

limited sovereignty, *terra nullius*, and conquest, as well as through a civilizational discourse (Anghie, pp. 127–128).² As Anghie argues, the exporting of violence to the colonies through international law does not find reference in positivist accounts of international law. He argues that European states denied sovereignty to non-European states through a civilizational discourse, through which “the Other” was denied sovereign status. Similarly, Mark Toufayan presents a critical account of Upendra Baxi’s work on human rights, where he has argued that these were not gifts from the West, but emerged from below, from people in struggle, and that the dominant historical narratives have silenced or excluded these alternate histories.³ As Toufayan points out, while Baxi does not explain how human suffering can be made legible and grievable in human rights or whether grassroots are always constituted by progressive voices, his work is a major contribution to the development of Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAAIL). The dark side of human rights finds little space in dominant accounts, where the injustices produced by the global war on terror, Guantanamo or Bagram, do not call for accountability but are justified through a security discourse that projects the West as defending “civilization” and liberal values.

While the essays are at times a bit unwieldy and could have been improved through more rigorous editing, the collection makes an important contribution to the relevance of critical international law, especially within an Asian context where the relationship between markets, non-state actors, and post-colonial states has been a feature of global governance for the past five hundred years. State-centric notions of international law do not capture how former colonized nations understood or engaged with international law. Its formative features were crafted on the anvil of a civilizational divide, where the non-European was deliberately and effectively excluded from international law and the family of nations. Not only was civilizational achievement a primary criterion for colonial nations to secure freedom, but the European powers refused to take on board how this divide was constitutive of international law as a discipline and practice as well as integral to global governance.

reviewed by Ratna KAPUR
Jindal Global Law School

Human Rights

China’s Human Rights Lawyers: Advocacy and Resistance

by Eva PILS.

Abingdon/New York: Routledge, 2015. 286 pp. Hardcover: \$160.

doi:10.1017/S2044251316000102

Due to the political sensitivity of the topic, very little academic research on China’s human rights lawyers has come from Chinese scholars. As a Western scholar having worked in the Chinese University of Hong Kong Faculty of Law for a significant length of time, the author has had unique access to the community of human rights lawyers in China, which is extraordinary and is shown through the book’s research method section (pp. 10–15) even though the author describes it as constraints and difficulties she faced during the research. The neutral and balanced view the book offers is valuable not only to non-Chinese communities seeking to truly understand the complexity of the issue in China, but more importantly to China’s human rights cause. Overall this book provides much needed systematic

2. Anthony Anghie, “Towards a Postcolonial International Law” in Prabhakar SINGH and Benoît MAYER, eds., *Critical International Law: Postrealism, Postcolonialism and Transnationalism* (Delhi: Oxford University Press (2014), 123 at 127–128.

3. Mark Toufayan, “‘Suffering’ the Paradox of Rights: Critical Subaltern Historiography and the Genealogy of Empathy” in Prabhakar SINGH and Benoît MAYER, eds., *Critical International Law: Postrealism, Postcolonialism and Transnationalism* (Delhi: Oxford University Press (2014), 167 at 175–176.

analysis and critical review of problems and issues faced by human rights lawyers in China, including exploring the deep roots of the systemic problems.

The book first lays out a clear historical background of human rights lawyers in China, including the ancient Chinese concept of “litigation masters” and the injustice concept of *Yuan*, development from the late Qing dynasty to the cultural revolution, to Deng Xiaoping’s reforms and opening era, to the recent rise of the rights defence movement. In Chapter Three, the legal and political context of human rights lawyers in China is discussed, including what kind of rights lawyers work on (in particular social and economic rights, and liberty), what legal and political challenges they face, and the legal institutions and processes involved, with a particular focus on the judiciary. Chapters Four to Six focus on issues faced by human rights lawyers in the courtroom, legal profession (such as All China Lawyers Association and Justice Department, Chapter Five) and various security bureaus respectively. Chapters Seven and Eight discuss the solutions and implications in a broader sense.

The book correctly points out the conflict between liberalism underlying the rights movement and the political roots and ideology of China’s ruling elite. Interestingly, the book challenges the view represented by Randall Peerenboom that the rule of law development is correlated with economic development (pp. 178–181). Among all the issues faced by the human rights lawyers, the Party’s involvement and control of the legal profession has been emphasized. What has been discussed in the chapter on the relationship between rights lawyers and the security apparatus is “eye-opening”, including those measures from soft detention, “chats”, pressure/threat on the family, to forced disappearance and torture. The observation of the concurrent growth of the normative and prerogative state in China captures the complexity of the issue (p. 225).

The book is very interesting, but one of its striking features is that it narrows down human rights lawyers to those who are “at constant risk of being detained, harassed and abused” (p. 1), which excludes those lawyers in China who work in the human rights field but to some extent within the system. It would be worthwhile to understand why different lawyers choose different pathways, and which way would be effective in improving human rights in China in both the short and long term.

reviewed by Sanzhuan GUO
Flinders University of South Australia

International Humanitarian Law

Perpetrators and Accessories in International Criminal Law: Individual Modes of Responsibility for Collective Crimes

by Neha JAIN.

Oxford/Portland: Hart Publishing, 2014. XX + 230 pp. Hardcover: £60.

doi:10.1017/S2044251316000114

Over the last two decades there has been a growing consensus that having international criminal law mechanisms respond to mass crime situations is an effective means to fight against impunity. However, even after a considerable amount of jurisprudence and scholarly work, understanding of certain fundamental issues of international criminal law continues to be beset with relative uncertainty. Neha Jain’s book under review engages with such an issue of fundamental importance: perpetrator and accessorial responsibility. The book is divided into three parts. Part One deals with modes of participation in international criminal law, Part Two focuses on the principal in international criminal law, and Part Three discusses the limits of accessorial responsibility for international crimes.

Despite similarities between domestic crimes and international mass crimes, the latter carry certain specific features. The author rightly identifies these specific features as: their collective nature; their conformity with prevailing social norms; and widespread participation by different levels of participants acting on different motives (p. 6). The author deftly engages with the specific aspects of