Nugent's general argument is that when authoritarian regimes use indiscriminate repression against opposition, they provide mechanisms and conditions for those opposition elements to find some common ground and that, after such regimes fall, such common ground makes polarization less likely and facilitates agreements that enable the construction of democratic systems. By contrast, when such regimes treat different opposition groups differently, they sow the seeds for polarization in any transitional situation and such polarization inhibits democratic outcomes.

This general argument is explored in the Tunisian and Egyptian cases. The argument is very clearly stated, and the cases are squarely situated within broader scholarly discussions about democratization and transition. This clarity sometimes leads to framing claims in terms that are quite strong—for example, downplaying the role of the military and suggesting a fairly high level of determinism—that are not likely to be fully persuasive for an audience deeply familiar with the two cases.

To be sure, Nugent generally favors modest terms for her causal argument, using words like "shape," "affect," and "condition" far more often than "create," "define," or "determine"—although the latter are used on occasion. Such careful word choice is to the author's credit. The argument on path dependency for patterns of repression comes closest to a historical determinism; the other parts of the causal chain are framed a bit less ambitiously but are still persuasively argued. With a phrasing that is generally probabilistic rather than deterministic, the framework of the book is better at supplementing other explanations than at replacing or disproving them. Factors often cited for preventing democratization or aggravating polarization, such as the role of the military, are dealt with a bit too quickly; some other factors—electoral outcomes resulting in a split assembly in Tunisia but a strong Islamist majority in Egypt—are not discussed.

The second contribution of the book is on an empirical level. The pace of events in both countries was dizzying; the number of highly engaged actors and analysts (and actor-analysts) was large, and indeed, the stakes were high enough to leave much of the narrative terrain contentious. Assembling a coherent analysis of the political tumult in both countries—and doing so in a manner that is judicious, well informed, and liable to be legible to a disciplinary audience with a specific vocabulary (about regimes and transitions, most specifically)—is not an easy task.

This clarity will aid understanding for comparativists. However, those whose interests are more specific to the two empirical cases than the cross-national study of regime change may find that the framework does not always fit. The contrast in outcomes between Tunisia and Egypt did indeed appear stark from the perspective of the half-decade after the 2011 uprisings (when the research was conducted). It is less clear now—and may continue to be uncertain in the future—whether demarcating that period as a clear "transition" with an authoritarian outcome in Egypt and a democratic one in Tunisia will be the most useful lens for understanding regime change.

But the final and most profound contribution made by the book is its innovative approaches to two subjects that play supporting roles in the argument but nevertheless help us to think about some critical areas a bit differently than is usually done. First, Nugent precedes the full explication of her argument with an exploration of *why* regimes differ in their repressive strategies, and in doing so, her approach comes close to undermining the phrase "repressive strategies" itself. She argues that state formation—and, in these two cases, critical institutional developments in the period of foreign control—forges patterns that later regimes find themselves forced to use. In that sense, repression is more a function of the tools available than a phenomenon that follows from any strategic logic on the part of the regime. This is a welcome departure from the functionalism that has crept into so much of the scholarship on authoritarianism, though again the clarity of the presentation sometimes seems to make the argument a bit too stark and deterministic, as if choices made within a colonial period are made for all time.

Second, the book offers an account of the effects of repression that takes individual experiences very seriously. Torture, incarceration, and exile can have profound effects. The impact that interests Nugent the most is the way such repressive tools can enhance empathy among ideologically diverse victims who share common experiences (and even common prison cells). She establishes the plausibility of this account with a survey experiment but persuasively traces its relevance and significance through interviews with activists in the two cases.

In sum, close readers of *After Repression* will be rewarded by sophisticated insights that are underplayed when the general argument is laid out but are richly developed within several chapters. Those seeking to understand political trajectories in Egypt and Tunisia in the 2010s will find a clear, plausible, and sensible account. Those who wish to probe a bit deeper will get richer rewards for how to think about repression's history and its effects.

The Black and White Rainbow: Reconciliation, Opposition, and Nation-Building in Democratic South Africa. By Carolyn E. Holmes. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2020. 264p. $75.00 cloth, $29.95 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592722000962

— Jessica Piombo, *Naval Postgraduate School*
jrpiombo@nps.edu

In this richly detailed study, Carolyn E. Holmes explores the challenges that postconflict societies face when navigating the at-times conflicting imperatives of nation-building and institutionalizing democratic competition.

She asks, How do societies recover from deep wounds and rebuild, and what does it mean to build democracy, government, and the nation all at the same time? Do these processes move in tandem, or might the demands of one undermine the necessary conditions for the other? Holmes explores these issues through an in-depth case study of post-apartheid South Africa, examining how the process of building a sense of cohesive national identity has been at times thwarted by the competition of the democratic process. In this book, she highlights a fundamental contradiction: whereas democracies require and depend on institutionalized competition in regulated fights for power, nation-building requires that national communities generate a sense of underlying commonality to bind them together. The problem, she argues, is that the process of institutionalizing competition can undermine the generation of the necessary sense of community (nation-building) that is necessary for postconflict reconciliation and recovery.

Holmes locates her inquiry within several intellectual traditions: postconflict peacebuilding, nation-building, nationalism studies, democratization and democratic institution building, state-building, and reconciliation. She identifies the intersections among these fields and carefully points out how the various processes influence each other, both in supporting and contradictory ways. The book is ambitious in its framing and delivers a complex and nuanced analysis of how these dynamics have played out in South Africa since 1994.

This book's core strength is its rich, highly contextual analysis of how individuals in post-apartheid South Africa have constructed their identities and how that construction has in turn been influenced by the changing political system, particularly the demands of democratization. Holmes skillfully uses both historical and ethnographic methods to contribute to contemporary political science's disciplinary debates about the tensions between peacebuilding, state-building, and democratization. She presents a detailed analysis of post-apartheid political and social contexts, adopting an anthropological approach to the collection, organization, analysis, and presentation of information. When organizing the volume, for example, she lets the data speak for itself, determining how to structure the book's chapters based on what was revealed by her interviewees about how they see the world. In this way, she allows South Africans to lead the way in identifying the core factors that have shaped their processes of identity construction.

Holmes's ultimate argument—that the democratization process in South Africa has stymied broad attempts at national reconciliation and nation-building as an outcome of the ways that political parties have gone about mobilizing electoral constituencies—is not new. This, as Holmes herself discusses, is an insight that has emerged from a range of prior scholarship on South Africa specifically, and in broader theoretical debates within the fields of democracy and democratization, ethnic politics, and nationalism studies. Holmes's argument for *why and how* this outcome has arisen, however, is both novel and carefully argued. Rather than rely on the common macro-level structural features prominent in mainstream political science—the structure of the party system, incentives established by national political institutions, and the nature of the country's social demographics—Holmes focuses on microfoundations: the cumulative impact of millions of individual acts of constructive creation as South Africans go about their daily lives.

In this manner, Holmes demonstrates how many aspects of the post-apartheid system have led to the continued reification of the old cleavages entrenched during apartheid, rather than breaking through them to refashion South Africa into a well-integrated multicultural society. She identifies a set of dynamics that have created these outcomes: the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the impact of national symbolic frames like the Rainbow Nation metaphor, the politics of ownership and access to place and public spaces, how celebrations and remembrances develop a national symbolic repertoire, and how political contestation emphasizes difference in a way that undermines the generation of a sense of commonality. In each of these contexts microprocesses of identity construction emphasize and reinforce difference, rather than eroding barriers between groups. Ultimately, her main contribution is a demonstration of how "constitutive causality"—the ways that actors and contexts create and re-create interdependent codes of meaning that in turn shape their individual, group, and national identities—shaped by the competing demands of democratization and nation-building—have led to a South Africa that, for the vast segments of the population, is as deeply divided today as in the past (pp. 190–91).

Holmes offers a way to bridge macro- and mesolevel processes with their micropolitical underpinnings. She offers clear warnings about the tensions between nation-building and democratization in the context of postconflict recovery in deeply divided societies. The writing is clear and articulate, and Holmes successfully integrates the concepts of positionality, practice, and ethnography into a macropolitical framework that will be understandable to mainstream political scientists. Her findings will ring true to South Africa specialists as well, and perhaps the deepest strength of this work is the empirical material, with its detailed descriptions of how South Africans understand the world and what shapes it. Holmes's approach is highly ethnographic, drawing from detailed interviews with more than 100 Afrikaners and Zulu persons (identified by home language—Afrikaans and isiZulu) in Bloemfontein and Durban, complemented by the participatory observation gained by living in South Africa for several years.

Although the book has many strengths, I am left wondering whether Holmes fully accomplishes what she sets out to do in the work. She frames the research as an exploration

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592722000962 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the disconnects and tension between the competition of a new democratic system and nation-building. However, she does not demonstrate (nor does she claim to) a causal dynamic here. Rather, she presents parallel information—theoretical discussions of how the competitiveness and institutionalized competition of a democratic system can undermine the project of nation-building—set next to discussions and evidence about how and why nation-building in South Africa has stalled since 1994. Neither does the book claim to show how the lack of nation-building is inhibiting postconflict recovery in South Africa, which is puzzling because of the significant emphasis on this theme in the setup and conclusion of the inquiry.

Similarly, the explanation of the enduring and possibly deepening cleavages is only partially tied to politics: of the arenas she investigates, two are explicitly political, and one is tied to party competition. The remaining dynamics are those that manifest in quotidian arenas: the delimitation of and access to public spaces, participation in festivals and rituals, mono- and multilingualism, and the dynamics of cultural celebrations and historical remembrances. Although these arenas are at times political, they are not explicitly linked to democratic politics in the volume, which undermines the emphasis on the tension created by the demands of institutionalized competition. In a way, Holmes has undersold the true contribution of her research in an effort to link it to higher-order political science debates. Holmes's analysis focuses on much more than the democratic process in explaining the entrenchment of social cleavages in the post-apartheid era, and rightfully so. In this sense, Holmes's work is excellent at what it does do and less convincing about what it claims to do, which leads this reviewer to offer that the core tension of the book is perhaps overplayed. The strength of this work is not how it addresses the larger debates in political science about the problems for postconflict recovery that are caused by democratic competition (what the book claims it does). Instead, its true strength is one of approach and research methods, specifically in showing how the anthropological approach can unearth the microfoundations and everyday processes that perpetuate social divisions, despite attempts to reduce them. The end result is a richly detailed examination of South African society and politics since 1994, one that can offer methodological insights to political scientists and a useful analysis of South Africa to area specialists.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Feminist Global Health Security. By Clare Wenham. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021. 296p. $74.00 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S153759272200041X

— Yara M. Asi, *University of Central Florida*
yara.asi@ucf.edu

More than two years after Chinese public health officials and doctors began warning about a mysterious rise in cases of "pneumonia of unknown etiology," does anyone feel secure these days? The COVID-19 pandemic has, as many scholars and practitioners across disciplines have described, exposed the cracks in our fragile construction of modern life. Traditional approaches to global health security have, with frightening efficiency, failed at offering either health or security. The timing seems apt for a reconsideration of our approach to these issues.

Clare Wenham offers a timely opportunity for such reflection in her new book, *Feminist Global Health Security.* The book is divided into seven chapters: the first two introduce the question "Where are the women?" and offer a robust literature review on the theoretical framework underpinning feminist health security. Primarily using the 2015–17 outbreak of the Zika virus as her case study, Wenham spends the next few chapters assessing how global health security failed those most affected by Zika—women. She explores how structural violence, gender-based violence, and climate change interact with global health security, and in an epilogue added after the book was submitted in late 2019, she addresses "the big one": COVID-19.

Global health security is focused on preventing, detecting, and responding to infectious disease threats of international concern. Although Zika did not affect the entire world as COVID-19 has, it offers a perfect glimpse into the weaknesses of global health security as currently practiced and an inroad into discussing the need for a feminist approach. Wenham starts the book with an anecdote about her attendance at a "Women in Global Health Security Breakfast," where she noted "the complete lack of recognition of how our collective work in global health security policy impacts women worldwide beyond the self-reflexive corridors of global health security influence" (p. 1). This anecdote thus presents one of the major tensions in even the most well-intentioned efforts: the increased (and long overdue) recognition and representation of senior women in global health along with still underestimating, or even overlooking, the impacts of global health security on the women most affected by negative outcomes. Although gender disparities exist in all sectors, mostly privileging men in terms of position and salary, the field of global health seems particularly ripe for a reckoning. The World Health Organization estimates that women make up 70% of the global health and social care workforce, whereas men hold 75% of health leadership roles. The gender pay gap is higher than in most other