

security, or business between 1970 and 2003. Although the level of violence was low compared to that committed by nationalist terrorist groups of the same era, such as the Irish Republican Army (IRA) or Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA), it left an indelible mark on the psyche of the countries experiencing it and proved treacherously difficult to uproot.

Cognizant of the limitations of the data given the small number of observations and overall limited degrees of freedom, Sánchez-Cuenca engages in very careful analysis using historically and theoretically informed measurement strategies and well-thought-through mechanisms associated with each variable. It is this deep historical knowledge that helps the reader contextualize and fully appreciate the quantitative findings. The book complements cross-national analysis with some excellently curated case studies: it covers the four main cases of revolutionary terrorism: Italy, Spain, Japan, and Germany; the two minor ones, Greece and Portugal; and two deviant cases, those of France and the United States. All the case material is well written, with the Italy case being quite exceptional.

Although Sánchez-Cuenca examines the role of political activism, labor conflict, and strike volume in the 1960s and 1970s in setting revolutionary terrorism alight, these events do not explain why violence erupted in some cases and not others. He argues instead that the explanation lies in the interwar years, where differences in developmental paths were most pronounced. In the highly volatile political and economic situation that followed the end of World War I and the disintegration of old empires, two broad clusters of countries emerged: liberal and nonliberal. Even though these countries converged politically and economically after World War II, they followed diverging paths in the interwar period.

A crucial point in the argument is that state legitimacy was lower in the circles of the Radical Left when the country had a nonliberal past, because the Left was severely repressed. Specifically, societies that did not respect an individual's autonomy as it related to his or her family and social group went through a nonliberal trajectory during the interwar years and experienced lethal revolutionary terrorism starting in the 1970s. Endogeneity is undoubtedly always a problem in the analysis of the interplay between culture and institutions, so the author is careful to correlate individualism with exogenous variables using family and grammar rules that were fixed in medieval times.

Even though the book is very much centered on the role of history, it is not about historic determinism. Rather, it discusses the historic conditions in the interwar period that mattered in turning late 1960s Radical Left movements violent, rather than using the role of history as a treatment in the causal sense. Although my work focuses on the endogenous dynamics of violence (see Fotini Christia, "Following the Money: Muslim versus Muslim in Bosnia's

Civil War," *Comparative Politics*, 40 [4], 2008; and *Alliance Formation in Civil Wars*, 2012) and opts for a more constructivist take on the way violence erupts and escalates, I really appreciate the degree of historical grounding in Sánchez-Cuenca's discussion of the role of exogenous factors. The book is at its best when highlighting that revolutionary terrorism is a result of short-term events, as well as long-term macrolevel processes of political and economic development associated with the interwar years.

Concurring with a quote from a leading member of the Red Brigades that the people who joined terrorist groups in the 1970s were "the last revolutionaries of the affluent world and the least likely to succeed" (p. 12), the author at the end of the book suggests that we have seen the end of the cycle of revolutionary terrorism of the Left in affluent countries. That got me wondering about radical leftist and anarchist groups that have been active during the recent years of austerity in Europe. Such groups as Rouvikonas or the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire in Greece, among other violent activities, have sent bomb packages through the mail to organizations across the EU. Would their activity suggest that revolutionary terrorism of the sort depicted in the book is actually still alive in Europe? What is it about austerity that may have worked as a fuse much like the protests and labor strikes of 1968 did? Is the variation in such revolutionary terrorism across Europe during the austerity years still explained by the experience in the interwar years, or is this a distinct phenomenon that should be conceptualized differently? Is the book's argument purely retrospective?

When I was reading this book in mid-January 2020, the news cycle in Greece was dominated by reports of the near-deaths of security forces trying to evacuate buildings occupied by radical leftists and anarchists. In their resistance they were catapulting police officers with slabs of concrete and bags of human excrement. Revolutionary terrorism is dead. Long live revolutionary terrorism?

Decentralized Governance and Accountability: Academic Research and the Future of Donor Programming.

Edited by Jonathan A. Rodden and Erik Wibbels. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. 310p. \$100.00 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592720000420

— Anjali Thomas , Georgia Institute of Technology
anjalitb3@gatech.edu

Decentralized Governance and Accountability is an edited volume whose stated purpose is to harness lessons from academic research on decentralization, with the aim of facilitating the exchange of knowledge between academics and international aid practitioners to inform future donor programming. The volume is organized around ten substantive chapters; each explores a key thematic question

related to decentralized governance. In an effort to serve the interests of policy makers, the editors Jonathan Rodden and Erik Wibbels identified these themes in close collaboration with USAID's Center of Excellence on Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance. The substantive focus of these chapters is wide ranging. Some address older long-standing questions, such as those about the relative merits of expenditure versus revenue decentralization and of subnational elections versus appointment. Other chapters address issues that have garnered significant attention relatively recently, such as how traditional leaders affect governance outcomes, as well as the effects of the proliferation of subnational administrative jurisdictions. The volume concludes with a chapter authored by three applied researchers offering a "practical postscript" that sheds light on the conditions shaping the potential for the uptake of academic research findings by policy makers and practitioners, particularly in the context of USAID organizations.

Although the insights offered by the volume are numerous, I discuss here three main contributions of *Decentralized Governance and Accountability*. First, the volume advances our understanding of the specific conditions under which decentralized governance is likely to lead to positive outcomes and when, why, and how it may result in adverse consequences. Second, the volume sheds light on the relative merits of different strategies pursued by donors working in a decentralized context. Third, it lays out an agenda for future research and specifies areas where collaboration between scholars and practitioners is likely to be especially useful and mutually beneficial. In the rest of the review, I elaborate on these contributions.

Decentralized governance has spurred a range of consequences—some beneficial, some mixed, and some adverse. Under what conditions does each type of consequence result? One of the main strengths of this volume is that each of the contributors is able to successfully move beyond the clichéd and uninformative assertion that "context matters" to elaborate on how specific contextual factors interact with the social or institutional features of interest to shape key outcomes. For example, two contributors point to the importance of information and monitoring on the part of citizens in shaping the effectiveness of subnational elections in generating government responsiveness (Guy Grossman) and of decentralized governance in promoting better business performance (Edmund Malesky). Other contributors emphasize the importance of the structure of communities, such as the density of social networks (Wibbels), the embeddedness of traditional leaders in their communities (Kate Baldwin and Pia Raffler), and local ethnic diversity (Thad Dunning). Meanwhile, Christopher Carter and Alison Post shed light on the importance of political competitiveness in shaping the performance of elected municipal government in providing urban services, arguing that such

competition can lead not only to greater inclusion but also to excessive pressure to keep service fees low, thereby undermining efforts to maintain or expand existing infrastructure.

One adverse outcome of decentralization emphasized in several chapters is the reinforcement of clientelism and patronage. For example, Jan Pierskalla highlights how the creation of new administrative units at the subnational level often gives higher-level elites new opportunities for allocating patronage to local power brokers. Meanwhile, Dunning and chapter coauthors Gianmarco León and Leonard Wantchekon highlight how political decentralization in weak institutional environments can reinforce clientelistic networks and promote upward accountability to officials and party members at higher levels of government, rather than downward accountability. This discussion resonates with my own work (Anjali Thomas Bohlken, *Democratization from Above: The Logic of Local Democracy in the Developing World*, 2016), in which I argue that upward accountability is exacerbated when local governments have low levels of fiscal autonomy—a situation that leaves elected local officials highly dependent on party members at higher levels of government for resources. Thus, as several contributors highlight, party structure and organization also often play an important role in shaping the extent to which decentralization leads to upward rather than downward accountability.

The second contribution of the volume is to offer interesting and novel insights about the relative merits of different approaches to decentralized governance taken by donor programs. For example, based in part on his own findings on the role that parties play in influencing local governance outcomes in several Indian states, Dunning highlights how the efforts of donor agencies to strengthen political parties at the local level may not always be beneficial for local governance. Meanwhile, Baldwin and Raffler conclude that, although policies that exclude or disempower traditional leaders are rarely optimal, donors' decisions to support and recognize traditional governance institutions could, under some conditions, make traditional leaders less dependent on their communities. Thus, they recommend that donors conduct a careful evaluation of the downward accountability and embeddedness of traditional leaders when developing their strategy toward traditional leaders and institutions. Wibbels also concludes that donors should take into account the structure of social networks when designing projects, either by implementing interventions that seek to change the nature of the social networks themselves or that take into account the opportunities and constraints that the existing social network structure provides.

Lastly, the volume does an excellent job of laying out a research agenda on decentralized governance, paying special attention to those areas that would likely serve the interests of both academics and practitioners. For example,

Rodden argues that, rather than focusing on the effects of local taxation, which often proves difficult to implement, scholars should explore more common but less academically studied forms of informal local revenue mobilization that are tightly linked to the provision of specific goods and services. Other contributors pay special attention to the design of experiments. For example, in Fotini Christia's review, she argues that, although community-driven development programs in postconflict settings often comprise a bundle of interventions, donors should implement the different component interventions separately both to allow better identification of the effects of individual interventions and to facilitate implementation and delivery. Suggestions such as these are useful, because they not only focus on gaps in knowledge but also pay heed to the practicalities of partnerships between donors, academics, and governments.

In seeking to tackle a series of complex questions about decentralized governance, this volume undertakes a daunting challenge. Conclusions are often difficult to draw, in part because there is frequently a paucity of empirical research on several of the issues that the contributors explore. Even on questions for which a handful of studies exist, the findings often conflict with one another, and the contributors can at best conjecture as to the reason for the disparate results. And, as with many important questions of interest to both academics and practitioners, the identification of causal effects in empirical research is tricky. Despite these challenges, however, the contributors to this volume do an impressive job overall of striking a careful balance between grappling with the theoretical and methodological complexities of the research on each question and distilling the findings into a set of coherent conclusions. We are left with a series of rich evidence-based insights about decentralized governance, as well as an agenda for future policy-relevant research on the subject to which any scholar working in this area should pay close attention.

Turkey: Between Democracy and Authoritarianism. By Yeşim Arat and Şevket Pamuk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. 308p. \$99.99 cloth, \$27.99 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592720000213

— Ahmet Erdi Öztürk, *London Metropolitan University*
e.ozturk@londonmet.ac.uk

Turkey is a nation that social scientists in various fields have sought to interpret and that, consequently, has received abundant and diverse academic attention. Different issues have dominated these studies from era to era. For example, whereas studies of the early Republican period compare modern Turkey to the Ottoman Empire, studies of periods in the second half of the twentieth century

examine multiparty political life, the tutelage system, and the governmental influence of political Islam and the army, which gradually strengthened during this period. These issues to an extent still guide the literature. However, especially after the early 2000s, social scientists have sought to make sense of the Justice and Development Party (AKP), which rose to power in 2002 claiming the ability to enable the coexistence of Islam and democracy. Although these efforts at interpretation were prominent until the early 2010s, Turkey's swift descent into authoritarianism at the hands of the AKP and its leader, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, altered the research agenda for political scientists. Recent studies across a range of fields focus on questions of how and in what manner Turkey is being dragged into authoritarianism. Yeşim Arat and Şevket Pamuk's *Turkey: Between Democracy and Authoritarianism*, to which they bring years of accumulated knowledge and experience, is one example of this new current of research.

Arat and Pamuk's study does not rely on any specific fieldwork, and it is difficult to ascertain a fundamental research question or hypothesis driving the book's narrative. However, it is clear that the authors are interested in the retraction of democracy in Turkey. Specifically, this study both scrutinizes meticulously and offers an expansive picture to the reader of the changes that Turkey underwent in various domains after the 1980 military coup d'état. Arat and Pamuk do not present us with a generalizable theoretical framework to help us converge on a broader explanation of the authoritarian, nationalist, and Islamic regimes through which Turkey passed; instead they take a deep dive into the Turkish manifestation of these phenomena. Nonetheless, academics who would compare Turkey to examples such as Hungary and Brazil, which quickly fell under the influence of conservative populist regimes, could use Arat and Pamuk's study as a resource.

The book, which comprises nine separate chapters including the introduction and conclusion, illustrates the salient issues facing Turkey in a logical manner. First, the authors summarize issues such as coups d'état and nationalism, which are the fundamental issues facing Turkey and are in some way correlated to nearly every topic they consider. The sections in which they mention secularism and Islam are problematic, however. In chapter 4, "Islamists in Power," they offer a superficial and one-dimensional analysis of the relationship between religion, state, and society in Turkey. They suggest that the conflict between the secular state and Islamist social structures generally determines the fate of Turkey. However, although this conflict is certainly significant, it is not determinative. To the contrary, the relationship of ends and means that religious groups, political configurations, and the state mechanism established with the religion of Islam is multifaceted and convoluted. This multidimensionality and