

familiar phrases and verbal tics. It is hard not to be impressed by the project's ambition and by the sheer effort that its author puts into understanding his subject.

Ian Hall, Griffith University, Australia

North America

God, guns, and sedition: far-right terrorism in America. By Bruce Hoffman and Jacob Ware. New York: Columbia University Press. 2024. 448pp. £25.00. ISBN 978 0 23121 122 2. Available as e-book.

In the preface of their book, Bruce Hoffman and Jacob Ware detail the germination of the book in 2020 amid pandemic lockdowns and Hoffman's personal experience of a serious hate crime, committed by a British neo-Nazi. The 6 January 2021 insurrection at the United States Capitol added greater urgency to Hoffman and Ware's research. *God, guns and sedition* makes it clear that the threat from far-right terrorism is a present and real danger, not a hypothetical one.

The book weaves together the history of the far right with the web of individuals who came together in support of it and the violence that it has produced in the US. Throughout, the authors refute characterizations of the movement as a new phenomenon. They emphasize the importance of the accelerationism movement that gained traction in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s, whereby society is deemed beyond redemption and so its destruction must be accelerated to impose a new (Christian white supremacist) society and form of governance. Hoffman and Ware also seek to correct misconceptions surrounding the far right's favourite racist novel, William Luther Pierce's *The Turner diaries* (1978). Indeed, snippets from the novel are used as chapter epigraphs that frame this narrative history, giving readers insights into the hateful and violent rhetoric that has long influenced far-right extremism.

The book also positions the far right in a continuum of terrorism, in a subtle and persuasive refutation of David Rapoport's four waves of modern terrorism theory (see Rapoport's chapter, 'The four waves of modern terrorism', in Audrey Kurth Cronin and James M. Ludes's *Attacking terrorism*, Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2004). In chapter four, Hoffman and Ware trace the rekindling of racism from the Ku Klux Klan in the 1870s, its suppression through federal legislation and then its revival in the early twentieth century, to the anti-government militia movement in the 1990s. The authors further support their assertion that the terrorist threat of far-right extremism is far from new when they point to its organizational strategies: both the early adoption in the 1970s and 1980s of networked computer technology and the promotion of leaderless resistance.

The book also examines the US government's failures to effectively combat the far right's growth, particularly in the 1980s and 1990s. Readers looking to understand why successive US government administrations—both Republican and Democrat—were disinclined to take legislative action against the far-right threat of domestic terrorism will find few answers. However, this caveat aside and given the outcome of the recent US election, the authors' policy recommendations remain

critical. Following the elections of Barack Obama and Donald Trump in 2008 and 2016 respectively, hate crimes in the US rose (pp. 125 and 154–5). Given Trump's continued espousal of inflammatory and racist rhetoric and the deep polarization of American society, there is little to suggest that the aftermath of the 2024 election will be different.

The book's later chapters explore the internationalization of the far right. The effective dissemination of online manifestos and livestreaming of attacks of foreign far-right terrorists have become templates for American domestic actors. This use of propaganda and digital myth-making also highlights the broadening appeal of far-right narratives and objectives. There is some risk that the authors replace the stereotype of the far right as poor and uneducated rednecks with one of far-right terrorists as young, depressed or neurodivergent. The discipline of terrorism studies has long debunked suppositions that terrorists are irrational or mentally ill (see Louise Richardson's *What terrorists want*, New York: Random House, 2006). Before the conclusion, Hoffman and Ware provide clear and realistic courses of action that policy-makers could take to counter the far right. The recommendations around social media and algorithm reforms remain relevant, if optimistic (pp. 233–4). Furthermore, designating foreign far-right extremist groups as foreign terrorist organizations would enable security services to prosecute and stymie domestic groups without any legislative changes, and it feels especially pertinent given the authors' observations on the global nature of the far right, the US' reluctance to regulate gun ownership and Hoffman's own personal experience (pp. 237–8).

The book is richly researched and evidenced, with extensive notes and bibliographic references totalling over 150 pages of supplementary material. This provides a defence against disingenuous criticism as well as a repository of knowledge for other scholars. The book could only be enhanced by a dedicated glossary of terms and abbreviations as, at times, the alphabet soup of far-right groups and American security apparatuses verges on overwhelming, but this is a minor complaint. Hoffman and Ware write in an accessible and occasionally wry tone of voice that carries academic authority while maintaining readability.

The book presents a detailed and timely history of the far right and the events leading up to and taking place after the 6 January 2021 insurrection. Policy-makers and researchers will find compelling and actionable arguments and recommendations for limiting burgeoning far-right terrorism—a threat that likely will continue to fester after Trump's 2025 inauguration.

Charlotte Plews

The uncertainty doctrine: narrative politics and US hard power after the Cold War. By Alexandra Homolar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2023. 220pp. £85.00. ISBN 978 1 00935 511 7. Available as e-book.

The uncertainty doctrine takes on the ambitious task of explaining why, despite widespread expectations of change, the end of the Cold War produced continuity rather than a redesign of the United States' defence strategy. Contrary to