

A central question is whether the leaders of the 1991 Revolution have delivered on their promises to create a more democratic Ethiopia. In light of continuing debate on definitions of democracy, there are no simple answers. The constitution approved in 1995 created a federal system with nine regional states based on local language and ethnicity. These ethnic states have provided greater governmental access for previously excluded groups. But it remains to be seen whether local ethnic elites benefit more than the “broad masses.” While early in the 1990s many hoped that the condition of women would improve, recent trends, based on the inclusive history of the Tigrayan Peoples Liberation Front, have been disappointing. The command economy of the Dergue era has given way to a greater economic freedom, but the state and the Midroc empire owned by Sheikh Mohammed Alamoudi have disproportionate holdings. In addition, the government continues to own all the land. Political discourse is freer than it was before 1991, with some seventy-two parties listed with the National Electoral Board, although the ruling party retains a tight control (by fair means and foul) of state power. One of the most significant areas of recent development has been at the level of local government. Greater authority has been given to *wereda* and *kebele* governments, apparently at the expense of the regional states. This may portend more responsive and effective grassroots government.

The authors conclude that “whatever the aspirations of the government, fundamental socio-political norms favour not democratization, but the perpetuation of hierarchy and authoritarianism at many levels of interaction” (34). They recommend, however, that “the most influential and important agents of change with whom Sida [the Swedish International Development Agency] can work in Ethiopia can be expected to continue to be the political leadership of the ruling party” (23).

Andrew J. Carlson  
Capital University  
Columbus, Ohio

**Michael Cowen and Liisa Laakso, eds. *Multi-party Elections in Africa*.** New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. 387 pp. Appendix. Bibliography. Index. \$65.00. Cloth.

*Multi-party Elections in Africa* is an edited volume consisting primarily of case studies of elections in twelve Anglophone African countries during the 1990s, although many chapters examine earlier elections as well. Two other case studies examine Ethiopia and Guinea-Bissau, but there are no chapters devoted to Francophone countries. This book can best be thought of as a reference book with an overview of the literature on elections as well as detailed summaries of these relatively recent elections and their outcomes. Links between communal, regional, and ethnic groups and voting,

especially for presidential candidates and/or political parties, are the most common theme. Some authors propose specific theories to account for electoral behavior.

There are three exceptions to the single-case format. The introductory chapter surveys, in great detail, the literature on election studies in sub-Saharan African from decolonization to the present, and it is worth reading as a stand-alone. The second chapter includes three countries—Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland—while the appendix includes statistical analyses (fixed effects, bivariate regression models) examining the link between elections and some macroeconomic variables associated with political cycles.

Despite its strength in empirical detail and complex description, the book displays some weaknesses. First of all, it is hard to read: nearly three hundred and fifty pages of a font that other books reserve for endnotes! Then, too, there is so much rich information about rapidly changing parties, personalities, regional political voting blocks, and ethnic alliances that non-country experts may have a hard time keeping track of it all; a few more maps or tables or charts would have helped keep all the individual trees in their respective analytical woods. Also, the most recent elections included date from 1998 or earlier; hence the discussions of Ghana and Kenya do not cover the demise of Rawlings and Moi. Furthermore, the chapter on Nigeria focuses primarily upon the Abacha years (1993–98) and the country's failed transition to democracy. Finally, several of the chapters deal with local or bi-elections where regional generalizations are harder to make. These analyses can be interesting in their own right, although the result is that the book covers mostly studies of elections held under "less-than-democratic" rule.

Since most of the scholars examine one country, comparative examination of electoral or political systems is problematic. In one case, for example, the author attributes electoral disproportionality (the difference between percent of vote received and the percent of seats received) to the d'Hondt system of proportional representation, despite the fact that the comparative literature usually considers it to be very proportional (perhaps the true culprits were low district magnitudes and high minimum thresholds?). Also, the chapter on Malawi argues that neopatrimonialism resulted in flawed elections, while the evidence offered shows that candidates were threatened with kidnapping and other forms of repression. Simple authoritarianism could explain the results, therefore, without a more elaborate structural variable. Finally, the study of local elections in Namibia discusses the importance of turnout without reference to such rates in other surrounding countries under similar circumstances.

Nonetheless, this is a useful reference work for examining nascent electoral and party development in (mostly) Anglophone sub-Saharan Africa before the end of the century. It provides a wealth of information on parties, personalities, and ethnic coalitions up to and including the 1990s.

It deserves a place in research libraries or on the shelves of those looking for detailed documentary evidence from this period and for these countries.

John Quinn  
Truman State University  
Kirksville, Missouri

**James L. Gibson and Amanda Gouws. *Overcoming Intolerance in South Africa: Experiments in Democratic Persuasion*.** New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 221 pp. Appendix. Bibliography. Index. \$55.00. Cloth.

The successful institutionalization of new democracies does not rely on formal political institutions alone. To develop and flourish, any new democratic system requires not only the creation of a legal structure that specifies basic rights, but also the actual enforcement of those rights. Perhaps more important, history demonstrates that citizens cannot simply depend upon the state for such enforcement. While the active engagement of a diverse civil society as a check upon state actions is necessary for the effective functioning of a democracy, not all associations of civil society promote democracy. Actors in civil society must be tolerant of their opponents, and this essential tolerance cannot be assumed. James Gibson and Amanda Gouws seek to measure this crucial trait of tolerance in South Africa. Underlining the central connection between political tolerance and the success of new democracies, they ask: How tolerant are South Africans? And they add a further question: "How does one come to tolerate those who have been responsible for the worst oppression" (xiii)?

In order to answer these questions, the authors surveyed 2,557 respondents in the primary sample and 477 in the boost (supplementary) sample in early 1996, and followed up with over half the interviewees in 1997. This study of mass public opinion in South Africa is welcome at a time when so many analysts continue to focus upon the interests and values of political elites. There are, nevertheless, many challenges facing such survey research. First and foremost is the matter of context, particularly in a country that has experienced such extreme discrimination, political violence, and conflict. Gibson and Gouws attempt to address this both in the design of their study and in their second chapter, which focuses on the South African context. This chapter points to the gross intolerance of the apartheid regime and underlines the violent nature of the struggle to end it. In their discussion of the liberation movement, however, the authors place excessive emphasis upon the violence of that struggle and completely ignore (except in a single footnote) the democratic aspects of anti-apartheid mass organizations, especially within the UDF, the unions, and many civic organizations before the state of emergency. This leads to a perception, unfortunately carried throughout the text, of the poor masses as