related to ideologies. Therefore, it will serve as a basic resource for libraries in English-speaking universities. Very few dimensions remain untouched by this immense book, although maybe a chapter on anti-Americanism or an essay about the Anglo-Saxon worldview would be relevant for a second edition. This excellent handbook will be essential for students and young professors in political science and all the social sciences, but also in philosophy, media and cultural studies. I am not aware of a more accurate reference book, at least in the English language, in Ideology Studies.

Yves Laberge
(University of Ottawa)


Julius Evola was a thinker whose abstruse thought, enigmatic style and prodigious output have conspired with his reputation as a fascist to his being neglected by English-speaking academics. Filling this lacuna, Paul Furlong provides a clear summary of Evola’s thought that is refreshingly dispassionate in its treatment of views that are unpalatable. Furlong evidences a depth of scholarship by his careful comparison of works and editions of the same work, as well as an awareness of philological issues – though this is done without clouding or hindering the pace of the exposition of the substantial points. A good deal of biographical information is also provided, which is highly useful given Evola’s relative obscurity. This is a strong work and a necessary read for anyone interested in Evola, or the history of anti-Enlightenment thought.

Chapter 2 concerns Evola’s philosophical doctrines, which intimately inform his entire social and political thought. One criticism of this book is that a longer treatment of these doctrines is deserved, given their importance, and perhaps an author with greater philosophical expertise might have been able to present them in a more distinct and thorough manner. Chapter 3 illustrates Evola’s understanding of the importance of tradition and the history of its disappearance in modernity by comparison with the views of René Guénon. Chapter 4 lays out Evola’s doctrines regarding the nature of the state – namely, the total sovereignty of the state, its independence from society and its organic nature. Here Furlong also emphasises the sometimes exasperating negativity of Evola’s prose: ‘Evola can say what he does not mean, much more specifically than what he does mean’ (p. 70). Chapter 5 highlights the differences between Evola and the fascists and Nazis on the issue of nationalism, while Chapter 7 similarly contrasts Evola’s ‘race of the spirit’ (p. 119) with more popular biological racisms. Chapter 6 concerns Evola’s political prescrip-tions for the far right after the Second World War, which is essentially quietist in calling only for apolitia: the ‘irrevocable interior distance from this society and from its “values” ’ (p. 98). However, in addition to this, Evola is shown to be open to the violent acts inspired by his work being committed in contemporaneous Italy.

In the conclusion Furlong convincingly disposes of the claim made by Roger Griffin, and assumed by many others, that Evola is merely a philosopher of fascism, suggesting instead that he should be understood ‘within the context of European conservative thought since 1789’ (p. 145).

Marcus William Hunt
(Queen’s University Belfast)


The book examines the cultural and political background of early twentieth-century theories of political legitimacy elaborated primarily by Georges Sorel, Vilfredo Pareto, Max Weber and Antonio Gramsci. The question it deals with is: how did these great sociologists confront the issue of the political legitimacy of the democratic state? On the one hand, secularisation and the advent of the French Revolution had undermined monarchical rule. On the other, the widespread social changes brought about by industrialisation and urbanisation had led to the formation of working-class parties and unions. Thus, in the nineteenth century, European political elites confronted numerous challenges, including the diffusion and expansion of universal suffrage and the emergence of parliamentary systems of government. It was a time of profound change in which many began to question the traditional underpinnings of the nation state. The theories of the various sociologists are interpreted as the outcome of a process of redefinition of the concept of ‘legitimacy’.
In the section on Weber the author contrasts the concept of ‘political legitimacy’ based upon the permanence, rules and impartiality of bureaucratic authority of modern nation states with ‘charismatic leadership’. For Weber, the latter allowed for the preservation and enhancement of political legitimacy and democracy since the competitive electoral process forges national leaders strong enough to control the bureaucracy. Another excellent chapter is dedicated to Sorel’s concept of ‘legitimacy’. In contrast to Weber, Sorel challenged the legitimacy of parliamentary regimes arguing that true legitimacy rested with the workers and their revolutionary leaders. The chapter on Pareto analyses the relationship between the circulation of elite theory and legitimacy. When, for example, the governing class has made a mess of government, a new elite will step in to replace it. For Pareto, the process was cyclical and inevitable.

In conclusion this is an excellent book outlining a political debate on legitimacy that is still relevant. There are only two problems with it. First, the author tends to describe in more detail than warranted the life and personality of the sociologists in question. Second, the author has failed to include a chapter on Carl Schmitt. He is central to the post-First World War debate on political legitimacy and his exclusion from this work is somewhat troubling. Schmitt argued that democratic constitutional systems such as the Weimar Republic lacked widespread political legitimacy because they permitted the undermining of their foundations by allowing all parties (including anti-democratic parties) an equal chance to obtain political power.

Paolo Morisi  
(Independent Scholar)


Political scientists may find Political Affections: Civic Participation and Moral Theology a difficult read, in part because of the amorphous quality of the subject of affect and identity, and in part because of the unfamiliarity on the part of political scientists with the languages of psychology, neuroscience and theology upon which Joshua Hordern draws. It would be unfortunate if they were dissuaded by this. Political scientists are accustomed to questions of how a given set of ends may be pursued in such a way as either to maximise or to satisfice their attainment, but typically the ends are simply assumed to be given. Hordern asserts that emotions should not simply be dismissed as either inherently irrational or potentially incendiary.

If the so-called ‘democratic deficit’ that is founded in cynicism about politics and exhortations for participation and/or support is to be overcome, it will be necessary, Hordern argues, to consider how political communities are able over time to attract loyalty. He considers some approaches that have been taken. Liberals, approaching the issue from a secular point of view, tend to propose some version of cosmopolitanism. Such an approach has much to commend it, but actual people may find it in the end somewhat thin and abstract. At its best it reminds us of the need to recognise the rights of people with whom we have no connection but a common humanity; at its worst it turns into vacuous rhetoric that might be summed up as ‘we love human-kind; it’s just actual persons we find tedious’. Hordern shows some sympathy for the approach adopted by Roger Scruton in which affection for the near and dear, and for the local, is seen not as an alternative to broader loyalties, but as a necessary first step. Drawing on the Judeo-Christian tradition of moral theology, Hordern suggests that such a tradition has a good deal to say not only about how to inspire loyalty and affect, but how to associate this, unlike the approach conventionally taken in liberal democracies, with joy.

There is much here worth pondering. If Hordern had devoted more attention to relating what he has to say to the debates and literature of political and other social scientists, and if he had elaborated on the role of theological or religious sources in an increasingly pluralist society, Political Affections might have been even better; but it is certainly worth reading, and worth reflecting upon.

James G. Mellon  
(Independent scholar)


This monograph argues for the continuing global relevance of the ‘Gandhian Moment’ to a human