

repulsive, and irredeemable” (*Barrio Libre*, p. 116), they dare rejection even by the few who care about them—pathologies below even Giorgio Agamben’s concept of humans stripped down to bare life.

The three studies plumb these depths even further when treating the unspeakable pain of a child’s violent death. *Living in the Crossfire* relates the killing of eight-year-old Matheus Rodrigues Carvalho by a stray bullet on his doorstep in a Rio favela. In Bolivia, a seven-year-old named Wilmer Vargas was killed by a speeding taxi as he crossed a busy highway. In both cases, the state’s piecemeal and biased investigation revealed “the partial, selective nature in which law” descends unwelcome into people’s lives (*Outlawed*, p. 103). The taxi driver who killed Wilmer illegally bought the sticker verifying that he had the required insurance coverage, while the policeman who shot Matheus continued his patrols. These senseless deaths make the grand concept of justice as flimsy as the societies it is supposed to structure. The broken links are scattered everywhere. In the frustrated words of a Bolivian judge, echoed in nearly any conversation with criminal justice reformers, every judge “bases his decision on the evidence presented to him, the proof. And how do they get this proof? Through an effective investigation. If this investigative work is poorly done, obviously the result they get, the incriminating evidence, will be poor as well, and the final result will be impunity, the result of bad police work” (*Outlawed*, p. 115).

Unable to take effective action or garner trust, officials can easily redirect blame onto society by deploying the tensions and hatreds that already divide it. As one Rio teacher says of her favela, “There is this idea, as the governor says, that the Alemão complex is a den of banditos, the ‘enemy of the State.’ This seems to me a highly exclusionist, even fascist, vision” (*Living in the Crossfire*, p. 36). In Bolivia, identity is “played out along axes of rural/urban, traditional/modern, and indigenous/not indigenous,” except for the lowly street criminals, called *rateros*, regarded “as monstrous, fundamentally different from normal people, lacking basic human relationship and therefore basic human feelings” (*Outlawed*, p. 126). In Nogales, the sewers from which Barrio Libre youth emerge and commit crimes are a fetid mirror of Bolivia’s *rateros*. These stereotypes travel easily up the political chain and take root in national policies, from the targeting of young men in Brazil to the militarization of the U.S.-Mexico border: “Nightmares of drug traffickers, terrorists, and illegal immigrants weigh down on the new frontier; these dark fantasies legitimate the continuing and ongoing amplification of militarized regimes of social control” (*Barrio Libre*, p. 104).

Sometimes the treatment of national security by these books is overwrought: *Outlawed* transposes a Cold War version of security onto the contemporary era in ways that simplify the diversity of current policy debate, while *Barrio*

Libre stretches the militarized right-wing view of the border over the American political spectrum. Such generalizations, though, are an exception, and overall these studies furnish detailed and profoundly human accounts of forgotten communities. They show well, for example, how being forgotten itself can clear the space needed for both new and traditional ideas to take root. In Bolivia, lynchings are often averted by producing witness testimony and establishing the suspect’s family relations (*Outlawed*, p. 196), and in the process frayed community relations are mended. In Rio, the nongovernmental Projeto Uerê works to document evidence of crime. As in other violent barrios in other countries, in fact, some of the most effective violence-reduction efforts involve citizen compilation of evidence, intervention with at-risk youth, neighbors’ ejection of drug dealers, and other initiatives that connect to, rather than compete with, the state. *Living in the Crossfire*’s description of Rio’s Rocinha shows the rich historical and cultural foundations that can be revived and marshaled on behalf of local security efforts, as well as for political action. Years before the 2013 mass demonstrations that rocked Brazil, mobilization in the favelas finally forced authorities to address the absence of basic services and safety there. While the governor of Rio de Janeiro state complains in his interview with the *Living in the Crossfire* authors of the “irresponsibility” of “allowing growth without planning” or adequate services (p. 204), he uses a fleet of helicopters—a flashpoint in the 2013 protests that rocked Brazil—while the state cannot legislate even basic fare relief, such as multiple-transfer tickets, for the masses condemned to insufferably long commutes on the streets below. Beyond squeezing limited concessions out of the state, such pressure can also lead to much-needed holistic reforms, such as Brazil’s 2008 National Program for Public Security with Citizenship, comprised of projects ranging from police training to social services. Many of these individual initiatives will collapse under the weight of politics and bureaucracy. But enough can survive to sustain a more holistic approach to deep-rooted but often ignored causes of insecurity—from fear and violence to employment and education—that these important books reinsert into anthropological, security, and Latin American scholarship.

Enemy Brothers: Socialists and Communists in France, Italy, and Spain. By W. Rand Smith. Lanham, MD:

Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2012. 302p. \$75.00.
doi:10.1017/S1537592714000577

— Sheri Berman, *Barnard College*.

This is an old-fashioned kind of political science book: a qualitative monograph that aims to shed light on a historically interesting and underresearched topic, namely, the relationship between Socialists and Communists in France, Italy, and Spain during the postwar period. It is historically interesting because the relationship between

these parties shaped the nature and fate of the Left, as well as the overall political dynamics in these countries. And although there is a huge literature on both socialist and communist parties, not much of it explicitly analyzes the relationship between these parties. In addition, although all European countries developed socialist and communist parties, France, Italy, and Spain were among a subset where both parts of the Left were fairly strong, and so a focus on intraleft relations in these countries also makes sense.

In order to fully understand the relationship between Socialists and Communists in France, Italy and Spain, *Enemy Brothers* asks three particular questions. First, “how have Socialist and Communist parties changed over time?” Second, “how have relations between the parties varied over time within countries and cross-nationally?” And third, “what explains these variations?” (p. 7). W. Rand Smith builds his answers to these questions around a “critical junctures” approach, examining periods when these parties faced particularly significant challenges and then analyzing their varied responses to them. Smith argues that three factors shaped socialist and communist behavior during these periods. The first was institutional context, which “refers to the arrangements [of] the main governmental and electoral systems” (p. 24), that is, the political rules of the game. The second was party culture, which refers to the “norms, symbols, collective practices, and collective memory” that constitute a party’s identity (pp. 24–25). And the third was leadership, which simply means paying attention to the type of leaders that different parties “favor” and how much power they have within different parties. He argues that together, these factors explain party behavior in general, and why Socialists and Communists have chosen at some times and in some places to become allies and at others to become enemies in particular.

The chapters include case studies of the evolution of socialist and communist parties in France, Italy and Spain (with shorter sections devoted to Portugal and Greece), as well as analyses of party organization and alliances. These treatments are comprehensive and judicious, and for those interested in party behavior and decision making more generally, they make a good case for why and how organization, culture, and leadership matter. What is curiously lacking from the book, however, is any discussion of ideology, which is particularly strange for a study of the Left, where ideas have been the stuff of endless intellectual and physical battles.

Smith implicitly dismisses the relevance of ideas early on by arguing that the two parties’ “traditions derive from the same roots and share a common struggle” (pp. 4–5). Perhaps. But while twentieth-century socialist and communist parties did indeed both share common roots in the nineteenth-century socialist movement, deep ideological rifts began to open up within this movement by the end of that century; by the interwar period, Socialists and Communists in some places were engaged in fratricidal

battles over capitalism, democracy, and much else. These profound ideological (and practical) differences are barely mentioned in the book.

Critically, the level of ideological divergence between Socialists and Communists varied significantly over time and among countries, clearly shaping (but not exclusively determining) the relative strength of the different parts of the Left, as well as their ability to compromise and contract alliances. To be fair to Smith, some of these differences might be captured in his “party culture” variable, but the lack of explicit attention paid to variations in ideological positions and traditions across time and space makes the book’s treatment of intraleft relationships less than fully satisfying.

That said, *Enemy Brothers* should be helpful both to students of the European Left and political parties more generally. In addition to the particular value derived from a study of party organization, culture, and leadership, Smith’s warning (following Nancy Bermeo) that “political scientists must be certain that attention to history precedes attention to theory, or we are bound to make a whole series of errors” (p. 227) is worth repeating.

Collective Killings in Rural China during the Cultural Revolution. By Yang Su. New York: Cambridge University Press,

2011. 320p. \$98.00 cloth, \$29.00 paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592714000589

— Daniel Leese, *University of Freiburg*

The depiction of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in Western media and academic writings has so far been dominated by accounts of the fate of urban intellectuals. These narratives commonly include reminiscences of violence and destruction handed out by youthful Red Guards in the early stages of the movement against their teachers and parents, as well as illustrations of the seemingly irrational leader worship surrounding the “Great Helmsman” Mao Zedong. The development of the Cultural Revolution in the countryside, on the other hand, has by and large been neglected by scholarship, leading to claims that the movement should exclusively be regarded as an urban phenomenon. These claims may be traced to two major reasons: On the one hand, most victims of Red Guard violence belonged to privileged, well-cultured strata, who later were able to retell their version of history. The fate of China’s peasants, on the other hand, especially in remote regions, left few traces in official writings, and only a handful of writers of so-called reportage literature (*baogao wenxue*) tried to reconstruct the events in rural settings.

In this important book, Yang Su forcefully shatters the claim that China’s countryside remained largely unaffected by the development of the Cultural Revolution. He convincingly demonstrates that casualties were highest in regions far removed from the urban centers