Review
Reviewed Work(s): Fascism: Past, Present and Future by Walter Laqueur
Review by: Roger Eatwell
Source: *The Historian*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (FALL 1998), pp. 201-202
Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24450125
Accessed: 19-11-2024 14:31 UTC

Kleinman argues that the birth of an heir to the throne was the pivotal event in the queen's life. When it became clear that Anne would preside as regent during the minority of her son, her status further improved as old and new friends began to court her. Even before the death of Louis XIII in 1643, Anne shrewdly made plans for the transition to the regency. She disappointed her friends by *not* blindly retaliating against Richelieu's creatures and stunned the Spanish ambassador by *not* seeking a quick end to hostilities with Spain. Instead, she protected the interests of France and protected her son's inheritance—prompting them to surmise that she had changed and was now capable of acting dispassionately and independently. The evidence of her own letters to Mazarin shows that she loved him platonically, but few believed that was the case. Kleinman cautiously concludes that the nature of Anne's personal relationship with Mazarin—as well as their working relationship—must remain enigmatic for lack of documentation. In fact, the author writes, there is much circumstantial evidence to argue against even a love affair.

In the eyes of Anne, the Fronde was simply a rebellion that compromised royal authority and promoted disobedience to her son. When the civil war came to an end and peace returned to the kingdom, however, Anne and Mazarin again did not seek vengeance. The two of them presided over the education of the young king and eventually arranged for his marriage to the Spanish infanta, Maria-Theresa, a union that served as capstone to peace concluded in 1659 between the weary combatants. At the time of the marriage ceremony, Anne said to her brother, King Philip IV of Spain: "I think your Majesty will pardon me for having been such a good Frenchman: I owed it to the king, my son, and to France" (271). Philip said he understood and respected her for it. Having safeguarded her son's inheritance, Anne died in 1665, fulfilled in what she perceived as her primary duty. In the eyes of Louis XIV, his mother's merit was so great that words could hardly do it justice. He wrote that "the plain account of [her] actions given by history will always far surpass whatever they have been able to say in her praise" (288). Kleinman's scholarly, entertaining biography likewise deserves praise for having restored this neglected historical figure to the forefront of our historical inquiry.

University of Texas at Arlington Steven G. Reinhardt

Fascism: Past, Present and Future. By Walter Laqueur. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. Pp. 263. $25.00.)

The author of this study has been one of the most respected scholars of fascism for more than a generation. As a polymath, whose other interests include Eastern Europe and terrorism, he is unquestionably well-equipped to write this wide-ranging book. It is organized around three main sections. The first of these, on "Fascism," mainly covers classic fascism in Germany and Italy. The second, on "Neofascism," largely deals with Western Europe, though there is some discussion of wider phenomena, such as skinheads. The third, on "Postfascism," deals especially with "clerical fascism" in the Third World, and the new radical nationalists like Zhirinovsky who have emerged in post-communist states.

Perhaps inevitably, given this broad canvas, there is, at times, a certain haziness in Walter Laqueur's brush strokes. One concern is the lack of any clear definition of subject matter. The issue is crucial, because some notable scholars have argued that Italian Fascism and German National Socialism were notably different. Moreover, linking Islamic Fundamentalism to fascism, which was in general hostile to organized religion, needs to be argued very carefully if it is not to appear as a latter-day form of the totalitarian argument, where the main object is to damn by association. Nor is there any overarching specific theory of why fascism succeeded or failed. Indeed, at times the argument seems somewhat contradictory. Thus, at one point the author claims that fascism was in general a movement of the lower middle class, but shortly afterwards he notes that in 1932 the Nazis polled more working-class and unemployed votes than the Social Democrats and Communists combined. Coming up to date, Laqueur gives little inkling as to why Jean-Marie Le Pen's Front Nationale could by 1995 control three French municipalities and have an opinion-poll standing that had risen to nearly twenty percent other than a general stress on hostility to immigrants. At times, there are surprising factual errors or misleading statements. For instance, the leader of the British Union of Fascists, Sir Oswald Mosley, is described as having been sentenced to a long period of imprisonment; in fact, he was released from internment before the war had ended and by 1947-1948 had set up a neo-fascist party. More seriously, Laqueur claims that sooner or later all the left-wing elements in Italian and German fascism were suppressed, failing to bring out the return to radicalism in the program of the Salò Republic (1943-1945), a phase that he vaguely describes as very similar in inspiration to Nazi Germany.

However, it must be stressed that this book is aimed primarily at the general reader, who is unlikely to be interested in the more esoteric discussions carried out by academics about definitions and theory. Such a reader is also likely to be uninterested in the kind of detail required by university students and unconcerned by the absence of more than a handful of references to chase up. Laqueur has written to provoke thought and to highlight that the next major wave of fascism will not exactly mirror the content and form of earlier varieties. As such, it is a book that can be recommended highly.

University of Bath Roger Eatwell

John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, 1504-1553. By David Loades. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Pp. xi, 333. $80.00.)

Since Henry VIII's son, Edward VI, did not live to maturity, his short reign was dominated by his regents, Protector Somerset (1547-1549) and the Duke of Northumberland (1549-1553). The character of these two men has been the subject of historical debate for years. The old view, stated by A. F. Pollard, and still found in W. K. Jordan's two-volume study of Edward's reign, completed in 1970, is that Somerset was an appealing liberal, who was sincere in his Protestant convictions but sadly unable to cope with the rebellions and divisions that erupted in 1549, while Northumberland was an ambitious schemer, motivated primarily by hope of personal gain. These judgments were challenged by M. L. Bush's monograph