due to mechanisms (irreducible to the sheer physical laws of inorganic matter) that display rules or norms for the kind of activities (*e.g.*, cell growth) involving specific entities (*e.g.*, APC gene). Understanding the lawfulness of living organisms then means unearthing the rule-governed behaviour of such entities in given conditions and environments, without yet knowing in advance or having antecedently grasped the rules themselves governing such behaviour. This is the exemplary necessity at work in the lawfulness of the contingent realm of living organisms. After all, it is not the rule itself, but the rule-governed behaviour that matters most. Studying defective organisms is often the best way of investigating such rule-governed behaviour. Contemporary biomedical research is precisely of this nature. Credit should be given to Ginsborg's careful reading of the third Critique for unravelling so far unexplored possibilities in Kant's legacy for contemporary debates in the life sciences, among many other areas.

Notes

1. See, for example, Levy, "What Was the Hodgkin and Huxley's Achievement?"; Kingma, "Situation-Specific Disease and Dispositional Function"; Ankeny and Leonelli, "What's So Special about Model Organisms?"; and Mitchell, "Laws."
2. For example, researchers investigate how amino acids sequencing maps onto functional domains, such as oligomerization. And how anomalous sequencing maps onto diseases, such as polyposis, in the mechanisms underlying the germline mutations of the APC gene responsible for colorectal cancer, for example.

Bibliography

Ankeny, R. A., and S. Leonelli. "What's So Special about Model Organisms?" *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A* 42 (2011): 313–323.

Kingma, E. "Situation-Specific Disease and Dispositional Function." *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*. First published online January (2015). DOI:10.1093/bjps/exu041.

Levy, A. "What Was the Hodgkin and Huxley's Achievement?" *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 65, no.3 (2014): 469–492.

Mitchell, S. "Laws." Chap. 5 in *Biological Complexity and Integrative Pluralism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Michela Massimi
University of Edinburgh
michela.massimi@ed.ac.uk

http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17496977.2015.1060740

Legitimacy and revolution in a society of masses: Max Weber, Antonio Gramsci, and the *fin-de-siècle* debate on social order, by M.F.N. Giglioli, New Brunswick, NJ and London, Transaction Publishers, 2013, pp. 260, US$49.95 (hardback), ISBN 9781412851626

This book seeks to address how the apparently confident political imaginary of Victorian liberalism disintegrated at the end of the nineteenth century, producing the more complex and contingent vision of the relationship between modern society and political legitimacy which characterised the early twentieth century. Matteo Giglioli's account of this shift hinges on demonstrating an evolutionary development across six case studies in continental political thought spanning from the 1870s to 1920s. After a first chapter that treats fin-de-siècle France in a general way, taking in Ernest Renan, Hippolyte Taine, and especially Gustave Le Bon, much of the book consists of

more conventional authorial studies. The following chapters accordingly address in turn Vilfredo Pareto, Georges Sorel, and Antonio Labriola, before concluding with a chapter each on Max Weber and Antonio Gramsci, who are here viewed as the culmination of the preceding debates.

At its broadest level, then, this book makes a case for continuity across the First World War, stressing that late-nineteenth-century figures such as Sorel or Labriola were "archetypal" of the modern debates over political legitimacy that followed in the twentieth century. Giglioli's more specific argument is that fin-de-siècle writers' re-examination of the bases of legitimacy emerged from particular historical conditions, chief among which ranked the confrontation of intellectual elites with the "society of masses" after the Paris Commune, whether through political organisation, agitation, or violence. What differentiated this new generation of writers from the earlier Restoration tradition of thinking on legitimacy, associated with say Louis de Bonald or Donoso Cortés, was that their approaches were fundamentally secular and social-scientific. Rather than something to be restored or validated, legitimacy became something unstable, constructed and maintained by social movements, political institutions, or governing elites.

Giglioli's contention that the six writers under discussion represent a coherent intellectual conjuncture is ultimately persuasive, and the originality of the book lies not so much in its individual chapters as in the effort to situate them alongside one another. The opening chapter on anti-democratic thought in the Third Republic offers few surprises, and its narrative that ties together decadence, race theory, and fears of the crowd will be familiar to readers of Robert Nye or Zeev Sternhell. Moving on from these French roots, he is perceptive about the connection between Pareto's notion of the circulation of elites and Sorel's cycles of revolution and myth. Both were pessimistic about the prospects of enduring legitimacy, which they saw as episodic, and grounded to some extent in nonrational forces. By contrast with these more original approaches to the problem of legitimacy and socialisation, Labriola represents an alternative path which, grounded by a dogmatic faith in historical materialism, viewed working-class solidarity as a purely rational and objective feature of the modern economy. In the early twentieth century, there emerged two comprehensive attempts to solve the "dilemma of legitimacy" that had been raised by these thinkers: Weber's charisma and Gramsci's hegemony. These intellectual giants are offered as "twin pillars of reflection on legitimacy in a society of masses," with Weber and Gramsci exploring the limits of liberalism and revolution, respectively. Giglioli concludes that the crisis of ideology of progress associated with the fin-de-siècle had "no automatic theoretical implications," and that shifting our focus away from the Weimar Republic and the turbulent thirties allows us to see quite how many ingredients of interwar thought were already in place at the turn of the century.

Consistent with his emphasis on the centrality of context, Giglioli takes a biographical approach that offers valuable background into the intellectual and professional trajectories of each writer that he treats. This is effective in, for example, the chapter on Labriola, whose sparring emerges as a peculiarly Italian manifestation of the general debate on Marxist revisionism. In the chapter on Pareto, however, Giglioli's extended and occasionally amusing critique of the elite theorist's "Apollinean detachment" left this reader longing for a more protracted exposition of his ideas, which are discussed without being very clearly explained. Reading the book as a whole, one is impressed by how Giglioli's comparative approach allows him to tease out important common themes. These include the repeated emphasis on what Renan called "intellectual and moral reform" as a vital solution to problems of mass participation. Related to this is the heavy consideration given by many of these thinkers to the role of the intellectual or revolutionary "fellow-traveller" vis-à-vis the state and social movements. Ultimately, the most controversial aspect of Giglioli's work will probably be that his account insists on the importance of context and yet relegates the two most obvious contexts into the background: the First World War (which simply "added an enormous amount of violence" into the intellectual mix) and the rise

of fascism. This is because, in Giglioli's account, the weakness of modern legitimacy had already been thoroughly exposed by the fin-de-siècle intellectual tradition that his book unpacks. Giglioli's early end-point might also be seen as an effort to shine the historiographical light away from Carl Schmitt, a figure who looms so large in recent scholarship.

This is in the end an impressively wide-ranging study that offers detailed appreciations of a range of continental political traditions in several languages. It brings together familiar figures under a new aegis – legitimacy – which allows us to perceive some fresh elements and common structures in their thought. Specialists on the particular national cases of France, Germany, or Italy will be stimulated by the book's comparative frame, and those working on either side of the First World War will want to engage with its account of the intellectual affinities that transgressed it. Although the density of Giglioli's prose may prove challenging to undergraduates, the case-study structure lends the book to those teaching any of the individual writers or texts discussed, while in each case the biographical approach provides non-specialists with a valuable angle of approach.

ORCID

Robert D. Priest http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8729-6497

Robert D. Priest
Royal Holloway, University of London
robert.priest@rhul.ac.uk

http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17496977.2015.1046766

Believe and destroy: the intellectuals in the SS war machine, by Charles Ingrao, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2013, 432 pp., £25.00 (hardback), ISBN 978-0745660264

Since the mid-1990s previously popular depictions of Nazi perpetrators as either pathological sadists or naïve bureaucrats have been widely replaced by nuanced studies that inquire into social and psychological settings – situations – or unfold the complicated ideological background – dispositions – that made otherwise ordinary men, and sometimes also women, commit mass murder. No consensus has yet been reached about the question, which situations and dispositions mattered most and how they might be combined in order to explain why the Holocaust perpetrators did what they did. While in the 1990s this controversy, most prominently represented by Christopher Browning and Daniel Goldhagen, revolved around "ordinary" German men, for example, police officers who had not volunteered for their genocidal tasks in the East and had no strong Nazi background, Ingrao's book probes into the core group of dedicated Holocaust perpetrators, the academically educated leaders of the mobile killing units in the Nazi occupied East, Himmler's infamous SS *Einsatzgruppen*. *Believe and Destroy* unfolds the surprisingly straightforward careers of 80 of these intellectuals, most of whom had joined the SS before or soon after 1933 at a very young age to then eagerly carry out the Nazi genocidal project that was to guarantee Germany's resurrection as a racist superpower ruling over and terrorizing the European continent and possibly the world.

Organized as a collective biography, the book traces in its first section the youth of these 80 men during and after World War I and in the revisionist, bellicose, and racist climate of the 1920s