



and comes at the price of overlooking some of Hobbes's explicit and unambiguous claims. In most cases, however, Tregenza maintains that Oakeshott brings to the light ideas that are in Hobbes' text, if somewhat hidden. The brief treatment of the (slight) differences between Oakeshott's Hobbes and Tregenza's Hobbes should not surprise as Tregenza himself states in the Introduction that 'this is a work principally about Oakeshott and only derivatively about Hobbes' (p. 7).

In conclusion, this is a fine work on Michael Oakeshott. The discussion of Oakeshott's ideas is interesting, intense, original, and balanced. Although Tregenza does not hide his sincere and deep admiration for Oakeshott, whom he refers to as one of the most original political philosophers of the 20th century, he has the great merit of refraining from making the excessive claims that are associated with the 'Oakeshott cult'.

Gabriella Slomp
University of St Andrews, UK.

Imagining the State

Mark Neocleous

Open University Press, Maidenhead & Philadelphia, 2003, viii + 176pp.
ISBN: 0 335 20351 5.

Contemporary Political Theory (2005) **4**, 344–347. doi:10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300205

The aim of the book is to explore the political imaginary associated with the state form. This is an interesting project, highlighting the importance of the fundamental rhetorical motif that helps to give meaning to the state. The book contains four chapters and a Coda. The first chapter, 'The Body of the State', deals with the analogy between the human body and the body of the state, and the long tradition of the body metaphor in political thinking. It then examines the construction of the social body as a feature of the modernization of society. The third section investigates the 'dirty body' — using examples ranging from the fascist political imagination to 19th century sanitary reform to the US foreign policy of containment. At the end of the first chapter Neocleous propounds the view that 'far from being a universal metaphor' the 'corporal metaphor is an ideological tool aimed at achieving good order and locating sovereignty' and that the 'corporeal model is a dead end for any critical politics of radical transformation' (p. 38).

Chapter 2 examines the 'The Mind of the State'. Under this heading Neocleous advances the case for the idea of reason of state as a rationality of



state expedience for the ‘penetration of civil society by the state’ (p. 45). He goes on to detail the expansion of state intelligence services and intelligence gathering, the information society and state statistics, ‘animated by the strategic relationship between knowledge and power’(p. 51). The third section deals with the issues of state secrecy, official secrets, and the idea of security risk. The ideas of the redrawing of the line between public and private and of reconstructing their meanings are important themes of the chapter. Chapter 2 ends with the argument that ‘privacy can be used as much by certain structures of power as against them’ (p. 70), and that ‘no state will ever be willing to see a ‘private’ space as a limit on its power’ (p. 71).

Chapter 3, ‘The Personality of the State’, rests on the notion that the impersonal ‘person of the state’ achieves the ‘convergence of domination and unity’ by ‘figuring domination *as* unity’. The chapter focuses on the ‘power of capital’, that Neocleous sees as ‘the main structural forms of *social* domination’ (p. 77). Having explored the ‘personification of capital’ the chapter examines the ‘revenge of sovereignty’. By this, Neocleous means that the authority of corporations derives from the state, which populates civil society with these ‘new legal subjects’ as artificial persons, ‘structured in its own image’ (p. 91). He gives the example of the East India Company as a ‘major mechanism through which the state began to administer civil society politically’ (p. 92).

Chapter 4, ‘The Home of the State’ begins with the argument that the “modernisation” of politics was...as much a process of territorialization as it was a process of secularization and rationalization’ (p. 99). It investigates the idea of the state as a ‘particular space imagined as a territorial container’ (p. 98), and argues that the ‘fabrication of *social* order is simultaneously the fabrication of *spatial* order’ (p. 101). The section called ‘The Terror of Territory’ problematizes the idea of the *legitimate* use of force by the state, and holds that the state is a ‘protection racket’ (p. 108). The section ‘The Scum of the Earth, or, Once More on the Dirty Social Body’ discusses border issues, refugees, and citizenship status in terms of the ‘political fiction’ of the ‘distinction between inside and outside’ the state (p. 109). Neocleous argues that ‘the figure of the refugee has...been instrumental to the task of statecraft’, by ‘enabling...a specific imagination of the world’ (p. 112). He contends that, according to this thinking, immigrants stand for the destabilising and ‘possible pollution of the social body’ (p. 116). The final section, ‘The Violence of Cartography’, deals with the political importance of maps — in that they ‘make space an object of political knowledge’ (p. 121), are bound up with intelligence gathering, enable political administration, and naturalize contingent historical boundaries.

It is in the Coda that Neocleous’s argument emerges fully. He brings the earlier threads to bear on what he considers an urgent contemporary challenge. He calls for a ‘movement for democratic globalization, a nonterritorial



democratization of power' to 'operate against state boundaries', a "geography of insurrection" in opposition to the geography of order' that he has outlined here. His argument is that "the state" is only one way of organizing and imagining space' and he asks that we 'think politics outside the statist political imaginary' (p. 126).

The wide range of disciplines upon which Neocleous draws is a valuable feature of the book. One of the strengths of this book is that it is studded with insights from social and political theory, social history, sociology, geography, the history of law and linguistics. On linguistics the author illuminates, for instance on p. 68, why it is worth attending to the meaning and etymological roots of words, and how words have significantly changed their meaning over time. However, there are times (for example on p. 102) when the use of etymology looks rather ritualistic and its relevance is in doubt.

This starts out as a book about the state as a political imaginary but becomes a book against the state and its insidious and masked powers. It is in some ways a traditional book about the state, very much opposed to the state from a Marxist perspective. Behind the examination of the state as a political imaginary lies a fairly familiar account in the Marxist tradition of the history of the state and its functions. Neocleous is suspicious of the very idea of the state, regarding it as an inherently oppressive and violent political construction. This is a problem in several respects. The Marxist framework structures the argument but sometimes foreshortens the perspective. It deals with regularities and models and does not allow for variations in experience and practices across different countries to be sufficiently recognized. Moreover, Neocleous's point of view is sometimes partisan to the point where it neither explains nor convinces. For instance, there are lots of examples in the 'Dirty Bodies' chapter of liberal and fascist uses of disease. But did the communists use this imagery too? 'Good' and 'bad' regimes are too clear cut here. Furthermore, the book focuses on the oppressive and sinister aspects of the state, enabled by the statist political imaginary. But what about its benefits? I would like to have seen arguments in favour of the state at least acknowledged or debated. In addition, while Neocleous brings together much interesting critique of the powerful state, his contemporary diagnosis in terms of globalization and the erosion of state power is already anachronistic in a debate that has moved on to the role of Empire and the resuscitation of the state within it, and his proposal harks back to the utopian aspect of Marxism.

However, a bigger problem is that a much more thorough and systematic analysis of the idea of 'political imaginary' is needed. The argument of the book hinges upon the idea of the 'political imaginary' of the state form, but the term receives scant consideration. At the beginning of the book the author is keen to establish that it refers not to discourse but to how the visual field is represented in human form. However, this definition raises lots of questions



that are unanswered, and the meaning of ‘political imaginary’ requires greater elucidation to underpin the project. At some level the distinction between visual representations and those in discourse is not so clear cut, and it would be interesting to know what difference it would make to see the two as related. Moreover, much of the book deals with textual evidence, historical and sociological analysis, and etymological derivation, all a long way from the initial emphasis on the visual representation of the state form. Furthermore, on p. 9, Neocleous states that ‘the idea of the body politic has been a central theme within the statist political imaginary’, but this is not such a bold claim once the imaginary is taken as visual, and indeed seems like a circular argument. In practice, the term ‘political imaginary’ is used as an umbrella term. In addition, the argument for the impact of the political imaginary on political thinking and practices needs to be made.

I would like to have seen this enterprise set in a wider context — what else is there at stake as well as the political imaginary, and what would the ‘political imaginary’ of a different political form look like? Without these contextualizations it is difficult to fully assess the importance and impact of what is under discussion in this book. While I found this a stimulating read, further attention to all these framing questions would have set out more fully the parameters of this enterprise, and so strengthened the book.

Raia Prokhovnik
Department of Politics,
Open University, UK.

The Politics of Jurisprudence: A Critical Introduction to Legal Philosophy, 2nd edition

Roger Cotterrell

LexisNexis UK, London, 2003, xiii + 324pp.

ISBN: 0 406 93055 4.

Contemporary Political Theory (2005) **4**, 347–349. doi:10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300206

The Politics of Jurisprudence is bound to be a different treatment of legal philosophy than the more usual fare, given that its author, Roger Cotterrell, is perhaps the foremost exponent of sociological jurisprudence. And, indeed, this work is different. Cotterrell is not satisfied with merely explicating what are the various features of particular legal traditions. Instead, he is concerned with uncovering how these traditions reflect the social context within which each arise. Moreover, he seeks to clarify the ways that the circumstances of