominant reactions towards this political other — the strategies of ‘assimilation’ and ‘criminalization’ — which render the homeless vulnerable either to forms of disciplining and rehabilitation in the case of the former, or the victims of ‘prerogative power’ and/or marginalization in the latter. By contrast, drawing on a range of Continental philosophers and post-structuralist theorists — Marx, Freud, Heidegger, Derrida, Foucault, Agamben, and Levinas — she argues that the homeless are systematically excluded from the political community because of the particular logic of the market in its late capitalist incarnation, and by an exclusionary conception of citizenship, which is strongly tied to the territorializing dynamics of nationalism and the modern nation-state. The latter establishes a norm of ‘internal exclusion’ in which marginalized others (such as the homeless) within the nation-state form a radical Otherness against which inclusion in the national family is conceived.

As against these forms of exclusion and marginalization, Arnold offers an alternative normative ideal to aim for in our dealing with ‘the Homeless’, and other forms of otherness that come to occupy the role of a ‘constitutive outside’ in the contemporary world. This consists of a revised, post-structuralist version of cosmopolitanism that builds on the idea of an ‘empty universalism’, which is both attentive to difference, multiplicity, and particularity, while retaining the idea of universal values such as freedom, political equality, and justice. Drawing on Marx’s critique of the abstract universalism of liberal constitutionalism (in his remarks ‘On the Jewish Question’ for example), and Derrida’s deconstructive readings of the ‘self/other’ binary, which requires the subject to acknowledge and be responsive to internal and external alterity, Arnold seeks

to develop a cosmopolitan project of justice that is able to 'transcend particularities and differences' without essentializing them, while still retaining a minimal set of weakened universals. In more concrete and practical terms, this approach calls for a decentring and deterritorialization of the strong connection between citizenship and the modern 'nation-state', and the elaboration of an 'urban cosmopolitanism', which places the pluralized space of the city at its centre (p. 171). It also involves a reworking of the notions of 'home' and 'homelessness', in which the former is given a more capacious meaning that goes beyond our traditional conceptions of 'home' as individualized physical housing, while the latter is presented as a generalized condition of dislocation and estrangement.

Homelessness, Citizenship, and Identity is a rich account of a complex series of issues in late modernity, and engages a host of theoretical themes and discussions in contemporary political theory in a lively manner. Understandably, given its scope, the book raises a series of questions that call for further thought and reflection. To begin with, the book's strong utopian dimension — the call for a new 'urban cosmopolitanism' built around ideas such as 'empty universalism' — while suggestive, needs much greater elaboration. Are these ideas feasible and realistic in the contemporary world (especially given the constraining logics pinpointed by the author)? If so, in what precise institutional and constitutional forms? Are there other ways of circumventing the debilitating logics of capitalism and the modern territorial state? What are the constraints to such proposals? Do models such as the European Union offer other more plausible ways of achieving Arnold's preferred ends? In short, it is not made clear how Arnold's alternative ethos — an invitation to a 'deconstructive living' in a pluralized and heterogeneous public space — can be put into practice and concretized in specific and viable political institutions.

Connected with this set of issues is the lack of engagement with a range of relevant bodies of literature that have also tackled issues raised in the book. For instance, there is little or no examination of alternative models of democracy, such as those associated with the 'deliberative turn' put forward by Habermas and his followers, and no discussion of modern and post-modern forms of liberal democracy (such as those advocated by the later Rawls or Richard Rorty for example). Indeed, although the book advocates a reworked cosmopolitan form of justice, there is little consideration of the growing body of Kantian literature on this topic, as developed by theorists such as Simon Caney, David Held, Kimberly Hutchings, and Onora O'Neill. A third cluster of issues emerges out of the specific question of homelessness. One aspect that is not really addressed in this regard concerns those groups and subjects that refuse homes — that actively choose 'homelessness' over and above a 'stable home'. These are people who in an important sense embody the condition of

homelessness that Arnold takes as a paradigmatic of our contemporary world, while also constituting a direct challenge to the territorializing imperatives of capital and the modern nation state. While to some extent this is an unfair observation, as Arnold's more encompassing conception of home as 'not merely a fixed address but a variety of relationships and locations that have at their core some type of stability and consistency and, ideally, support' (p. 62) does extend to travellers and nomadic groups, it is a theme that surprisingly is not explicitly tackled in the book. A final issue concerns Arnold's reworking of the notion of homelessness: while she persuasively draws attention to the ontological character of homelessness — the all-pervasive uncanniness and rootlessness of contemporary experience — she does not really explore the conditions for the subjective recognition of this dislocation and disorientation, and the varieties of subjective response to it. These political concerns, which arise directly from this challenging book, constitute important food for future thought.

David Howarth
Department of Government,
University of Essex, UK

Conservatism: Burke, Nozick, Bush, Blair?

Ted Honderich

Pluto Press, London, 2005(revised edition), ix + 334pp.

ISBN: 0 7453 2129 1.

Contemporary Political Theory (2006) **5**, 354–358. doi:10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300252

This is an impressively crotchety book. Reading it is rather like being beaten over the head with Labour's 1983 election manifesto for a terribly long time by Victor Meldrew. Ted Honderich's (1989) original attack on conservatism has been extended and supplemented by discussion of Tony Blair and George Bush.

Honderich's nominal aim is to find a usable definition of conservative thought, and evaluate it. The result is, however, a diatribe. The admirable clarity of style encourages an unfortunate populism. He makes Michael Moore seem like H.L.A. Hart.

There are four major problems with *Conservatism*. First, the edition isn't revised so much as expanded with scattergun attacks on New Labour. Even Blair's chancellor Gordon Brown, the hope of many on the left, is dismissed as