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 prescriptions 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’.
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