

authors in their historical context, and to show how their views of international relations were shaped by their own experience. That approach is particularly illuminating when it comes to Locke, whose political thought as exposed in his *Two Treatises of Government* is presented alongside his colonial activity as a member of the Board of Trade, which oversaw transatlantic commerce, and as a contributor to the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina.

A further benefit of this approach is to take the reader on an intellectual journey tracing the development of global connections among peoples in the maritime age. A precursor to globalisation, that age saw fundamental questions emerge as to which law ought to govern the growing interactions across the globe. In a fascinating chapter, Armitage describes how Jeremy Bentham pursued answers to these questions, developing in the process two attitudes which put him ahead of his time (and of most of his followers): scepticism about colonisation, and faith in a universal international law.

These attitudes contrast with the contradiction inherent in Locke's defence of liberty within Britain, and of empire abroad. Of course, Locke was not alone in adopting contradictory positions: Burke famously acquiesced to the cause of independence for America, yet promoted counter-revolutionary intervention against France. Hobbes saw no higher political objective than the establishment of civil peace within national borders, while resigning himself to the pursuit of a state of nature more or less equivalent to a permanent state of war among nations.

The only mild shadow of criticism one might dare to cast over this profound and erudite work is that Armitage could have given more room to the critics of some of his authors: in particular, in the chapter on Hobbes, one misses a mention of his most determined adversary, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who denounced 'the horrible system of Hobbes' which, as Rousseau saw it, justified the loss of freedom within, as well as war abroad.

Just and Unjust Military Intervention: European Thinkers from Vitoria to Mill

Stefano Recchia and Jennifer M. Welsh, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. £60.00/\$99.00. 306 pp.

The sustained interest in the history of political thought as applied to international affairs, and the quality of research in that field, is amply demonstrated not only by *Foundations of Modern International Thought* (reviewed above), but by this small volume of essays edited by Stefano Recchia and Jennifer Welsh, respectively University Lecturer at the University of Cambridge, and Professor at the European University Institute, Florence, both in international relations.

Just and Unjust Military Intervention comprises 12 chapters mostly devoted to classical thinkers' views of the propriety of intervention: specific chapters focus on, among others, Francisco de Vitoria (by William Bain); John Locke (by Samuel Moyn); Emer de Vattel (by Jennifer Pitts); David Hume and Adam Smith (by Edwin van de Haar); Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Immanuel Kant and G.W.F. Hegel (by Pierre Hassner); Edmund Burke (by Jennifer Welsh); Giuseppe Mazzini (by Stefano Recchia); and J.S. Mill (by Michael Doyle).

While the intellectual quality of the contributions is generally of the highest order, the challenge of the book was to come up with a concept of 'intervention' that could stand up against the changing background of war and peace through four centuries of European history. The book claims to be concerned with 'military intervention motivated at least in part by humanitarian purposes, or ethical concerns' (p. 21), which does not confine the subject to modern humanitarian intervention alone, but also seems to include the 'just war' tradition.

While the definition excludes counter-revolutionary intervention of the type pursued by the Holy Alliance from 1815, and by Russia later in the nineteenth century, the book nevertheless devotes a chapter to Burke, who justified intervention against revolutionary France. Likewise, it is not entirely clear whether the book was meant to include quasi-colonial interventions against non-European powers or the Ottoman Empire before its downfall, which, while often justified on humanitarian grounds (such as the expeditions against the Barbary pirates or the 1830 conquest of Algiers), frequently bore the mark of imperialism.

Beyond these uncertainties, there is enough scope to revisit the views of classical political thinkers in light of contemporary debates on intervention, which they often echo and enlighten. Mill's thoughts on (and general reluctance towards) intervention are extraordinarily relevant in view of the debates which have raged over Kosovo, Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya. That consideration is enough to fully justify the project, and the resulting book is, by any measure, a remarkable accomplishment.

The Oxford Handbook of the History of Nationalism

John Breuilly, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
£95.00/\$185.00. 824 pp.

Nationalism continues to be one of the most powerful ideas and political forces at work in the twenty-first century. Yet its content, and even its definition, remain a matter of uncertainty, and of considerable scholarly debate. Indeed, it is a field in which it has been virtually impossible to separate the politics from the intellectual debate, since the political entrepreneurs known as nationalists