

contemporary readers interpret negative passages properly. He also deftly shows how Augustine's tactic of bringing his readers "into hell and out again" (p. 148) is firmly rooted in his pedagogy of hope. This part of the book is truly exemplary—the highlight of what is a rigorous, careful, and insightful study throughout.

The final third of Lamb's project focuses on the politics of hope, and it is here that the upshot of Lamb's earlier analysis becomes apparent. Fundamentally, Lamb is at pains to defend Augustine against an "otherworldly, antipolitical, and exclusivist" reputation (p. 265). For Lamb, Augustine's "participationist ontology" and "inaugurated eschatology" provide strong rebuttals to the first charge: because it is possible to love temporal goods properly, as long as one's loves are rightly ordered, Augustine is not the otherworldly figure he is purported to be (p. 264). Neither is he antipolitical: because Augustine uses rhetoric to help his readers avoid both presumption and despair, there is good reason to reevaluate the significance of his well-known "antipolitical" moments. In part III, Lamb bolsters this claim by offering evidence of Augustine's own political engagement from his correspondences. Presenting an Augustine who encouraged others to participate in civic life, admired virtuous patriots, and worked to promote justice and peace in his role as a bishop, Lamb offers a compelling model of hopeful citizenship.

Lamb's desire to address the charge of exclusivism, however, propels him into difficult territory. Insofar as this charge implies that Augustine should sever human goodness from the love of God, lest he leave non-Christians outside the realm of virtue, it is unclear to me exactly how it can be resolved while remaining faithful to Augustine's theological vision. Augustine does not present the two loves as "poles on a continuum of virtue," but as fundamentally different postures toward reality, even if they sometimes generate similar actions (p. 195). Accordingly, although I appreciated Lamb's attempts to carve out space for "genuine" but "incomplete" virtue among pagans, I found myself wishing for more clarity as to when he was presenting Augustine's views and when he was going beyond them (p. 236). I also found myself wondering whether less of Augustine's theological framework needed to be sacrificed to show that he urges citizens to "forge unity in plurality and seek concord around common goods" (p. 270). Perhaps it would be possible to make this case without addressing the charge of exclusivism head-on—or by using immanent critique to interrogate the charge's presuppositions, as Augustine does so often (p. 270).

Nevertheless, I was appreciative of Lamb's careful demonstration that the call to work with others for earthly peace is "faithfully Augustinian"—as is the call to see the good in the other (p. 249). In showing this, *A Commonwealth of Hope* is a welcome intervention in a fraught political climate. More than this, it is a timely rehabilitation of a

figure who sought to engage well in political life, even as he had his sights set on the eternal city.

**Tocqueville's Dilemmas, and Ours: Sovereignty, Nationalism, Globalization.** By Ewa Atanassow. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2022. 272p. \$39.95 cloth. doi:10.1017/S1537592723002591

— Gianna Englert , Southern Methodist University  
genglert@smu.edu

Can contemporary democratic regimes weather the political storms generated by illiberal nationalist and populist movements? In this elegantly written and insightful book, Ewa Atanassow urges us to see these threats to liberal democracy as the latest manifestations of democracy's inherent "dilemmas" or what she describes as the "tensions" and "conundrums" (p. 10) that plague modern popular governments. The questions that motivate this study are not new. By approaching them as "timeless questions of modern politics" (p. 6)—or as the book's pithy title indicates, enduring *dilemmas* that originated in the early nineteenth century and persist through the present—Atanassow hopes to secure liberal democracy's future by returning to its past.

For this task, *Tocqueville's Dilemmas, and Ours* foregrounds Alexis de Tocqueville's writings on sovereignty and global affairs. As both a "complex" and "ambivalent" (p. 10) observer of American democracy and a French statesman, Tocqueville was attuned to what Atanassow calls the central dilemma of democratic life: the "tension between the universal scope of [its] principles and the particularity and limits of any political attempt to realize them in practice" (p. 3). Democracies are built on the principle of human equality. But because we live in a world of diverse cultures and societies, our political practices often run afoul of such universalist, egalitarian aspirations. According to Atanassow, virtually all the dangers that democracies face, from swelling nationalist sentiment to the resurgence of autocratic rule, showcase the broader conflict between the universal and the particular. When viewed in this light, Tocqueville's questions are our questions. The Frenchman's answers likewise transcend his time. Much more than an antiquated figure in the history of political thought, Atanassow's dilemma-driven Tocqueville is a guide for committed liberal democrats in the twenty-first century. His insights anchor the "nondogmatic," "ambivalent," and "nonideological" liberalism (pp. 4, 6) that the author aims to reconstruct in the struggle to save constitutional governments.

By placing the theme of dilemmas front and center, the book's three main chapters offer fresh readings of Tocqueville's work—an impressive feat given the extensive literature on *Democracy in America* (1835/1840). Each chapter moves from political theory to a single "case study" (p. 19), revealing how Tocqueville tackled real-world controversies: the nullification crisis in Jacksonian America (chap. 1),

France's 1840 response to the Eastern question (chap. 2), and Algerian colonization (chap. 3). Even the most discerning interpreters of *Democracy* have overlooked Tocqueville's remarks about popular sovereignty and peoplehood, topics that Atanassow explores in careful detail in chapter 1. For although Tocqueville marveled at how the providential sweep of equality "pushes against all limits and borders," he recognized that popular government needs a circumscribed "people" (pp. 20, 62) along with a "story about the particular collective that is entitled to govern itself" (p. 103).

Atanassow claims that such imagined communities are prerequisites for the survival of liberal democracies. And surprisingly, they may be strengthened by the same globalizing processes that seem to erode them. One of the book's most illuminating discussions appears in chapter 3, where Atanassow contrasts Tocqueville's neglected thoughts on globalization with those of his contemporaries, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Unlike Marx and Engels, who imagined a zero-sum struggle between national identities and capitalist expansion, Tocqueville believed that the worldwide egalitarian revolution would solidify national differences while effacing class distinctions. Taking its cue from Tocqueville's analysis, the book suggests that today's liberal democracies should not—and need not—sacrifice their own identities.

Chapters 2 and 3 look outward from America and France to the rest of the world. Atanassow reopens Tocqueville's 1840 exchange with J. S. Mill on the issue of war and national pride, aiming to correct scholars' standard interpretations that often pit an unapologetic, pugnacious Tocqueville against an even-tempered Mill. It is true, as chapter 2 notes, that their correspondence over the Eastern crisis did not put an end to their fruitful friendship. Furthermore, both figures recognized the shortcomings of their respective positions, a point that resounds throughout Atanassow's clear-headed interpretation. Yet the book's effort to rehabilitate Tocqueville's reputation in this period is much less convincing. Although he did acknowledge the potential pitfalls of populist fervor, Tocqueville continued to insist on the indispensable role of national pride in revivifying France's languid, bourgeois-led domestic life.

As Atanassow points out, Tocqueville clashed with the July Monarchy's foreign minister François Guizot about how and where to channel the nation's energies (pp. 92–93): to pursue international glory or domestic material prosperity. For Tocqueville, "if the government is to be both liberal and democratic, involving the people in international affairs is no longer a matter of choice but of double necessity" (p. 99). The entire globe becomes "the arena where the highest form of national instruction can take place" (p. 101) and the crucible in which French identity is further forged. But Atanassow's conclusions about Tocqueville's internationalist turn cannot help but

underscore its militarism. In the case of the Eastern crisis, Tocqueville declared that "a disadvantageous war was less to be feared than 'a peace without glory'" (p. 91). Even if he could foresee some of the dangers stirred by patriotic sentiment, Tocqueville himself seemed to err on the side of grand nationalist excess when it came to reforming his enfeebled French democracy.

It seems an odd choice, then, to resurrect Tocqueville's nineteenth-century calls to assert French dominance abroad to address the current crises of liberal democracy. Even so, Atanassow does not shy away from bold Tocquevillean conclusions in the book's closing pages, though she presents them under the heading of "liberal moderation" (p. 174). "To remain liberal, then, democracy requires the...conciliation of national pride" (p. 167) fostered by an active foreign policy. But where do we draw the line between building a salutary national identity and justifying illiberal policies that endanger other nations and people, some within our own borders? Can a democracy cultivate national pride by taking a leading role on the world stage, as the book's "nondogmatic" liberal perspective recommends, without succumbing to the sword rattling that suffused Tocqueville's imperialism?

By marshaling Tocqueville on the contentious issues of colonization and globalization, Atanassow seems to reinforce the complexity of those dilemmas she so expertly highlights—while also leading us implicitly to question the value of Tocqueville's solutions. Despite these lingering questions, scholars of Tocqueville, contemporary democratic theorists, and anyone worried about the fate of free government will find much to learn in this thoughtful and timely book.

**Justice by Means of Democracy.** By Danielle Allen. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2023. 288p. \$27.50 cloth.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592723002621

— Clarissa Rile Hayward, *Washington University in St. Louis*,  
chayward@wustl.edu

In this insightful, well-argued, and systematically structured book, Danielle Allen makes the case that those who are concerned with justice should focus not only on questions about how to fairly distribute income, wealth, and other valued resources but also, and centrally, on how to achieve political equality. Justice, she writes, is "best, and perhaps only achieved by means of democracy" (p. 4).

Allen introduces what she characterizes as three "guiding design principles" that aid the pursuit of justice: the value and interdependence of negative liberties and positive liberties, a commitment to political equality, and what she calls "difference without domination." The last design principle directs those who would pursue justice in political societies characterized by social, economic, and political differences to be alert to the possibility that laws, institutions, norms, and