brings Müller to highlight the common logic of populism: its antipluralism.

Populists, Müller suggests, claim that only some of the people are really *the* people, and that only they as populists can identify and represent them. In consequence, he submits, the populist claim fundamentally contradicts the pluralism of democratic societies, to which it belongs that the *demos* is not seen as a closed singularity but as an open union of diverse individuals. By defining populism as a moralised form of antipluralism, Müller echoes some of the most influential definitions of populism in the literature (notably those of Cas Mudde and Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser), but he goes beyond them in offering a clear criterion that allows separating populism from legitimate forms of democratic persuasion.

Based on various examples from Viktor Orbán in Hungary to Hugo Chávez in Venezuela, Müller identifies in the second part of the book three populist techniques for governing that illustrate populism's antipluralistic tendency: colonisation (or occupation) of the state, mass clientelism, and oppression of the civil society and the media. This development of the argument convincingly proves that populists are willing and capable of governing and *do* constitute a concrete threat to democracy.

In the last part of the book, Müller engages with the question of how best to deal with populists. While he recommends an increased readiness for a substantive dialogue with those who are unjustly dismissed as populists, he also strongly advocates a determined vindication of democratic values in confrontation with true populists.

Müller's clear thesis about populism's antipluralist core is illuminating. However, it leaves the reader with questions regarding its far-reaching normative underpinnings, which are not investigated given the conciseness of the work. That said, this is a study which is excellently done and that provides an account of how to understand and tackle populism in modern democracies.

Michael I Räber
(University of Zurich)

DOI: 10.1177/1478929917716098
journals.sagepub.com/home/psrev

Reordering the World: Essays on Liberalism and Empire by **Duncan Bell**. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016. 441pp., £29.95 (h/b), ISBN 9780691138787

Reordering the World collects together some of Duncan Bell's most notable writings of the past 10 years, focusing in particular on British imperial thought in the Victorian era. With the exception of two chapters, these essays have all been published previously. But it is a mark of the quality of Bell's scholarship, and the integration of his thought, that their assembly here works as well – indeed, better – than many freestanding monographs.

Equally adept in the disciplines of political theory and the history of political thought, Bell moves seamlessly between them. Encouraging us to understand the ongoing conceptualisation of liberalism as bound up with its own self-affirmed history, he shows that at crucial points in its genesis, liberal thought was inseparable from meditations on empire. Moreover, because liberal practice was also bound up with real-world imperial administration, it is hopeless to attempt to understand either liberalism or empire via single-track interpretations. One must be simultaneously historian *and* political theorist.

The depth of Bell's engagement pays off in many rewarding ways, two of which deserve special mention. First, a major upshot of the work is that we must learn to move beyond existing debates on the alleged opposition, or co-dependence, of liberalism and empire. Much energy has been expended upon the question of whether liberalism is inherently imperialistic, or whether the two can come apart (and hence whether liberalism can transcend and repudiate its bloody imperial past). Bell, however, impresses the necessity of seeing that the varieties of liberalism and imperialism – and in turn, the varieties of imperial and liberal *thought* – entail that no simple story of opposition or integration can ultimately be tenable. Understanding the relationships between liberalism and empire requires detailed study of a range of complex cases, which often pull in different directions. History is just too messy for neat conceptual stories here. Adequate theory will have to reflect this.

Second, Bell brings to the fore the thus-far neglected importance of settler colonialism to imperial thought, in particular how the fate of

the 'Anglosphere' – in places like South Africa, Australia and Canada, and as distinct from India or the Far East – shaped influential theories of the British Empire. Again, this serves to remind us of the complex legacy of European imperialism, which continues to shape our world in ways that for the most part we still do not yet adequately understand.

Paul Sagar
(University of Cambridge)

DOI: 10.1177/1478929917712148
journals.sagepub.com/home/psrev

The Shape of the New: Four Big Ideas and How They Made the Modern World by **Scott L Montgomery and Daniel Chirot**. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015. 492pp., £24.95 (h/b), ISBN 9780691150642

In this book, authors Scott L. Montgomery and Daniel Chirot explore the impact of the principal ideas of Enlightenment liberalism on modern history. The first part of the book discusses five leading thinkers: Adam Smith, Karl Marx, Charles Darwin, Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, with each chapter examining how later history, and later thinkers, adopted and modified these thinkers' ideas. The second part of the book discusses several ideas and movements that rejected many of the tenets of the Enlightenment, namely, the Counter-Enlightenment, fascism, Christian fundamentalism and Islam.

The book does not purport to be a work of original scholarship (p. 8), but a work of synthesis, and an extremely wide-ranging one, discussing in its pages many thinkers, countries and movements. The argument is an ambitious one, aiming to show that 'ideas have been among the primary forces behind modern history during the past three centuries' (p. 5), and the book concludes with a call for the increased study of the humanities.

The discussion of the key thinkers is illuminating and balanced, recognising their good points as well as the bad. Part 1 of the book serves as a competent introduction to thinkers who have undoubtedly had an important impact on modern history. Some defects of the work include over-simplification, including a rather vague use of the term 'Enlightenment liberalism' throughout – with that term meaning something broader than an aggregation of the ideas discussed in Part 1 – and at times a use of terms (such as Marxism) without carefully defining them.

The need to identify a single theme in the early chapters leads the authors to focus narrowly on some aspects of the thought of the key thinkers while truncating or ignoring other aspects. The way that ideas impact on history is complex, and arguably, the authors have not done enough to demonstrate the specific ways in which the ideas of 'Enlightenment liberalism' impacted on the events of modern history.

The text often loses its way in the detail, with the relation of many events to the key ideas of 'Enlightenment liberalism' unclear; virtually every major historical and intellectual development from the nineteenth century is discussed as either accepting or departing from 'Enlightenment liberalism'. In this, the breadth of the book is a weakness as well as a strength.

Benjamin Saunders
(Deakin University)

DOI: 10.1177/1478929917712909
journals.sagepub.com/home/psrev

Recalling the Caliphate: Decolonisation and World Order by **Salman Sayyid**. London: C. Hurst & Co, 2014. 288pp., £18.99 (p/b), ISBN 9781849040037

This evocatively titled book aims to reconceptualise the idea of the *caliphate*. This reconceptualisation focuses less on restoration and more on innovation – of the very philosophy that expounds the meaning of the *caliphate*. It speaks about Muslim autonomy that can embolden the Muslims to write their own history and 'project themselves into the future' (p. 14).

Sayyid's attempt is 'an exercise in Critical Muslim Studies' (p. 14). He ventures to dismiss the ontically inclined answers to the Muslim question and argues that the multiplicity of positions which emerges from such an articulation does not dissolve the singularity of Islam into 'distinct multiple Islams' (p. 8). He paves a middle ground between essentialist claims about Islam and the apologetic reaction to it which reduces the singularity of