and takes over in order to initiate dictatorship, as well as their organized support base" (p. 3). The nature of the group that seizes power shapes the strategic dilemmas that aspiring dictators have to solve. For example, if the seizure group is riven by factions (say, among ethnic groups or clans), then this gives dictators more discretion to amass personal power than they would have in the context of a unified seizure group (see Chapter 4).

The implicit theme is that authoritarian politics is the politics of survival. The politics of an institution such as the military, in other words, is about the fact that militaries contain specialists in violence who have a particular capacity for overthrowing dictators. The politics of a legislature is about how that legislature promotes the dictator's interests. And so forth. This tight focus on survival is clarifying, in that it provides a common optic for understanding the various things that authoritarian regimes do. It is also common among related "big picture" treatments of authoritarian regimes (see, e.g., Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson, *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, 2006; Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Alastair Smith, Randolph Siverson, and James Morrow, *The Logic of Political Survival*, 2003; Jennifer Gandhi, *Political Institutions under Dictatorship*, 2008; and Milan Svolik, *The Politics of Authoritarian Rule*, 2012). It might strike some readers as excessively spare, however. Readers who are interested in how authoritarian regimes create development policy, how they propagandize, or how they build national identity will have few tools from this book to work with, aside from the entry point that however those things happen, the dictator's calculus of political survival will matter. Still, that is not such a bad way to start, even if it does not get us very far on its own.

Turning to the core empirical chapters, what distinguishes this book from the other books on authoritarian politics cited is its breadth. So the seizure group is the main conceptual move, and the logic of survival is always at play, but arguments do not cumulate as tightly as they do in other treatments. There is not a single, underlying theoretical model; instead, Geddes, Wright, and Frantz build their case through an accumulation of smaller verbal theories and lots of evidence. In exchange for parsimony, the authors have opted for explanatory capacity, and by collecting data that no one else has on all sorts of variables that other authors have not yet measured, they are able to test more claims and fill out more features of authoritarian rule. Other researchers interested in these variables will surely have an opportunity to build on the findings in this book.

At the same time, the individual chapters can be unsatisfying. Verbal theories are presented in terms of tendencies, and supported by evidence about how things usually work. But some regimes are exceptional, and those exceptions fall under the authors' radar. For example, dictators tend to create parties in order to marginalize the military (Chapter 5), but other pathways to party creation (in those cases where parties are created when the theory indicates that they are not needed) are not explored.

Taken together, *How Dictatorships Work* is most effective in discussing dictatorships that come to power through coups and dictators who personalize their rule. That the former is the most common way that dictatorships come to power is helpful—the book explains a lot. That personalization has never been so carefully and consistently measured across regimes and across time gives the authors a window into the dynamics of authoritarian rule that few other treatments have. But other cases that do not comport to the general tendencies found in the data are not so easy to understand through the authors' framework, and some of these are interesting cases. The book has surprisingly little to say about the USSR, or about politics in countries ruled by communist parties or even mass-mobilizational parties like UMNO in Malaysia, the PAP in Singapore, the KMT (Kuomintang) in Taiwan, or the CCM in Tanzania. It is better at dictators like Kwame Nkrumah, Augusto Pinochet, and Islam Karimov; a peek at the index reveals more mentions of Mobutu Sese Seko and Gamel Abdel Nasser than of the Soviet Union, and most discussions of China focus on personalism over time rather than the structure and organization of the Chinese Communist Party.

A final point concerns changes over world-historical time. At various points the authors present findings over time (postseizure party creation from 1945 to 2010 [p. 114], elections and coup attempts from 1950 to 2010 [p. 180], personalism and democratization from 1950 to 2010 [p. 212]). Yet they do not focus on how changes in the international system might condition their theoretical approaches to the ways in which regimes work, opting instead to interpret differences across time periods as affecting the stock of regimes that emerge; that is, the post–World War II period is a period that generated many new regimes that did not yet have parties (p. 114). If "how dictatorships work" is timeless, this is fine. If dictatorships work differently depending on the world around them, then there is more to explore. Happily, Geddes, Wright, and Frantz have provided us with new data and a coherent theoretical approach from which to begin that exploration.

Voter Behavior in Indonesia Since Democratization: Critical Democrats. By Saiful Mujani, R. William Liddle, and Kuskridho Ambardi. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018. 286p. $99.99 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S1537592719000306

— Edward Aspinall, *Australian National University*

This book presents the first systematic analysis of voter behavior in what, over the last 20 years, has been the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592719000306 Published online by Cambridge University Press

world's third most populous democracy: Indonesia. Throughout that period, the literature on Indonesian politics has been wide-ranging, including a myriad of studies on such topics as the role of the military, Islam and politics, ethnic conflict, subnational variation, social movements, and the like. The overarching framework for much of this literature has been provided by debates about democratic transition and consolidation. Although it touches on this framework, the book reviewed here, by contrast, is one of the first to treat Indonesia as a normal democracy. It does so by drilling down into why Indonesian citizens vote the way they do, and by framing its analysis by reference to wider concerns about the drivers of voter behavior. In doing so, it sets out to bring knowledge of the Indonesian case into dialogue with comparative research on electoral politics and voter behavior in more established democracies.

The authors are well placed to write such a study. Saiful Mujani and Kuskridho Ambardi are two of Indonesia's leading public opinion specialists, both having been at the forefront of the rapid evolution of opinion polling in Indonesia from a cottage industry two decades ago into a sophisticated, competitive, and agenda-setting enterprise in the contemporary period. R. William Liddle is one of the most respected comparativists working on Indonesia, with a body of work going back half a century. This is a formidable group to throw light on Indonesian voting patterns. In doing so, they also draw on a truly impressive stock of national survey data they have accumulated since 1999, which allows them to systematically assess Indonesians' attitudes to democracy, their political participation, and their preferences for parties and leaders across four national electoral cycles. Most of the surveys they draw upon were administered in association with Indonesia's five-yearly national legislative elections (the first of which during the current democratic era was in 1999) and direct presidential elections (the first of which was in 2004).

In assessing the vast amount of data they have accumulated, Mujani, Liddle, and Ambardi advance as their framing argument an analysis that Indonesian voters are, on the whole, "critical democrats" (a term they adapt from Pippa Norris) who are generally supportive of democracy as an ideal, but often critical of how it is implemented in their country, and whose attitudes to democracy, electoral participation, and voting choices are best explained by "political economy" (the authors' term) factors, especially evaluations of governmental economic performance. Participation and voter choices are, in general, greatly affected by voters' assessments of how the economy is performing and of their own economic circumstances. In particular, the authors point out, better-educated voters tend to more strongly value democracy and critically assess governmental performance; they have also become more likely to abstain from voting and other forms of political participation over time. Overall, the authors argue, "participation in Indonesian elections rests on conservative social forces: citizens who are religious, rural, and older" (p. 132).

In contrast to their emphasis on the effects of governmental performance, the authors find that sociological factors, notably those related to social class and religion, are on the whole less predictive of democratic attitudes, voter choice, and engagement—though they identify many important exceptions to this general rule. Overall, the picture they paint is consistent with qualitative studies of Indonesia's party system that have explained how—despite the continuing presence of several Islamic parties—parties in general have become increasingly dealigned from underlying social constituencies since the beginning of the new democratic era. They show that voters are more interested in individual leaders than in programs (p. 34) and have become dramatically less identified with political parties over time: In 1999, 86% of respondents reported feeling close to a party; by 2014 that figure had dropped to 9% (pp. 186–88).

Along the way, the authors make a host of observations that will be of interest to comparativsts. For example, they delve deeply into the effects of Muslim religiosity on voting behavior, showing that "[p]ious Muslims who regularly carry out the obligations of their religion tend to be more active politically" (p. 79), contradicting claims by Samuel Huntington and others that Muslim religiosity does not support democratic participation. They show that religion drives political participation through a pattern of civic voluntarism: Religiously observant Muslims are more likely to be engaged in a host of religiously linked social activities and networks and, through these, are drawn into political life. This pattern is consistent with experiences in North America and Western Europe. On the other hand, they also find that the relationship between religiosity and religious parties is far from straightforward: "The number of pious Muslims is expanding but support for Muslim parties is shrinking" (p. 233).

Although the primary goal of Mujani, Liddle, and Ambardi is not to interrogate the light thrown by voting behavior on the stability and consolidation of Indonesia's democracy, many of the findings are highly relevant in this regard. For example, though they point out that once controlled for other factors, education turns out to have had relatively little effect on voter choice through Indonesian elections, there was one significant exception: the authoritarian-populist presidential candidate Prabowo Subianto, who was strongly supported by better-educated voters in 2014 (p. 144). When taken alongside other indicators of growing alienation among middle-class voters, this finding is surely suggestive of the potential for Indonesia's "critical democrats" to support

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592719000306 Published online by Cambridge University Press

authoritarian alternatives, in a pattern consistent with developments in many countries in our contemporary populist age.

Voting Behavior in Indonesia Since Democratization is a formidable achievement. The authors have provided such a rich array of data and analysis that it warrants being viewed as a foundational text in the study of Indonesian voting patterns. (Indeed, they say that they seek to do for Indonesian political studies what Angus Campbell et al.'s *The American Voter* (1960) did for studies of voting in the United States.) The book will be the key starting point for future studies of electoral dynamics in Indonesia, and a rich resource for comparativists seeking to understand voter behavior in Muslim societies, new democracies, and more generally.

Comparative Area Studies: Methodological Rationales and Cross-Regional Applications. Edited by Ariel I. Ahram, Patrick Köllner, and Rudra Sil. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. 320p. $99.00 cloth, $29.95 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592719000719

— Jefferey M. Sellers, *University of Southern California*

As the field of the discipline devoted to empirical inquiry into the full range of political experience, comparative politics has long had to accommodate aspirations toward a universal science of politics with the vast diversity of political contexts across time and space. Both postwar modernization theory and the rational choice theory of the 1990s challenged the institutionalized traditions of area studies that have continued to support interdisciplinary scholarship based on knowledge of specific languages, cultures, and histories. However detailed or extensive contemporary global data sets may become, analysis of them invokes the same dilemmas. Among the world regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where most people live, the profound divergences in historical experiences and contemporary societies make these tensions especially acute. In this volume, political scientists from Europe and the United States discuss and debate how to adapt inherited approaches to comparison to grapple with these divergences.

The editors and contributors argue for what they call "Comparative Area Studies," a fusion of context-sensitive comparison within world regions with comparison of similar contexts outside of that region. On the one hand, they argue that comparisons should be grounded in contextual knowledge of some country or region, including aspects of the history, language, culture, and society beyond those that have usually been the focus of political science itself. On the other hand, cross- or interregional comparisons are seen as providing a way to understand both how political phenomena within a single world region may be distinctive, and the more general properties of those phenomena. At points, the volume reads as a sophisticated restatement of the conventional wisdom about contextual variation that continues to shape the choice of cases for comparison. As the editors note in their introduction (p. 17), comparisons within single regions continue to dominate the multimethod and case study scholarship that remains the mainstay of the comparative field.

The main thrust of the volume, however, is to offer a variety of rationales, protocols and examples for comparisons that extend between world regions with distinct cultures and histories. Essays by Dirk Berg-Schlosser, Laurence Whitehead, Christian von Soest and Alexander Stroh, and Rudra Sil lay out numerous ways in which cases from culturally and geographically distinct regions can be leveraged to broaden the reach of theory and testing. Summaries of monographic studies highlight diverse examples of contextualized cross-regional comparison: election law reform in Europe and the United States (Amel Ahmed), anticorruption campaigns in Russia and China (Cheng Chen), separatism in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East (Benjamin Smith), natural-resource booms and institution building in Latin America and Africa (Ryan Saylor), and local production models in Wenzhou, China, and among immigrants from that region to Italy (Calvin Chen). Essays by Mikko Huotari and Jürgen Rüland and André Bank draw on the examples of Southeast Asia and the Arab Spring to demonstrate how regionwide comparisons with the rest of the world can illuminate transnational commonalities within a single region.

At the same time, the collaborators emphasize careful attention to context. They contrast their approach with mixed methods that start from analyses of global databases, or from abstract analytical narratives. The comparative case studies showcase impressive demonstrations of numerous ways in which contextual variations among world regions have been deployed to generate, develop, and validate theories. Each project is also grounded in primary research, usually including fieldwork or the gathering of archival evidence, in at least one of the regional contexts. The contributors make a strong case that this empirical depth has been essential to solidly grounded new scholarly findings. Readers interested in the details of how the authors deploy this strategy of contextualized research will also find it useful to consult the full monographic versions of the case studies summarized in the volume.

Despite this common agenda, the approaches of the contributors to comparison diverge along key dimensions. As Sil notes in his concluding essay, area-sensitive comparisons can draw on various levels of expertise about regional political contexts and a range of approaches to knowledge that vary from nomothetic to idiographic. The comparative projects highlighted include a comparative ethnographic study (Calvin Chen) as well as macro-historical case studies (Cheng Chen, Smith, Saylor).

The frameworks the contributors adopt for comparison also treat the properties of the areas they study in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592719000306 Published online by Cambridge University Press