little in the way of detail and positive examples. Not to give attention to the changes in foreign behavior during Rousseff's administration disregards an important element for understanding the political crisis the country is currently undergoing.

Last, the author makes some considerations for the future, which are on hold in the current context. What we read between the lines of his suggestions is that Brazil may evolve into a country with less unique foreign behavior. He finishes by commenting on the Ministry of External Relations.

This is a controversial book that makes an important contribution to understanding Brazilian foreign policy with the concept of structural power and Brazil's pursuit of it. It is an excellent conceptual tool for understanding an unusual foreign policy.

Miriam Gomes Saraiva
Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro

Alejandro Velasco, *Barrio Rising: Urban Popular Politics and the Making of Modern Venezuela*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015. Maps, figures, notes, bibliography, index, 321 pp.; paperback $29.95.

Perched just above Miraflores Palace in the foothills of western Caracas, the 23 de Enero (January 23rd) neighborhood is undoubtedly the single most debated and controversial patch of land in all Venezuela. Local revolutionaries inhabit this historic hotbed of militancy while others revere it from afar. The wealthy view it with a fearful suspicion shared by all governments before the 1998 election of Hugo Chávez, whose own relationship to the neighborhood took the form of a broad boomerang arc: it was from there that Chávez helped launch a failed 1992 coup, only to return there to his rest after his death in 2013.

Home of guerrillas past and armed militias today, 23 de Enero has too often served as a useful caricature for left and right alike. Not so for Alejandro Velasco, whose *Barrio Rising* disrupts the uniformity of this image without dispersing its historical weight. Beautifully written, thoroughly researched, and adorned with a striking array of archival imagery, Velasco's account grants the neighborhood all the complexity of a real place inhabited by real people. By providing an account of the complex and shifting repertoires of protest and resistance forged in 23 de Enero, Velasco has given us the best book yet on popular participation in Venezuela.

23 de Enero was born twice, in diametrically opposed ways, and Velasco treats these dual baptisms in a first pair of chapters. In the mid-1950s, the area served to showcase the modernizing aspirations of the dictator Marcos Pérez Jiménez, whose "battle against the *rancho*" saw slum housing bulldozed and replaced by towering 15-story apartment blocks—a project named 2 de Diciembre to commemorate the dictator's own seizure of power. As in all brutal modernization campaigns, reactions from the population were ambivalent at best: some were ecstatic at their new accommodations, others felt a sort of existential disconnect living in a giant "matchboxes," while still more were less than grateful to a regime that had only just demolished their own self-made homes (42).

The zone's second birth—this time as 23 de Enero proper—was not completely *ex nihilo*, but instead sprang from the very contradictions and complexities that Velasco draws out so skillfully. Although named for the date that Pérez Jiménez was overthrown, in early 1958, this strategically central space had seen increasing tension, resistance, and police repression even before the dictator's ouster. Local residents participated in that overthrow directly, but their insurgent participation did not stop there: within 48 hours of the dictator's fall, "nearly thirty thousand people had illegally occupied over 3,000 [vacant] apartments in the western sectors of the housing project" (52).

When the apartments were all occupied, up went the very same self-constructed housing that the dictator had sought to eradicate, producing the landscape that prevails today: tall apartment blocks protruding from an undulating sea of informal housing. Changing names aside, the fiercely resistant spirit of 23 de Enero has always exceeded the apartment blocks for which it is best known, partly because their explicit function was that of a straitjacket: where the apartment blocks sought "to homogenize space and social relations," what instead emerged was a "deeply riven social landscape" in which "old and new residents, apartment dwellers and rancho inhabitants, coexisted, sometimes uneasily" (14).

Rather than paper over these complexities, Velasco dwells on the socioeconomic, cultural, and political "fault lines" between east and west, "between the superblocks above and the ranchos below" (54). While many in the west organized to keep their squatted apartments, those in the east organized to drive down their rent payments, but both sectors joined in broad struggles for schools and infrastructure. They also came together in the streets months later in apparently contradictory incidents that nevertheless confirm Velasco's analysis: local residents mobbed U.S. Vice President Richard Nixon's motorcade, forcing the new government to deploy tanks in the streets, only then to mobilize to defend that government against a right-wing coup attempt. Even when defending the government, however, many did so with the repertoire of autonomous techniques that remain central today, from "order brigades" to armed barricades (82–83).

In a pair of chapters spanning the 1960s, Velasco depicts a local population torn between revolutionary change and electoral participation, noting "a difference between insurgent youths and youths in the insurgency, where political consciousness and participation reflected parts of a spectrum rather than any more formal dichotomy" (116). Eventually, guerrillas would abandon the hope of mass insurrection in 23 de Enero (an error they would attempt to correct two decades later), leaving local residents "deeply disenchanted with both insurgents and the major parties in power" (15). In fact, local residents maintained a peculiar position: consistently voting but using those votes to reject the emerging two-party system. In 1958, 1963, and 1969, the major party victors all lost Caracas, and 23 de Enero often more severely (130).

The next pair of chapters narrows in on the rebirth and development of local, grassroots struggles in 23 de Enero in the 1970s (beginning with a 1969 skirmish over water shortages) and the 1980s (particularly a wave of hijackings of garbage trucks). In both cases, residents targeted the state's failure to provide necessary serv-

ices by taking direct and militant action, but did so not to overthrow the government but to demand accountability—embodying in the process the contradictory position in regard to the state that Velasco understands as characteristic of 23 de Enero.

There is a danger, when discussing contemporary Venezuela, of focusing too much on exceptional people, moments, and spaces to the neglect of the banality of the everyday. 23 de Enero is central among these exceptions for its symbolic charge and ferociously revolutionary character. But while *Barrio Rising* is entirely dedicated to this exception, Velasco uses the exceptionality of 23 de Enero to pry open the everyday. Toward this end, his methods resonate deeply with his subject matter, allowing unevenness to emerge ethnographically without dissolving the broad contours of history, and walking the fine line between macrolevel theorizing and the disintegrative tendencies of ethnography.

The result is a text that dramatically enriches our understanding of what democracy means by incorporating new political subjects and the tactics they bring to bear in the tense space between "the ballot" and "the street." Velasco rejects liberal pieties by taking seriously otherwise *verboten* tactical repertoires—protests, street barricades, and even hijackings—but crucially, taking these seriously as democratic means and elements in "an expansive understanding of democracy that combined institutional and noninstitutional, formal and informal, legal and illegal practices in their dealings with the state" (9).

The inverse of Velasco's thick and expansive view of democratic participation and 23 de Enero's "contradictory relationship with the state" is that "the ballot" remained a consistently "powerful weapon in a broad arsenal of political action" (10). This insistence, he argues, can "chafe" against those "revolutionary designs" according to which *Chavismo* rejects representative democracy *tout court* in favor of more direct forms of participation. And it chafes similarly against an "episodic view of history" in which one episode stands out above all others, where exceptional space meets exceptional moment: the 1989 mass antineoliberal rebellion and massacre known as the *Caracazo*, which set the Bolivarian process in motion (9).

Velasco provides a local history of this murderous assault on democratic expectations, but he also points to the ways that prevailing *Chavista* narratives—which tend to split "pre-1989 Venezuela from post-1989 Venezuela"—can reproduce the invisibilization of earlier local struggles. Local residents were neither co-opted into passivity before nor suddenly awakened after 1989, and exaggerating moments of dramatic rupture runs the risk of recreating elite prejudices, according to which the *pueblo* is incapable of independent action and reflection, and—paraphrasing Marx—the poor cannot represent themselves and must instead be represented. But considering that presumed passivity opens onto representation in Marx's account should also give us pause.

In other words, if "*el pueblo* was far from passive" in its resistance to the old regime (9), we should be wary of coming to the opposite conclusion—that grassroots commitment to representative democracy remained uniform over time. While the *Caracazo* did not create an entirely new country overnight, it was nonetheless a moment of radical reordering; indeed, as radical as the world has seen in recent

decades: the old two-party system collapsed, new battle lines were drawn, and people were thrown to one side or the other in the tumult that has come since. But this was also a moment when many found their patience for representative democracy and representative institutions running out. The widespread sympathy for the failed 1992 coup—and subsequent support for Chávez—was not an endorsement of existing representative institutions but of radical intervention from outside and a very different vision of democracy.

Velasco frames *Barrio Rising* as an attempt to break what Fernando Coronil called a "collective amnesia" fueled by oil wealth, an unmoored condition that renders Venezuela, in the words of Federico Vegas, "a hysterical country subject to infernal repetition." When, in 2007, a Caracas skyscraper known as the Tower of David was occupied by the poor, wealthy elites recoiled in abject fear. Since the past remains "masked and distorted by layers of amnesia and hysteria," Velasco suggests, it was difficult for many to connect this recent occupation to the mass squatting of 23 de Enero nearly 60 years ago (xii–xiii). But there is a certain naïveté to thinking that these are not willful fears, that they provide no comfort or alibi, and that cutting through them with reasoned history will disarm their effects. It is not that elites have forgotten that 23 de Enero "held the promise of greater participation, of greater democracy" (xiii); this is precisely what many fear most.

George Ciccariello-Maher
Drexel University

Tiffany D. Barnes, *Gendering Legislative Behavior: Institutional Constraints and Collaboration*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Map, figures, tables, bibliography, index, 274 pp.; hardcover $99.99, paperback $34.99, ebook $28.

This well-researched and well-structured book investigates collaboration in legislatures, understanding it as an important but underrated and underresearched phenomenon in need of further investigation. In her thoughtful study, Tiffany Barnes explores the extent to which women legislators, in particular, collaborate in the legislature. The book asks and answers three core questions that get to the heart of the key issues: can democracy be collaborative? why do women collaborate? and when do they collaborate?

Through a detailed and careful analysis, Barnes shows us that collaboration is indeed important in legislatures and that overall, women are more likely than men to collaborate. Argentina provides her primary case study material, taking up most of the book, with a much shorter discussion of four national legislatures as comparator cases in the last chapter to test the generalizability of her findings. The four comparator cases are the Rwandan Parliament, the U.S. Senate, the Uruguayan Congress, and the South African Parliament. Her in-depth empirical data were gathered from Argentina's provincial legislatures. Indeed, Barnes's choice of Argentina was partly determined by the country's federal system, which allows for the direct comparison of a number of subnational legislatures in one country.