

about Certain Concepts' in the appendix also support this end.

The opening foreword by Suely Rolnik gives an important insight into the context of the book and its format. The book is divided into key themes, all of which are familiar to the regular Guattari reader: culture, subjectivity, politics and territories of desire, among others. One finds interviews and discussions on terms such as 'de-territorialisation', 'multitude', 'desiring-machine' and 'rhizome', all of which are well established in the academic circles of Guattari's works. One also finds the usual Deleuze and Guattari ambiguity of 'remaining Marxists' without being one. From his concept of Integrated World Capitalism and blunt affirmation that 'there is only one culture: capitalistic culture', Guattari still affirms that 'I have never belonged to any religion ... I am not a Catholic or Marxist', when questioned about his relationship to Marxism (p. 33, p. 198). This ambiguity should not lead to a grotesque conclusion, such as one held by Slavoj Žižek that Guattari's work (along with that of Deleuze) ends up supporting capitalism rather than undermining it. It demonstrates how Guattari was aware of the theoretical limits established by classic Marxism, but still saw the dynamic of capitalism as that which should be analysed.

Another interesting aspect of the book is the link to the Brazilian Workers' party (Partido dos Trabalhadores [PT]). The link consists of a conversation between Guattari and Lula (Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva), who was then running for governor of São Paulo State. Guattari also conducted debates at the PT's local branches throughout the country. Thus one finds a Guattari as activist who was engaged with what was one of the most important left-wing party organisations of Latin America at the time. Although originally formatted during the early 1980s, the book still holds conceptual relevance for today's analysis of neo-liberal globalisation and resistance.

Carlos Pessoa
(Saint Mary's University, Canada)

Faith in the Halls of Power: How Evangelicals Joined the American Elite by **D. Michael Lindsay**. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. 352pp., £13.99, ISBN 978 0195326666

Lampooned and lambasted, American Evangelicals contend that they are misrepresented and misunder-

stood. Their complaint has merit. One wonders, for example, how much is contemptuous caricature and how much is fact when *The Times* (8 October 2005) describes Evangelicals as 'God-fearing rednecks from backwoods Kentucky who hunt down gays, see blacks as savages and who generally have lost all capacity for rational thought'. Such obloquy does not deepen our understanding.

Political sociologists are now giving Evangelicals an opportunity to speak for themselves. Rank-and-file voices were heard in Greeley and Hout's *The Truth about Conservative Christians: What They Think and What They Believe* (2006). Now Michael Lindsay lets Evangelical leaders have their day.

How did these leaders, once scorned and shunned, rise to positions of prominence? Rather than speculate, Lindsay asked them. Employing Marie Griffith's 'critical empathy' approach, Lindsay interviewed 360 Evangelical leaders. He emerged three years later with 5,000 transcribed pages in which interviewees convey their experiences and understandings without a distorting lens. The result reveals the 'subtlety and complexity of the lives [Evangelicals] lead and the worlds they inhabit' (p. xiii).

Embracing a common core of beliefs regarding God, the Bible, sin and salvation, Evangelical leaders also share a moral framework which makes 'sense of their lives and endow[s] their work with special meaning' (p. 216). They believe they have a 'spiritual calling' to make a difference in this world. This spiritual motivation accounts for their zeal and their resilience.

Lindsay's key discovery is a divide within Evangelicalism between 'populist' and 'cosmopolitan' leaders. The former mobilise believers; the latter infiltrate established institutions. The former battle secularisation; the latter seek power and status. The former inhabit the Evangelical subculture; the latter operate in mainstream America.

Pat Robertson, James Dobson, Timothy LaHaye, D. James Kennedy and Jerry Falwell are populist leaders. Os Guinness, Richard Mouw, Doug Coe, Michael Gerson and Charles Colson are cosmopolitan leaders. The former direct Evangelical organisations; the latter run in secular circles. The former rely on the bully pulpit; the latter employ 'political influence, academic respectability, creative inspiration, and financial capital' (p. 212). The former are media figures largely identified with the American heartland; the latter are working

professionals residing in New York City, Washington DC and Los Angeles.

While critics and pundits highlight the faults and foibles of populists, cosmopolitans have ingrained Evangelicalism into the fabric of American life through social networking, organisational savvy and strategic philanthropy. Lindsay has done a great service by accurately portraying the leaders of Evangelicalism and explaining their ascendancy into the corridors of power.

David L. Weeks
(Azusa Pacific University)

The Case for Big Government by **Jeff Madrick**. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008. 205pp., £13.50, ISBN 978 0 691 12331 8

This work is a response to and denuding of the conservative axiom that low taxes, free markets and personal liberty are the best description of and prescription for a successful society. The author casts such views as ideological folk wisdom and demonstrates how government is essential for social and economic prosperity.

The book has three parts. Part I questions the empirical validity of the axiom and relates the historical success of big government in America. The author dismantles the carefully crafted studies of conservative scholars, offers empirical evidence of growth among high-tax states and reveals as romantic the historical narrative of *laissez-faire* in nineteenth-century America. He then ties government action to rising growth, opportunity and security to maintain that 'there really is no example of small government among rich nations' (p. 10). Part II tells of the failure of the axiom during the past 35 years of conservative governance. During the economic transformations of these years conservatives ignored the need for government investment and coordination and so created a devastating stagnation that has left current workers with roughly the same (adjusted) earnings as they had in the 1970s. The author views this as 'about as conclusive a proof as history ever provides that the ideology applied in this generation has failed' (p. 126). Part III contains an agenda for change that turns on more spending, taxation and regulation. Due to events, however, it already seems dated and insufficient.

The argument in this book is as useful and important a counterpoint as its delivery is vexing. It presents in a

concise and convincing manner historical, statistical and policy arguments which make it clear that the conservative axiom works only if one ignores the world at large. It expands the lens, in this sense, to render it obvious that wealth flows as much from the government action that makes individual risk possible – the provision of clean air, water, food, education, standardisation, infrastructure and social security for aged parents – as from the individual risk itself. Its content thus makes it a useful work for undergraduate survey courses. Students will groan when they read it, however. To be fair, it is difficult to discuss economic issues in a discrete manner: the issue of low wages relates to the issue of access to health care. It is all interrelated. Even so, to its detriment, this work is remarkably repetitive. Part III, in particular, has a staccato, hurry-up-and-finish sense to it that would be more of a problem if events had not already overtaken the proposed agenda. This book is a useful if at times awkward corrective to the suffocating conservative axiom that government is dangerous and that genuine success in America is a radically individualist achievement.

Matthew Woods
(Independent Scholar)

Between Freedom and Bondage: Race, Party, and Voting Rights in the Antebellum North by **Christopher Malone**. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007. 253pp., £17.99, ISBN 978 0 415 95697 8

Christopher Malone's book can be seen as a well-argued rebuttal of the simplistic yet potent idea of the history of the United States as a history of the unidirectional extension of democracy. Aptly titled *Between Freedom and Bondage*, the book represents a comprehensive attempt to address black enfranchisement in the antebellum North within a larger context of race and American political development. It scrutinises the right to vote for black Americans in great detail in four states (Pennsylvania, New York, Rhode Island and Massachusetts) in the antebellum North. Malone demonstrates that conditions for black Americans were not the same across Northern states; nor were they the same within Northern states over the course of the antebellum period. Furthermore, he demonstrates that disenfranchisement in the antebellum period was not necessarily confined to the Southern states. For instance, Pennsyl-