

are tied together in networks with differing degrees of structure and scope (“A-Net”). The dynamics of this transition are conditioned everywhere by the timing and circumstances of economic crisis, which undermines the ability of established political parties, party systems, and affiliated organizations to maintain themselves and sustain their ties with organized groups.

Working off this main story, the authors give particular stress to four issues: 1) variation in the scope and intensity of participation; 2) the ways in which new associations manage, if at all, the business of “scaling up,” that is, organizing a chain of linkages and impacts that move interest representation from smaller to larger stages with some hope of effectiveness; 3) state–associational ties and the limits to associational autonomy; and 4) sources of representational distortion, which are mostly attributed to inequalities of class and education.

The contrast among national cases is striking, if not very surprising. The collapse of party systems of the UP-Hub genre is associated with the emergence and expansion of associational networks as an alternative. This is most notable in Peru and least visible in Venezuela, where although the old party system did collapse, all organizations came under severe pressure, pressure that has only been magnified with the efforts of the Chávez regime to reconstruct organizations through state sponsored and controlled networks of groups. Argentina presents what the authors call a *Statal Web*, with associations tied to interactions with the state and closely linked to Peronista networks. Chile is described as a *Liberal Net*, with less state dependence and weaker links, a heritage of the Pinochet-era attacks on preexisting groups and networks.

Although the book’s title speaks of “popular politics” (basically equivalent to the politics and action repertoires of poorer and less educated citizens), and the theme is repeated throughout, what the analysis and data show is that middle- and upper-class citizens fare better in the new A-Net patterns, where their specific advantages of education, money, time, and connections are felt more effectively.

The book is organized thematically. Three chapters on “Interest Politics and the Popular Sectors” introduce the surveys, provide context on the cases and on broad regional trends, and outline key elements of the contrasting UP-Hub and A-Net patterns. Subsequent chapters address evolving patterns of individual participation, with attention to the choice between direct-action protest and group-mediated participation (Chapters 4 and 5), group structure, linkages across levels, and action repertoires (Chapters 6, 7, and 8). A general conclusion draws these themes together around the central motif of the transition from UP-Hub to A-Net.

*Reorganizing Popular Politics* is unduly difficult to read and occasionally frustrating. The editors and authors indulge a predilection for classification, typologies, acronyms, and coined terms that sometimes substitute for clear explanation. Frustration arises because the editors and

authors are very cautious about drawing conclusions and implications, limiting themselves instead to mapping the patterns they find (p. 328). This sometimes leads to findings that are, to say the least, not surprising. Thus, for example, “better linked associations are far more likely than atomized associations to engage in a range of state-targeted strategies” (p. 229). The more general point worth taking from the analysis of state-association ties is that notions of organizational autonomy that are central to much of the new social movement literature are not very accurate. Most associations seek and compete for ties with the state. Those with more resources and better connections manage the process better.

The book continues themes advanced in Ruth Berins Collier and David Collier’s *Shaping the Political Arena* (1991) and marries them to concerns arising from a very different literature on new social movements. Although the fit is sometimes difficult, the overall result is a valuable book that rewards the effort required to read it, with rich and useful insights about the evolution of associational life and representation, as well as the likely shape of future patterns. The authors demonstrate that despite widespread belief that civil society is fragmented and weak in Latin America, participation remains high and groups are continually exploring new ways of coordinating with one another in a search for more effective representation and links with the state. These efforts often do not succeed, or if they succeed, they do not endure for very long, a result that can be traced to long-term class and institutional rigidities.

#### **Politics, Identity, and Mexico’s Indigenous Rights**

**Movement.** By Todd A. Eisenstadt. New York: Cambridge University

Press, 2011. 226p. \$82.00.

doi:10.1017/S1537592712003349

— Courtney Jung, *University of Toronto*

Based on interviews with indigenous and non-indigenous respondents in Mexico, this book shows that indigenous people do not universally endorse collective over individual rights, and argues that it is social and economic history, and not only ethnic identity, that shapes attitudes toward rights. This finding challenges the claims of many indigenous rights activists and scholars who believe that there is a more or less singular indigenous worldview, which centers on a communitarian conception of identity. The research here, however, draws indigenous people into the fold of political subjects whose attitudes may vary, may change, and are shaped by institutions beyond culture alone. It is a valuable and timely contribution to indigenous scholarship and politics.

*Politics, Identity, and Mexico’s Indigenous Rights Movement* is built around a puzzle that emerges from a comparison between the 1994 Zapatista uprising in Chiapas and a widespread social protest in Oaxaca in 2006. While the Zapatista uprising famously included an indigenous

political platform and demands for collective rights, in Oaxaca, which has an even larger ethnically indigenous population than Chiapas, the 2006 social protests did not include any explicitly indigenous agenda, even though many of the protestors were themselves indigenous. Todd Eisenstadt deploys his survey of 5,000 indigenous and nonindigenous respondents in Chiapas, Oaxaca, and Zacatecas (a state with almost no indigenous people, which he uses as a control case) to explain why two Mexican social movements, both driven primarily by indigenous people, should have had such distinct agendas.

Eisenstadt finds that indigenous respondents in Chiapas hold more communitarian views than indigenous respondents in Oaxaca. He attributes this distinction to landholding patterns and the history of conflict in each state. In Chiapas, most indigenous people live on *ejido* land, which requires collective decision making, whereas many indigenous people in Oaxaca live on communal land which, despite the name, does not involve collective decision making (p. 68). In addition, Chiapas has a long and violent history of conflict between indigenous and nonindigenous people, whereas in Oaxaca, most conflict has been between and within indigenous communities.

Although the author's research reveals important variation across space (indigenous people hold a range of views regarding collective rights), his analysis does not take into account the likelihood of change over time. The survey he uses to explain the difference between the 1994 and 2006 mobilizations in Chiapas and Oaxaca was undertaken in 2002–3. His reliance on this data to explain political events that took place at other times—almost 10 years earlier, and then three years later—involves a presumption that indigenous views are static.

The first half of the 1990s, however, was the high-water mark of indigenous politics, not only in Mexico but also in many parts of Latin America. As Eisenstadt admits, Zapatista leaders adopted an indigenous rights agenda in 1994 only after realizing that indigenous identity was highly resonant at that particular time (p. 88). Indigenous rights was also on the political agenda in Oaxaca in 1995, as activists demanded, and received, the right to conduct local elections according to traditional practice (*usos y costumbres*). Indigenous identity has been much less politically salient in Mexico since the 2000 election that ended the hegemony of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI). It is therefore reasonable to hypothesize that if the Zapatista uprising had taken place in 2006, then like the Oaxaca protests, it also would not have coalesced around indigenous rights. Eisenstadt's analysis does not take into account the likely possibility that the difference between the two social movements might be one of time (1994 vs. 2006), rather than place (Chiapas vs. Oaxaca).

Although the book is primarily constructed around a comparison of the two social movements, the author also, and more controversially, frames his research as a referen-

dum on the Zapatista leadership. The survey of indigenous public opinion in Chiapas is meant to assess whether Zapatista leaders represent indigenous attitudes in Chiapas, whether indigenous people express communitarian beliefs, and whether the Zapatistas are the natural interpreters of an indigenous cultural frame (pp. 54–55).

Although Eisenstadt finds that indigenous people in Chiapas are more likely than those in Oaxaca to hold communitarian views, he also asserts that even in Chiapas, most indigenous survey respondents do not hold such views. The evidence for this strong claim, however, is difficult to assess. The author constructed communitarian and pluralist clusters by aggregating eight survey questions, including “the indigenous people are the true stewards of the land” and “people have the responsibility of following the ideas of the community and not question them much” (p. 58). But 72.1% of “Communitarian Indigenous Respondents” (a category that is not clearly explained, but may represent indigenous respondents that sort into a communitarian modal cluster based on their answers to all eight questions) agree with the first statement, and 69.9% agree with the second statement.

I was unable to locate data on how indigenous respondents in Chiapas specifically (as opposed to Chiapas and Oaxaca, combined) answered these questions, or on how indigenous respondents who were not already sorted into a communitarian modal cluster answered these questions. The author does not reveal, for example, how many indigenous respondents in Chiapas agree with the statement that “mandatory communal work is not legal” (one of the eight survey questions designed to assess communitarian attitudes). And indeed, although he asserts that “Zapatista communitarianism was not reflective of the attitudes of most indigenous respondents in Chiapas” (p. 71), elsewhere he also admits that the data “disconfirm the null hypothesis that ethnic identity is an important cause of communitarian attitudes for all but Model 1 (Chiapas)” (p. 63). This sentence is not easy to unravel, but it appears to indicate that in Chiapas, ethnic identity *is* an important “cause” of communitarian attitudes.

In his introductory chapter, Eisenstadt explains that his approach is “similar to that of anthropologist David Stoll, who took issue with many of the factual inconsistencies in Nobel Laureate Rigoberta Menchu's epic autobiography *I Rigoberta Menchu* (1984). He aims at moving beyond the activist scholarship that, he believes, has dominated research on the Zapatistas to uncover the “objective circumstances and discernible truths” (p. 15) he believes that his survey reveals.

The author seems to be on much firmer ground, however, in Chapters 6 and 7, where he relaxes the premise that indigenous people hold either individual or communitarian commitments, presenting ethnographic research that shows how people integrate both perspectives, and how their orientations may change in different contexts.

Here, he truly captures the agency and complexity of indigenous beliefs and attitudes, and shows that indigenous rights are not, by definition, collective rights.

Many indigenous rights activists, however, including the Zapatistas, already reflect this complexity. In public documents like the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, indigenous activists have endorsed both individual and collective rights. Article 1 of the UN declaration states, for example: "Indigenous peoples have the right to the full enjoyment, as a collective or as individuals, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms." The Zapatistas have also insisted on a simultaneous commitment to individual and collective rights, in particular with respect to women's rights. In January 1994, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) circulated the Zapatista Women's Revolutionary Law, which asserts a range of individual rights that challenge many indigenous traditional practices. The Zapatistas, in fact, were instrumental in orienting the indigenous rights movement around the premise that the moral force of collective rights depends in part on respect for individual rights. This position does seem to come closer to accurately representing the complexity that Eisenstadt reveals.

This book is a work of "critical" indigenous scholarship. It breaks important new ground by taking indigenous people seriously as political actors who hold a range of views, many of which are shaped by forces beyond culture alone. This analysis of political identity challenges the claims of many rights activists, and activist scholars, who have staked indigenous rights on the assertion that indigenous peoples hold a fundamentally distinct and unified worldview. Eisenstadt's findings problematize that belief, with the potential for shifting and proliferating, or undermining, the grounds on which indigenous people make political claims. At the same time, the author seems to overstate the degree to which indigenous people in Chiapas break with communitarian beliefs, and to understate the degree to which indigenous rights movements already grapple with the tensions inherent in a twin commitment to collective and individual rights—probably the central issue of indigenous politics in most countries today.

**Elites and Classes in the Transformation of State Socialism.** By David Lane. Edison, NJ: Transaction, 2011. 222p. \$49.95.

**Popular Support for an Undemocratic Regime: The Changing Views of Russians.** By Richard Rose, William Mishler, and Neil Munro. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 214p. \$88.00 cloth, \$30.99 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592712003350

— Vladimir Gel'man, *European University at St. Petersburg*

These two books deal with an important yet underexplored societal dimension of postcommunist political

change in the former Soviet Union. Despite numerous calls for "bringing society back in," the postcommunist literature is still heavily dominated by institutionalists and/or scholars of political economy, while many crucial research questions remain unanswered. Why do Russian citizens not actively participate in politics? What are the reasons behind the political loyalty of Russians vis-à-vis the country's authoritarian regime, and does their loyalty indicate that Russians are genuinely undemocratic? What is the nature of the relationship between the changing social structures of post-Soviet countries and their regime changes? And to what extent is the level of continuity and change among elites regarded as a key factor in determining the direction of post-Soviet political and economic reforms?

The wave of "color revolutions" of the 2000s and the "Arab Spring" after 2010 brought to the fore our need to understand the societal issues of global politics. Russia's postcommunist experience is worth further consideration for what it can contribute to that understanding. The elite-driven nature of postcommunist change occurred against a backdrop of major economic decline, the subsequent rise of the predatory state, and the major alienation of society from the political process. Indeed, the Russian experience raises numerous questions for scholars of comparative politics and political sociology. Although the books under review are both focused on explaining the postcommunist experience, they deal with different scholarly issues and utilize quite diverse research frameworks, methodologies, and data. It is no wonder that their major conclusions as well as their contributions widely differ from each other.

In *Popular Support for an Undemocratic Regime*, Richard Rose, William Mishler, and Neil Munro present the results of their longitudinal study, the New Russia Barometer, which was carried out in collaboration with the Levada Center, one of the most reputable Russian polling agencies. This unprecedented research project allowed scholars to create a unique data set of 18 nationwide mass surveys conducted from 1992 to 2009 using similar sampling and questionnaires. Based upon their careful and sophisticated statistical analysis of the results of these surveys, the authors focus on the nature and determinants of mass political support of the status quo political regime in Russia (which in itself drastically changed over time). To a certain extent, the current book is a follow-up to a previous study by the same group of authors, *Russia Transformed: Developing Popular Support for a New Regime* (2006), but the addition of new data and new dimensions of analysis makes the recent study more current and valuable.

The key argument of the authors might be summarized as follows: Despite the fact that Russian citizens do not deny democratic ideas and procedures (such as competitive elections), they endorse an authoritarian regime, which was able to build a popular basis through coercion