

make a strong case for the integration of studies focusing on women's representation into the broader literature on Latin American democracy and on institutions.

Pedro A. G. dos Santos  
College of Saint Benedict  
and Saint John's University

---

Kenneth C. Shadlen, *Coalitions and Compliance: The Political Economy of Pharmaceutical Patents in Latin America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. Figures, tables, appendix, bibliography, index, 320 pp.; hardcover \$88, ebook.

*Coalitions and Compliance* traces the impact of three interrelated processes: the privatization of knowledge through an intellectual property regime, the internationalization and governance of knowledge through TRIPS (trade-related intellectual property rights), and the attendant impact on national development trajectories as a result of a focus on "knowledge-based" development. Detailed case studies of Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico are deployed in a comparative historical analysis that substantiates the thesis that state-level institutional legacies and subsequent path-dependent evolutions of social structures lead to differentiation in policy and associated state institutions; this analysis is conducted in the context of a transition from a world in which knowledge associated with medicines was a public good to a world in which such knowledge became privately owned and controlled (6). *Coalitions and Compliance* thus provides a welcome tonic to a steady diet of studies that (overly) focus on the inexorable logic of globalizing neoliberalism.

The book is split into nine chapters. After a general theoretical framework, a second chapter translates this into the context of pharmaceutical patents. Chapters 3 through 5 deal with the three countries and how they introduced their respective pharmaceutical regimes in the context of changing international patent governance. Chapters 6 through 8 then tackle how these same countries subsequently reformed their pharmaceutical patent regimes. A final chapter offers a synthesis of the previous analysis, as well as suggestions for further and future avenues of research.

Pharmaceutical patents present a particularly interesting case study for analysis of cross-national diversity in the context of the homogenizing forces of globalization. Kenneth Shadlen demonstrates that country-by-country differentiation occurred in two waves: first in the 1990s, when these policies were introduced after the Uruguay Round of the WTO talks; and second in the 2000s, when policies were progressively modified. The former came because of how industrial legacies present at the national level interacted with existing export profiles; the latter as a result of institutional path-dependencies created by form-determined condensations of how those original conflicts were resolved. In other words, existing social structures at the state level interacted with a change to governance at the global level to shape the contours of an initial insertion into the new regime, a process that led to a concomitant evolution in those same social structures, which, in turn, affected the subsequent pattern of compliance.

© 2019 University of Miami  
DOI 10.1017/lap.2019.19

To understand that social structure shapes patterns of state-level compliance to changes in global governance regimes reveals Shadlen's adherence to a form of historical institutionalism—although this is tempered with a significant dose of agent-focused analysis. This is because forms of compliance are not attributable directly to social structure; instead, they are “tied to characteristics of political coalitions that social structure both enables and encumbers” (25). Shadlen emphasizes how political actors' abilities to construct and sustain “supportive coalitions,” or “new constellations of actors” (229), are influenced by changes to social structure: while executives are key players, they do not build coalitions in a political vacuum, as they are intimately related to those very social structures. Thus, “executive agency remains conditioned by social structure” (58).

In Argentina, this manifests itself in what Shadlen terms “market preserving,” or a by-the-book approach. Coalitions evolved to facilitate regulatory changes that helped local firms to adjust to the new status quo of international dominance in the sector. In Brazil, there was a “neodevelopmentalist” response: an adoption of the TRIPS regime that put innovation at the heart of development policy. Coalitions that emerged in this context generated measures to ameliorate the effects of stronger protection. In Mexico, there was an “internationalist” regime: coalitions formed that incited an expanding embrace of new global norms and best practices to attract pharmaceutical FDI. Empirically, Shadlen concludes that

neither Argentina, nor Mexico, nor Brazil had pharmaceutical patents; now each country does, and the subsequent conflicts that take place are about how these countries' new patent systems should function. This narrowing of the terrain of debate and conflict provides further illustration of how international politics have fundamentally changed national policies and political economies. (233)

The book makes three interrelated contributions beyond the valuable empirical detail. First, it contributes to the agent-centered institutionalism literature by mapping the contours of change in social structure and how those changing constellations of interests create or foreclose opportunities for coalition building and subsequently, political action—in this context, Latin American patterns of (non)compliance with a changing international governance regime in pharmaceutical patents.

Second, it contributes to the governance debates that focus on the interaction between different levels of analysis by considering how domestic, state-level coalitions are affected by systemic-level variables. The analysis concludes that through “process tracing” (229), the relative roles of global and domestic spheres in shaping governance structures can be seen to be grounded in a mutually reconstitutive dialectic, with an element of path-dependency present, once the initial condensation of social structures and political coalitions has settled.

The third and final contribution of *Coalitions and Compliance* is the way it integrates the role of policy itself into shifting constellations of actors and interests. This can be understood as a revised formulation of Gourevitch's infamous “second image reversed,” in which entire political economies can be transformed because of earlier external events. In the context of pharmaceutical patents in Latin America, “the

explanatory framework links the outcome of conflicts over tailoring new patent systems to the resolutions of previous conflicts over introducing pharmaceutical patents” (23). This leads Shadlen to conclude that “the relevant question is not if countries comply with TRIPS but rather how they do so” (13).

Christopher Wylde  
St. Mary’s University

---

Erin Beck, *How Development Projects Persist: Everyday Negotiations with Guatemalan NGOs*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017. Illustrations, appendix, notes, bibliography, index, 280 pp.; hardcover \$99.95, paperback \$26.95, ebook.

In this book, Erin Beck presents a useful, rigorous, and interesting analysis of the internal workings of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in Guatemala. Beck convincingly argues that the extant literature on NGOs, and especially microfinance institutions (MFIs), is too general, too abstract, too economic, and too aggregated to identify the most effective approaches to development projects and microfinance. Further, she suggests that in order to determine the most effective approaches to microfinance and other development activities, scholars must understand better how development projects work on the ground. This requires us to look inside development NGOs to understand how they operate on the ground.

Beck’s solution to the failures of the scholarly literature on NGOs—and microfinance institutions in particular—is an in-depth, qualitative, “thick” description of two MFIs working with rural Guatemalan women. Each description, based on extensive fieldwork, emphasizes the varying incentive structures, goals, and belief systems held by NGO donors, workers, and beneficiaries. Beck argues that the on-the-ground impacts of MFIs and other NGOs are substantially driven by these factors, which may contradict or compete with the NGOs’ official goals.

Apparently as part of a most-different-systems research design, Beck studies two organizations with similar goals but very different strategies and ideologies, comparing them in detail to determine how those differences do or do not impact outcomes. Given that there is little evidence that microfinance improves recipients’ standards of living, it is perhaps unsurprising that both NGOs seem to face significant internal difficulties that limit their effectiveness.

The first of these two organizations is the professionally operated and well-organized Namaste Guatemala, an NGO that uses microfinance to pursue economic development in rural Guatemala. Namaste was founded by a successful businessman in the global North, who assumes that microloans can be a powerful tool for economic development because of their ability to harness the supposedly inherent entrepreneurial qualities of all people, including rural Guatemalans. The NGO lends exclusively to women because Namaste’s directors believe that loans are more likely to lead to long-term benefits in women’s hands.

Namaste’s strategies have changed over time. Initially, the organization worked through local (Guatemalan) nonprofits, but gradually came to work directly with