Smith devotes a chapter each to the advantages enjoyed by legacy candidates in Japan at three stages of their political careers: selection, election, and promotion. The analysis uses a variety of approaches and measures to study Japanese politics from 1947 onward. Smith makes use of interview material and many examples drawn from electoral politics to illustrate key points. He also devotes some attention to the consequences of Japan's dynastic politics for gender representation, the representational style of candidates, and legislative behavior. He acknowledges that more research on the consequences of dynastic politics is required and offers many ideas for future research.

This book is clearly much more than just a study of Japanese politics, given the attention paid to other democracies and the extensive effort to advance comparative theories about dynastic candidate selection. The combination approach to studying dynasties in democracy in general along with a fine-grained analysis of Japanese politics is commendable and will help advance research in this area for a long time to come. The datasets used in this book will continue to help drive research into the causes and consequences of dynasties in democracies. Smith's book is required reading for anyone interested in democratic politics more broadly and in the puzzle of political dynasties in democracies.

Building Participatory Institutions in Latin America: Reform Coalitions and Institutional Change. By Lindsay Mayka. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. 320p. $99.99 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S1537592719004523

— Françoise Montambeault, *University of Montreal*
francoise.montambeault@umontreal.ca

Latin America is often cited as a laboratory for participatory institutional innovation, because many countries have adopted and implemented institutional reforms aimed at including citizen participation in democratic decision-making processes. Located at all levels of government and in a variety of public policy arenas, different models of participatory institutions have indeed been developed, implemented, and diffused across the region. Although some of these participatory institutions have emerged from the bottom up, many have been established in the context of national legal frameworks that require the creation of permanent participatory mechanisms aimed at engaging citizens and civic associations, along with policy makers and bureaucrats, in decision-making processes in a variety of policy areas. Nationally mandated participatory institutions, although quite common in Latin America (in 17 of 18 countries), have, however, been overlooked by the literature and constitute the object of Lindsay Mayka's important contribution.

Nationally mandated participatory institutions, like the local ones, have the theoretical potential to profoundly transform not only policy-making processes by making the state more efficient and responsive to citizens' needs, but also to society itself by giving a voice to otherwise marginalized citizens and creating institutional spaces for civil society to engage in the social construction of citizenship rights. However, as Mayka's puzzle emphasizes, not all national participatory mandates meet their ambitious goals: many "exist only in the books, but not in practice" (p. 2). Why do some nationally mandated institutions never become viable institutions? What are the factors underlying successful cases of participatory institution building in Latin America? These are the central questions addressed by *Building Participatory Institutions in Latin America*. The careful comparison between two cases in Brazil and two cases in Colombia allows Mayka to provide a compelling theory of participatory institution building that not only contributes to scholarship on participatory democracy in Latin America, but also provides insightful contributions to the study of institutions in comparative politics.

Chapter 1 systematically develops the theoretical framework and the argument of the book. One of the important tasks it undertakes is to provide a novel definition of successful participatory institution outcomes with regard to the two complementary dimensions of institutional building processes that Mayka fleshes out: institutional design and implementation. This definition not only contributes to institutional scholarship by operationalizing the concept of institution building and bringing together insights from different institutionalist traditions, but it also unpacks the process, thereby introducing the possibility of observing variation across cases of participatory institution building over time. First, institution building entails crafting a strong institutional design, one that grants participatory institutions formal authority and clear prerogatives, formal decision-making power, and enforcement capacity. Although she does not take influence on policy outcome as an indicator of the success of participatory institutions, Mayka shows that, in Brazil, strong institutional designs were established in the areas of social assistance and health policy and have thereby become sites to advocate policy change. In Colombia, weaker institutional designs were created for planning councils and health committees, making them less relevant as institutional sites for influencing policy outcomes.

If designing strong institutions is important, Mayka rightfully contends that implementing them requires a process of institutionalization of the rules, practices, and authority of participatory institutions, which then become unquestioned as part of the policy-making process. Drawing from both rational choice and sociological institutionalism, she suggests that institutionalization

happens when participatory institutions are routinized into an organizational structure that shapes participation and gains the informal legitimacy among actors needed to influence behaviors and practices. Here again, she finds differences in terms of institutionalization between Brazil and Colombia. Health and social assistance councils in Brazil are backed by financial resources, trained officials, and a decentralized organization that structures civil society participation. However, she does observe higher legitimacy for participatory councils in the health sector, which makes them a bit stronger than social assistance councils overall. In Colombia, the state neglected the implementation phase for its nationally mandated planning councils and health committees, and planning councils were taken over by civil society organizations, resulting in weaker institutions in the health sector.

How then to explain the differences observed in Colombia and Brazil and across policy sectors within each country? Starting from the premise that "participatory institution building requires creative destruction to reconfigure (or even dismantle) existing state agencies, lines of authority and decision making practices" (p. 4), Mayka offers a twofold argument (p. 52) that goes beyond and builds on existing theories focusing on state capacity, partisan strategies, and civil society's strength. She then empirically assesses her argument through a carefully crafted and systematic case comparison developed in chapters 4 and 5 (Brazil) and 6 and 7 (Colombia), drawing from extensive qualitative and quantitative data. First, she argues that nationally mandated institutions can take root when they are embedded in sweeping sectoral participatory reforms, which not only allow participatory institutions to be included in the policy-making process but also create opportunities for mobilizing support among reformist policy makers and incentives to create pro-participation coalitions. Second, she highlights that, beyond these reforms, successful participatory institution building requires the involvement of what she calls "creative" policy entrepreneurs among state or civil society actors. Those policy entrepreneurs, who pitch the idea of participation to reformist politicians as key to achieving the policy reform's objective, also play a central role in activating support and coalitions for participatory institution building, sometimes even among surprising allies (both stakeholders and policy makers).

Comparing participatory institution building in two policy sectors in Brazil and Colombia is ambitious, and the detailed analysis that Mayka provides of all four cases is particularly enlightening in guiding the reader as the argument unfolds empirically: it highlights both similarities and differences in participatory institution-building trajectories across and within countries. As she shows, Brazil's health and social assistance sector's successful participatory councils emerged in the context of sweeping policy reforms that profoundly transformed them and fostered collective action among stakeholders. In particular, a variety of stakeholders (including beneficiaries, workers and bureaucrats, among others) united and mobilized in a large pro-participatory coalition behind policy entrepreneurs, who took advantage of the opportunity created by policy reforms to push their agenda for participatory institutions.

In Colombia, even though participatory institutions emerged in a context comparable to the Brazilian one (chap. 3), the participatory institution-building outcomes Mayka finds are different and even display variation across policy sectors. In the planning councils, on the one hand, the outcome is mixed, because the institution-building process remains incomplete. This is explained by the fact that, even if civil society policy entrepreneurs supported the reform, these councils emerged in the context of a procedural reform with only limited benefits for stakeholders that did not carry strong incentives for actors to coalesce and mobilize behind it. The case of Colombian heath committees is, on the other hand, classified as a case of failure, showing that even if the policy sector reform is sweeping, policy entrepreneurs are key to activating the successful implementation/institutionalization of participatory institutions in policy makers' and stakeholders' practices.

Lindsay Mayka's *Building Participatory Institutions in Latin America* is certainly a must-read for students of participatory democracy, who have generally overlooked the cases of nationally mandated participatory institutions and focused instead on local experiences with participation. Her important comparative endeavor allows us not only to go beyond existing arguments to explain the implementation gap in practice, but also builds on analyses of civil society's strength to understand the *mechanisms* by which civil society and politicians can be mobilized and coalesced behind the project of building participatory institutions: in doing so, it unveils the crucial role and creativity of a generally hidden actor— policy entrepreneurs. More generally, Mayka's book offers an important contribution to comparative politics and the literature on institutional change by proposing a compelling definition of institutional strength that focuses on the *process* by which this strength is built— or not—over time. But where there is successful participatory institution building, as in the case of health councils in Brazil, can the process be overturned? In the face of incoming political leaders who have no political will to comply with nationally mandated participatory institutions, can wide stakeholders' coalitions mobilized in favor of health councils do enough to secure their institutionalization? These are questions that certainly will attract attention in the coming years, and Mayka's

book is an important contribution that gives us some keys to start thinking about them.

Statebuilding by Imposition: Resistance and Control in Colonial Taiwan and the Philippines. By Reo Matsuzaki. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2019. 264p. $49.95 cloth.

— John T. Sidel, *London School of Economics and Political Science*
j.t.sidel@lse.ac.uk

Contrasts and comparisons between the Philippines and Taiwan have been of considerable interest to political scientists and policy makers since at least the 1970s. The eminent development economist, Gustav Ranis, for example, penned an important report for the International Labour Organization (ILO) in 1974 titled *Sharing in Development: A Programme of Employment, Equity and Growth for the Philippines* in which he celebrated the Taiwanese model of "growth with equity" as worthy of emulation; he subsequently published a series of academic journal articles along similar lines over the late 1970s and early 1980s. By the 1990s, moreover, as the Philippines was still struggling to catch up with economic growth rates of the other "ASEAN Four" countries—Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand—scholars working on the comparative political economy of development focused considerable attention on comparisons between the "Taiwanese economic miracle" and its South Korean counterpart on the one hand, and the impressive but markedly less equitable pattern of economic development observed in Southeast Asia on the other. Here the contrast between growth with equity and growth without it was most glaring between the neighboring countries of Taiwan and the Philippines, and thus arguably most instructive.

Against this backdrop, Reo Matsuzato's empirically rich and analytically rigorous study *Statebuilding by Imposition* comes as a very belated but also very welcome comparative analysis of Taiwan and the Philippines, even if today the contrasts between the two countries are not so stark as they were several decades ago. Interestingly, as flagged in its title, the book is less focused on the puzzle of variance in patterns of economic development across Taiwan and the Philippines and more on the implications of the divergence in their forms of governance for various "state-building efforts" by the United States and "the international community" in diverse settings, such as Afghanistan, Libya, and Somalia. Yet the line of analysis developed in the book's paired comparison of Taiwan and the Philippines will be of considerable interest to specialists on East and Southeast Asia, as well as to scholars addressing the challenges of development and governance in a variety of regions across the world.

Matsuzaki proceeds with commendable clarity, coherence, and command of diverse primary and secondary sources in English, Japanese, and Chinese to elaborate and substantiate a set of arguments that account for divergences in patterns of governance in Taiwan and the Philippines already evident under Japanese and American colonial rule, respectively, in the two countries in the decades preceding World War II. Late nineteenth-century patterns of rule in both countries, Matsuzaki suggests, were roughly comparable in their forms of local power rooted in landownership and commerce and in state offices at the local level. If anything, the local institutions of the state were more fully differentiated and developed in the late Spanish colonial Philippines than in Taiwan under late Qing rule. Against this roughly comparable backdrop, the intervention, occupation, and colonization of Taiwan and the Philippines by Japan and the United States, respectively, unfolded more or less simultaneously at the turn of the twentieth century, thus presenting further commonalities across the two cases, which serve as the basis for the paired comparison between them.

In both cases, external intervention, occupation, and colonization met violent resistance. But by the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, divergence in the patterns of colonial governance was evident, and it became enduring in its legacies. In Taiwan, a strong state was effectively consolidated; in the Philippines, what Prasenjit Duara, in his 1988 book *Culture, Power, and the State: Rural North China, 1900–1942*, termed "state involution" unfolded instead. As Matsuzaki shows, this broad divergence in patterns of governance prefigured marked differences between Taiwan and the Philippines in the establishment and implementation of new institutions and procedures for education, public health, policing, property relations, and public infrastructure. Differences in patterns of governance thus mattered already in the 1910s, 1920s, and 1930s in myriad concrete ways in Taiwan and the Philippines. Where previous studies, like Lynn T. White's 2009 book, *Political Booms: Local Money and Power in Taiwan, East China, Thailand, and the Philippines*, emphasized the imposition of the Kuomintang regime in the late 1940s as the foundational moment from which to plot lines of path dependency, Matsuzaki's study instead brings the paired comparison back to the turn of the twentieth century and identifies an earlier critical juncture from which to date the diverging trajectories observed over the following decades.

By Matsuzaki's account, the crucial cause of divergence between Taiwan and the Philippines lay in the varying ways in which what he terms the "mediating institutions" of local governance were established and institutionalized at the turn of the twentieth century. Here he emphasizes the "formalization" and "cellularization" of such mediating institutions in Taiwan: a centrally controlled *polizeistaat* was imposed on the village or neighborhood level, thus creating small "administered communities" known as *hokō*. In the Philippines, by contrast, the devolution and concentration of state powers and prerogatives into the hands of locally elected officials at the municipal and