

men and women migrants who have run for election or held office, Danielson approaches the question of why some migrants engage in local politics and what makes them successful. His is a nuanced perspective that reveals as much about local politics in origin countries as it does about political transnationalism. On the one hand, it shows that in the face of Mexico's uneven democratic transition, the mechanisms for migrant political participation and the impact of such activities are limited. At the same time, even though it is clear that the migration experience shapes political identities and behaviors, this experience is not monolithic. Danielson's nuanced understanding of these different subnational contexts and individual experiences allows for a deep exploration of various forms and stages of transnational connections and political participation—shaped by remote communications, return visits, meetings, and negotiations with elected authorities in migrant-receiving places; transfer of financial or in-kind resources for the community; funding of public works projects or political campaigns; and formation of civil society organizations.

Danielson reveals some of the paradoxes of migrant political engagement, where the expectation that their election or appointment to public office might lift up marginalized groups does not necessarily materialize, because returning migrants are often better off than local communities and therefore are not seen as representative of their interests. In many cases, it is precisely their migration experience that allows them access to political power and establishes a new political class, but this does not necessarily imply an improved representation of popular classes. In fact, in most cases, migrants who enjoy recognition and representation in the local political system are incorporated into dominant political groups. Thus, counter to his own initial optimism, Danielson concludes that “noteworthy levels of social capital, status, and wealth, help migrant political actors to gain local influence, but it proves very difficult for them to bring fundamental changes to the way politics are done back home” (p. 183).

Another paradox is the fact that, even though migrant engagement in some cases does increase democratic competition and weakens the grip of dominant political parties, it can also often devolve into conflict and factionalism at the municipal level, rather than build toward a consolidated democracy. The case of indigenous communities in Oaxaca is significant because their strong communal norms, practices, traditions, and identities determine strong transnational ties between migrants and their home communities, which can have a positive correlation with political representation and pluralism. But common responses of the Oaxacan state and local governments to the emergence of migrant actors as political subjects have been exclusion and repression, which are explained, according to Danielson, by the

absence of institutionalized channels through which migrants can gain authentic representation.

Danielson's book sounds a powerful and persuasive cautionary note regarding the democratizing promise or ideal of migrant political participation—a phenomenon that is increasingly the subject of scholarly inquiry (see recent works by Burgess, Duquette-Rury, Krawatzek and Muller-Funk, and Perez Armendariz, for example) and that needs to be amply considered in public debates and policies focused on absentee voting rights, migrant candidacies, or political empowerment within migrant communities. Even if the channels through which migrants participate and become influential politically become clearer and in some cases more open, Danielson reminds us that “this does not necessarily tell us what the nature of their influence is likely to be” (p. 18). In the Mexican case, migrants have had a mixed role in the construction of an inclusive subnational democracy, and the systemic barriers to building it are deeply entrenched.

Although they raise similar questions, these two books offer different perspectives and methodologies that complement each other and open up new areas of inquiry within the fields of transnationalism, migration and diaspora studies, citizenship, and subnational politics. The value of their in-depth ethnographic study of the Mexican case and their mixed-methods (and, notably, the datasets that Danielson offers) will surely be to enhance future comparative analyses of migrant participation in other local contexts and in other countries. With changing migration dynamics in the region, studies such as these provide essential elements for understanding migrants' processes of political participation in the United States and Mexico, including naturalization and voting rates, absentee voting, and the changing dynamics of participation in local politics in Mexico. These studies will be invaluable as further analyses consider new and important questions that are reshaping the political, economic, and social landscape in the two countries. This includes the differences in transnational engagement and political participation between migrants who return voluntarily versus those who are deported, or the political role of dual citizens who were brought from the United States to Mexico at a young age as a result of their parents' forced return.

Regime Support Beyond the Balance Sheet: Participation and Policy Performance in Latin America. By Matthew Rhodes-Purdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. 278p. \$105.00 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S1537592719003505

— Kirk A. Hawkins, *Brigham Young University*
kirk.hawkins@byu.edu

In Regime Support Beyond the Balance Sheet: Participation and Policy Performance in Latin America, Matthew

Rhodes-Purdy uses the puzzle of regime support in Chile and Venezuela as a weapon to challenge the dominance of rationalist accounts of democratic regime support. Until the early 2010s, levels of regime support in Chile and Venezuela were outliers for the region, with unusually low support in Chile despite strong policy performance, and high support in Venezuela even with the poor policy performance of the Hugo Chávez government. Rhodes-Purdy argues that participatory opportunities, or what he calls “citizen autonomy,” were responsible for the difference. Drawing from participatory democratic theory (à la Carole Pateman and Benjamin Barber) and social psychological theories of organizational justice, he argues that citizen satisfaction with democracy depends crucially on perceptions about procedure and not just policy outcomes: perceptions are key. Rhodes-Purdy admits that most citizens lack the desire or the ability to actually participate, but theories of organizational justice require only that there be opportunities for participation that help people feel empowered. Because Chávez’s government provided these opportunities, even in partisan forms limited to the local level, it enjoyed a cushion of legitimacy that protected it from its policy mistakes, at least as long as Chávez was alive to supplement these participatory opportunities with his populist rhetoric and charisma. Chile’s post-transition elitist government, which shielded technocratic policy making from popular input, lacked this buffer and suffered from a growing sense of malaise, despite exemplary policy performance for the region. The implication is that theories of democratic regime stability should not focus exclusively on citizens’ material preferences; psychologically rooted, normative preferences regarding procedures are also important.

Rhodes-Purdy fleshes out this argument in the first three chapters and then uses the rest of the book for empirical tests. In chapter 4, he provides a large-N study of four waves of the Latin American Public Opinion Project’s Americas Barometer. He models the relationship among three sets of attitudes: regime-based efficacy (RBE; his indicator of perceived participatory opportunities), perceptions of policy performance, and regime support. He finds that RBE has the stronger association with regime support and moderates the effect of perceived performance (performance matters more when RBE is low, suggesting that RBE insulates regime support from bad performance). He checks these results by running a similar analysis on ANES data and by estimating the effect of an objective measure of participatory institutions on his model.

Chapter 5 provides a case study of participatory institutions in Venezuela under Chávez. Rhodes-Purdy argues that Venezuela represents a case of “participatory populism” in which a populist movement enacted participatory institutions only at the local level, where they could be contained and co-opted by the movement leaders. This solves what Rhodes-Purdy calls the “popu-

list dilemma,” or the conflict between populism’s participatory message and the concentration of power in a leader who claims to embody that will. Rhodes-Purdy is at his best in describing the workings of the Communal Councils (CCs), the main participatory project until Chávez’s death in 2013. He draws from several studies on the CCs that highlight their combination of local control over CC decision making with state control over funding. He also analyzes survey data from the Americas Barometer in Venezuela, showing that Venezuelans’ experience of participation in the CCs boosted regime support among Chávez supporters.

Chapter 6 explores the Chilean case by showing first that economic performance since the transition to democracy fails to explain the country’s much-noted popular dissatisfaction with the party system; most of Chile’s governance indicators are the highest in the region, and satisfaction with parties is actually strongest among the poorest segments of society. The culprit is the protected democracy left over from the military dictatorship. Electoral rules and technocratic decision making in government agencies, both established under the Pinochet government, shielded political elites from popular input in decision making while raising barriers to entry to new participants. Rhodes-Purdy tests these claims through an analysis of a 2012 nationwide public opinion survey, an experiment ($n = 147$) on Chilean university students, and a qualitative analysis of a participatory initiative by a Santiago municipality. He finds that confidence in political parties is closely linked to (the lack of) participatory opportunities and that creating participatory opportunities dramatically improves citizens’ support for the political system.

Overall, Rhodes-Purdy’s spirited rebuttal of rationalist accounts of regime support is a welcome addition to the literature, and he makes an important contribution by applying social psychological theories of organizational justice, as well as more familiar theories of democratic participation. His attempt to test these with studies of these two puzzling cases is largely persuasive and will speak especially to scholars studying the region.

However, the book could have gone further in two directions that would have made a stronger contribution. First, although Rhodes-Purdy is careful to specify key terms such as “regime support,” he tends to invent new terms or use old ones in ways that readers will find puzzling and that limit his ability to speak to a larger audience. For example, he labels restrictive, nonparticipatory models “liberal democracy,” despite citing liberal democratic theorists such as John Stuart Mill and Robert Dahl to buttress his claims about democratic participation. The term “neoliberal” might have been a better choice. In addition, despite some obvious theoretical overlap with Hanna Pitkin’s work on representation, Rhodes-Purdy fails to cite or speak to her fourfold model, drawing only on

the concept of substantive representation, which he rightly argues is a limited basis for ensuring regime support. Pitkin's concept of procedural representation seems similar to his concepts of procedural support/opportunities for participation, and one wonders (especially given the importance of Chávez's populist rhetoric) whether Pitkin's descriptive and symbolic representation are doing some of the causal work as well.

Second, the empirical tests in the book are sometimes thin, giving it a rushed feel that leaves important questions unanswered. For example, it is not clear why Rhodes-Purdy's comparative analysis of regime support in chapter 4 does not control for whether respondents voted for the incumbent; in this regard, the analysis of Venezuela (which is transparent about the impact of partisanship) is more persuasive. Likewise, readers may wish that Rhodes-Purdy had brought in more objective measures of participatory opportunities and that he had spent more time modeling RBE itself. Furthermore, although I found the argument for Chile intuitively appealing, each of the three tests in the chapter is weak. As Rhodes-Purdy notes, the public opinion survey measures perceptions of participatory opportunities through confidence in parties, the experiment is performed on very small student samples, and the qualitative study of the participatory initiative lacks a pretest. Finally, many technical details in the book are missing. Chapter 4 lacks specifications for its final robustness check, and most of the Venezuela and Chile case studies fail to include model specifications and question wording. It would have helped to see some of the confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling rendered graphically.

Despite these weak points, this book gives a persuasive account of recent events in Chile and Venezuela with broad implications. As stated in the conclusion, these implications help us understand more recent developments in both countries (positive in Chile, negative in Venezuela), and they speak to the rise of populism today. And as Rhodes-Purdy suggests, politicians who try to shield themselves from voter participation to prevent populist mobilization may be causing the very thing they hoped to avoid.

Why Alliances Fail: Islamist and Leftist Coalitions in North Africa. By Matt Buehler. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2018. 304p. \$75.00 cloth, \$39.95 paper. doi:10.1017/S153759271900327X

— Jean Lachapelle, *University of Michigan*
jeanlach@umich.edu

Recent events in the Arab world have demonstrated the importance of cross-ideological mobilization for determining whether authoritarian regimes persist or democratize. Only when both Islamists and non-Islamists joined forces against Arab autocrats have autocrats been removed

from power, and only where such coalitions did not disintegrate after the regime's breakdown did we witness democratization. Matt Buehler's book provides a much-needed contribution to our understanding of how cross-ideological alliances shape Arab politics. Focusing on party alliances between leftists and Islamists in the Maghreb, his book provides valuable insights into opposition politics and autocratic survival.

The book compares seven cases of alliances between Islamist and leftist parties that formed during the 2000s in Tunisia, Morocco, and Mauritania. Buehler finds that among these seven alliances, only five survived longer than 12 months, while the remaining two collapsed soon after their creation. The central puzzle this book addresses is therefore: Why did some cross-ideological alliances survive, whereas others did not?

Although existing scholarship often focuses on the ideological disagreements and doctrinal differences between Islamists and leftists, this book highlights the role of pro-regime forces in breaking up opposition alliances. Buehler argues that every time cross-ideological coalitions began to form between Islamists and leftists, the authoritarian regime moved aggressively to shatter them. Whether the alliance ultimately survived depended on whether it could resist the regime's onslaught. Cases where alliances did not endure are those where the regime was able to co-opt politicians from one of the parties in the newborn coalition. For example, in Morocco in 2009, the regime co-opted elite and rank-and-file politicians from the Socialist Union of Popular Forces after it formed an alliance with the Islamist Justice and Development party, and the coalition disintegrated. In Mauritania, the regime co-opted members of the Islamist Tawassoul Party and forced it to retract an alliance with the leftist Union of Forces of Progress formed in 2008. In the five other cases that the book examines, which include the 2005–14 coalition between Tunisian leftist parties and the Islamist Ennahda Party, regimes were unable to co-opt any member of the cross-ideological alliance and the coalition endured. What Buehler shows us is that a cross-ideological alliance is only as strong as its weakest member.

What makes some parties more vulnerable to co-optation than others? Based on in-depth studies of these seven cases, Buehler argues that parties that establish a foothold in rural areas tend to be more vulnerable to co-optation, whereas those that maintain an urban social base are better able to resist an authoritarian regime's pressures. This is because politicians in rural areas need access to state resources to maintain clientelist ties with voters and advance their careers. Loyalist (pro-regime) forces can easily co-opt such politicians by offering direct access to state resources and attractive opportunities for career advancement. Rural and mostly illiterate voters will not punish opposition politicians who switch to pro-regime parties because such voters are motivated not by