

extent. The cases appear as separate process-tracing illustrations, without much explicit comparison. The reader is left wondering, for example, why wage moderation seems so similar in Sweden, Germany, and Britain in the 1950s and early 1960s. Certainly this period best showcases her basic process in all three cases: Fairly centralized unions discipline their ranks (British centralized bargaining breaks down later), and rising welfare benefits purchase wage moderation. But Swedish and German unions are more centralized and are getting a much better deal in benefits, and so it seems as though Mares should see the modesty of British-worker demands as more surprising than she does. Again we wish we could hear more about more focused analytic segments and comparisons within her multipart model.

In sum, Mares offers a thought-provoking intervention on a major theme in European political economy. The book is impressive for its ambitious scope and in integrating a variety of insights into a coherent model. The unemployment literature was due for more attention to the welfare-state burdens that so preoccupy today's European policymakers. To find a strongly distinctive theoretical understanding of European unemployment, however, we must hope that she sharpens her approach in future work.

Citizenship in Britain: Values, Participation and Democracy. By Charles Pattie, Patrick Seyd, and Paul Whiteley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 364 pages. \$70.00 cloth, \$29.99 paper.
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707070545

— Willem Maas, *York University*

What does it mean to be a British citizen in the early part of the twenty-first century? The authors of *Citizenship in Britain* address this question through the lens of the Citizen Audit, comprehensive surveys carried out as part of the Economic and Social Research Council's democracy and participation program. The Citizen Audit had three components: "wave 1" face-to-face interviews of 3,145 respondents (62.2% response rate) conducted between September and December 2000, "mail-back survey" questionnaires with 9,023 respondents (37.5% response rate) between January and May 2001, and follow-up "wave 2" face-to-face interviews with a subset of the original interviewees (809 respondents; 67% response rate) between September and December 2001. The wave 1 interviews consisted of 62 questions, while the mail-back surveys and wave 2 interviews included a subset. The authors weighted the raw data by age, sex, and employment status to make them consistent with census data to compensate for nonresponse.

Before examining their data, the authors note that citizenship has become a central concern not only of academics but also of politicians and policymakers. This is true, they argue, for five reasons. First, citizenship has

always raised basic questions about the relationship between the individual and the state, leading normative theorists to reexamine it whenever there are transformations in that relationship, as are now occurring. Second, real or perceived changes in the values, attitudes, and forms of participation that underpin civil society provoke interest because democracy cannot function effectively without participation. The paradoxical decline in electoral participation accompanying the spread of democracy around the world implies that "there is something happening to contemporary citizenship" that causes declining voter turnout (p. 3). Third, changes in the welfare state raise the specter of flimsy rather than robust citizenship, weakening the social contract and rendering governments unable to deliver on their promises. Fourth, the growth in immigration and multiculturalism leading to heterogeneous identities will, the authors argue, make more difficult the task of building a social contract on the basis of shared citizenship. Finally, the weakening of state power brought about by globalization and, for Britain, the consolidation of policymaking in the European Union, creates a democratic deficit and problems of accountability.

The authors argue the Citizen Audit surveys were needed because "many of the contemporary philosophical debates about the nature of citizenship have lost touch with the political reality of societies and governments trying to grapple with these problems" (p. 4). This leads the authors to propose their own definition: "Citizenship is a set of norms, values and practices designed to solve collective action problems which involve the recognition by individuals that they have rights and obligations to each other if they wish to solve such problems" (p. 22).

Turning to the survey results, Chapters 2–4 explore the extent to which civic attitudes vary according to demographic characteristics. The surveys demonstrate that attitudes toward the rights and obligations of citizenship vary according to respondents' age, gender, occupational status, extent of religious commitment, income, education, ethnic background, and place of residence. Overall, respondents were quite aware of their rights and obligations, feeling both a shared British identity and an obligation to contribute to the common good. Yet only 1 in 3 respondents were satisfied with British democracy, and their sense of their own collective political impact was low. Younger respondents were less likely to be "good citizens" than older respondents. Respect for the law was highest among the religious, women, and the elderly. Somewhat surprisingly, education appeared to reduce commitment to the state: those who remained in full-time education until the age of 19 or beyond were far less likely than those who left at the age of 15 to respect the law (p. 66).

Chapters 5 and 6 consider political behavior. In terms of "macro" behavior—a list of seventeen actions intended to influence rules, laws, or policies—the authors find that the most popular actions were donating money to

an organization, voting in a local government election, signing a petition, and boycotting certain products. Against worries about apathy, the Citizen Audit revealed that citizens were engaged in many political activities, but that these activities were dominated by the most highly educated, the rich, and those from the top occupational echelons. In terms of “micro” political behavior—actions to influence the quality of schooling, health care, or working environment—respondents felt they had influence over their teacher, doctor, or employer and were generally satisfied with how they were treated.

Following this discussion of the survey results, the book changes direction to explore five theories or models of civic engagement. The authors conclude that citizenship is not stable but rather is “malleable as individuals make choices about their participation and their perceptions of rights and obligations” (p. 184). Citizens’ relationships with the state are subject to continuing negotiation, changing in response to shifting incentives or circumstances.

In a section inspired by the social capital analyses of Robert Putnam and his colleagues, the book explores the extent to which citizens’ attitudes and behavior influence policy outcomes. The authors find that good citizenship matters: the more active local people are in politics and in associational life, the more trusting they feel, and the more affluent they are, the better their lives are. (Of course, the direction of causation is open to interpretation.) Also consistent with Putnam, the authors find that television has deleterious effects on civic participation: frequent TV watchers did not get involved. The authors reach the “cautiously optimistic” conclusion that citizenship in Britain is not in deep crisis but rather is quite healthy in some respects (p. 283). Yet they acknowledge that the decline in the sense of civic duty and in collectivist forms of political participation bodes ill for the future. Indeed, perhaps the audit’s finding that only 1 in 3 respondents were satisfied with the workings of British democracy should preclude any optimism about the state of citizenship in Britain. Yet this is an important book about an important subject, and it provides much fodder for discussion.

Political (In)Justice: Authoritarianism and the Rule of Law in Brazil, Chile, and Argentina. By Anthony W. Pereira. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005. 280p. \$27.95. DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707070557

— Caroline Beer, *University of Vermont*

Pereira’s new book is a fascinating comparison of the legal systems of the military dictatorships in Brazil, Chile, and Argentina. It focuses on the concept of “authoritarian legality,” which at first seems to be an oxymoron. As the book unfolds, however, and the differences among the regimes’ legal strategies become clear, the usefulness of the concept becomes apparent. This book highlights the importance of the legal dimension of authoritarian regimes, thereby

providing important new insights into the nature of both authoritarianism and judicial systems. A broadly comparative chapter also extends the argument to Nazi Germany, Franco’s Spain, Salazar’s Portugal, and the United States after 9/11.

The main argument is that the historical relationship between the military and the judiciary influence the military’s choice of legal strategy for carrying out repression. Where there was greater consensus and integration between the judiciary and the military prior to the onset of authoritarianism, there was greater reliance on courts to try political prisoners. Where there was less consensus and integration, repression was more likely to take place outside of any type of legal structure. Moreover, the judicialization of repression tended to moderate political repression, and the legal strategy of the military regime had important implications for the transition to democracy and the authoritarian legacies that shaped the new democracies.

In Brazil’s dictatorship, political repression was highly judicialized. The Argentine military regime of 1976–83, by contrast, relied almost exclusively upon extrajudicial political repression, largely through “disappearances.” Chile’s military regime occupied a middle position, with some judicialization, but also a significant level of extrajudicial repression. To quantify this level of judicialization, Pereira presents a particularly telling statistic: the ratio of political prisoners tried in military courts to those killed extrajudicially. In Brazil, the figure is 23:1, as compared to Chile 1.5:1 and Argentina 1:71 (see Table 2.1, p. 21). These different levels of legality were the result, according to Pereira, of varying degrees of consensus, integration, and cooperation between the military and the judiciary.

Perhaps the most useful contribution of this book is the basic information it provides about the largely overlooked institutions of authoritarian judiciaries. Pereira skillfully details the legal strategies of these three regimes. The level of legal continuity from before the coups is striking in the cases of Chile and Brazil. Much of their legal strategy relied upon laws written by previous governments, what Pereira refers to as a “prior legality.” The book also presents extensive data on the political trials carried out in Chile and Brazil, including acquittal rates, professional background of defendants, and sentences of those convicted.

The comparison between Brazil’s gradualist and conservative approach to legality and Argentina’s almost complete repudiation of legality presents clear evidence of the variation among authoritarian approaches to legality, and the importance of military-judicial consensus and integration as a key causal variable. Pereira’s characterization of Chile as an intermediate case, however, is more problematic. There seems to have been extraordinary consensus between the military and the judiciary in the case of Chile, beginning with the Supreme Court’s combative approach