

This book succeeds in challenging the dominant structuralist paradigm of social movement theory through in-depth case studies of East Asian protest movements. It offers excellent examples of how culture can work independently from structure to mobilize social actors. However, despite the editors' strong insistence that the culture-based approach is the way to go, the many chapters that employ the political opportunity framework weaken such conviction. As such, this book does not disprove the structural-functional framework but cautions against its pervasive use as an explanatory framework. The culturalist approach serves as a contending framework to its structuralist counterpart but does not replace it.

Reading this book, students of social movements will have a much greater appreciation for the role of culture and ideas in the process of contentious politics. Democracy scholars will also learn that civil society is very lively in East Asia—a region often perceived as being dominated by a strong and overbearing state. Social movements that have emerged in the region reflect the changing state-society relations. China is a case in point. Political openings set forth by the post-Mao reforms have led to a surge in protests against the state itself. Recent leaders have been far more wary of suppressing protest movements as they seek to balance economic development and political order.

This book should inspire future generations of students of social movements to take cultural and social dynamics seriously, especially in non-Western societies.

■ *Aim Sinpeng*
Department of Political Science
University of British Columbia

How East Asians View Democracy. Edited by Yun-han Chu, Larry Diamond, Andrew J. Nathan, and Doh Chull Shin. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008. 328 pp. \$55.00 (cloth); \$26.50 (paper).

Modernization theory, originating in the work of Seymour Martin Lipset (1959), argues that economic development will enhance the likelihood of a country establishing and maintaining democracy. East Asia, as one of the world's most economically dynamic regions, presents a different picture for the prediction of modernization theory. The best case would be Singapore, the most economically developed authoritarian state. China, as the new center of economic gravity in the region, provides another strong case against modernization theory. Rapid growth and an ever growing middle class in China do not seem to provide vital momentum for the country to democratize. Why would East Asia be exceptional to

the patterns predicted by modernization theory? This book is intended to answer this puzzle by focusing on the political culture of East Asian countries. More specifically, mass-level political culture may be “a crucial link between economic development and democracy” (p. 2). Francis Fukuyama’s “Asian exceptionalism” (1998) may have more bearing on how east Asians view democracy.

The analysis of political culture in East Asia in *How Asians View Democracy* is based on the East Asian Barometer (EAB), a large-scale collaborative survey study in eight countries within the region, launched in 2000. A standard 125-item core questionnaire was designed, and a national team from each of the eight countries administered the survey to ordinary citizens in their own countries. This pathbreaking initiative toward the study of mass attitudes makes it possible to compare mass attitudes across countries within a region as well as to view the issue in a global context.

Following a brief review of the literature on and empirical study of the emergence and consolidation of democracy, the first chapter provides an East Asian picture of mass belief in democracy legitimacy and also considers the East Asian picture in a global context, including some comparisons with other regions of the world. Each of the following eight chapters examines the common research question on a country-by-country basis. The interpretation of the findings on mass attitudes toward democracy is contextualized on a country’s unique historical and institutional trajectory as well as its changing social and economic conditions. Following a similar structure, new democracies—South Korea, the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and Mongolia—are introduced in order. Mass support for democracy in these new democracies is conditional on the performance of the new democratic regime, especially the regime’s ability to boost economic growth. But the new democratic regimes in these countries are challenged by deficiencies and political turmoil, which could hardly sustain consolidated mass support for democracy. Thus, from the standpoint of mass belief in democracy, these new democracies are still fragile. Three other regimes are compared with the new democracies. Considering democracy on a continuum from consolidated democratic country to nondemocratic country, Japan is presented as an example of a consolidated democratic regime. Hong Kong is a partial democracy lying in the middle of the continuum, while China is an authoritarian state falling on the extreme nondemocracy end of the continuum. When mass attitudes toward democracy are studied from a comparative perspective, the point is clear that “citizens understand democracy differently in different countries and in various ways within any given country” (p. 36). The comparison also reinforces the point that East Asians are open to but not committed to democracy, while commit-

ment to democracy is essential for democracy to take root and consolidate. The mass attitudes toward democracy that have been revealed suggest that it is still a long process for democracy to consolidate in new democracies and to develop in nondemocratic or partial democratic countries in East Asia. A breakthrough point for democracy to take root in East Asia would be that the democratic governments in this region prove the merits of democratic regime by better performance. Summing up the patterns within East Asia and comparing the East Asia patterns with patterns in other regions of the world, through the use of global barometer surveys, the conclusion offers a relatively balanced view. Democracy in East Asia stands “in a twilight zone” (p. 256). The support for authoritarian rule is dwindling, while democracy has not yet earned enough support among the public in East Asia.

The case of China renders some thoughts on the study of the impact of political culture on regime type. Overall, the Chinese were generally at least as supportive of democracy as respondents in other East Asian countries, if not more so. However, the support for democracy does not seem to induce regime transition in China. On the contrary, the Chinese authoritarian system still enjoys a high level of popular support. The sustainability of the Chinese authoritarian system is likely to be a result of successful economic performance and other factors. Political culture alone cannot provide a sufficient explanation for regime transition.

Singapore is missing in the study. As one of the four Asian Tigers, Singapore experienced a similar trajectory of economic development between the 1960s and 1990s, characterized by a high growth rate and rapid industrialization. However, the pattern of political development in Singapore is strikingly different from the other three in that Singapore stands as the only authoritarian state. If economic development is not the reason, political culture could be a potential factor contributing to the sustainability of the authoritarian regime in Singapore. Including Singapore might help support the link between political culture and regime type.

As the first systematic, comparative, large-scale survey study in East Asia, this book offers valuable scholarly understandings with strong empirical evidence on East Asian public opinion regarding democracy. On the whole, the book will be of special interest to scholars and policymakers interested in the development of democracy in East Asia. However, the readership should not be confined to academia and professionals. The general public could also appreciate the book as an introduction to the development of democratization in general as well as specifically in East Asia.

■ *Ting Luo*

Department of Government

London School of Economics and Political Science