

In one of the book's major scholarly contributions, Frymer shows the importance of internationalizing research on the American state. Drawing on a rich body of cross-border historical scholarship, he argues that the Mexican government's failure to settle lands north of the Rio Grande made those lands attractive to the United States as a place for white settlement. By contrast, the more densely populated areas of present-day Mexico ultimately prevented their incorporation. Cuba and Santo Domingo were never annexed for similar reasons. One hopes that other APD scholars will be inspired by this example to pay more attention to how events in Latin America and the Caribbean affected US political development.

In a stand-alone chapter that enriches his story of territorial expansion, Frymer pays particular attention to the long-standing project of black colonization. Although there is an enduring misconception that this was a fringe project, Frymer shows that it had significant support among many political elites including James Madison and Abraham Lincoln. Rather than allowing African Americans to move westward, which threatened the racial demography of territorial expansion, northern leaders developed ill-conceived plans to create black colonies in Africa, Latin America, or the Caribbean. Most of these schemes were never implemented, but their popularity among a wide variety of US elites reveals the state's commitment to white supremacy across the continent.

The book concludes with a brief look at the acquisition of Hawai'i, the final site of American settler empire.

Despite vigorous opposition from Native Hawaiians and concerns about the archipelago's diverse population, the white oligarchy managed to overthrow Queen Lili'uokalani. The annexation of Hawai'i was in doubt until the American rebels could convince Congress that the islands were suitable for white settlement. Although this section could have engaged more directly with the extensive literature on Native Hawaiian resistance (e.g., Noenoe Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 2004), Frymer still makes a persuasive case: Hawai'i may have been located thousands of miles from the North American continent, but the logic of demographic dominance still applied.

Any scholar of empire, state development, race, or indigenous politics will benefit from a close reading of *Building an American Empire*. With this fine study, Frymer paves the way for more nuanced understandings of the nineteenth-century American state and its foundational political project of territorial expansion. He also fills a gap in APD scholarship, which has too often neglected the importance of territorial expansion and indigenous resistance in shaping US institutions. In tracing the history of US settler colonialism, he establishes the centrality of land policies that allowed the American state to expand its control with little direct coercive force. But Frymer's careful research reveals more than the underlying institutional mechanisms of empire building. He also uncovers the tensions between expansion and white supremacy that have always been at the heart of American empire.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Limits to Decolonization: Indigeneity, Territory, and Hydrocarbon Politics in the Bolivian Chaco. By

Penelope Anthias. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2018.

312p. \$115.00 cloth, \$27.95 paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592720001619

— Karleen Jones West , SUNY Geneseo
kwest@geneseo.edu

In 2006, Evo Morales was famously elected the first self-identified indigenous president of Bolivia. Under Morales, the decolonization of politics, economics, society, and culture was the central project motivating state and social transformation. Morales promised to extend human rights and dignity to every Bolivian citizen as part of his “plurinational” state, which formed the cornerstone of his New Left political ideology and the rewritten 2009 constitution. In 2011, Morales mandated an annual “Day of Decolonization” celebrating indigenous nations and commemorating his administration's extension of rights to Bolivia's long-neglected indigenous citizens.

According to Penelope Anthias, the president of Bolivia's Guaraní indigenous community Itika Guasu claimed, also in 2011, that the Guaraní had finally achieved “fully legal recognition” (p. 5) of their property rights over their native community territory (Tierra Comunitaria de Origen; TCO). However, this “fully legal recognition” was not provided by Morales and the Bolivian state. Instead, after a decade of failed attempts to gain legal titles for their TCO from the Bolivian government, Itika Guasu had circumvented the state to directly negotiate and sign an agreement with the Spanish oil company Repsol. In exchange for access to Itika Guasu's section of the hydrocarbon-rich subsoil of Bolivia's arid Chaco region, Repsol acknowledged the Guaraní's property rights and promised them an investment fund totaling \$14.8 million, “the interest from which was to be managed independently by the Guaraní organization” (p. 5).

There is tremendous irony in this juxtaposition of Morales's decolonization efforts and Itika Guasu's view that they achieved “fully legal” recognition of their lands only through an agreement with a Spanish oil company. But this juxtaposition also captures the desperate situation in which many of Latin America's contemporary

indigenous communities find themselves. On the one hand, indigenous nationalities have been afforded more legal recognition than ever as democratization, multiculturalism, and New Left governments swept across the region. On the other hand, the persistence of neoliberal doctrine, the global demand for hydrocarbon resources, and states' pursuit of development mean that indigenous groups have continued to be neglected and manipulated in favor of neocolonial extractive interests. At its core, *Limits to Decolonization* provides a richly detailed case study of how this tension has evolved in a remote Guaraní community in the Bolivian lowlands Chaco region. But Anthias's much larger contribution—and one that she could have spent more time developing—is how this case illustrates the overarching conflict between human rights, extractivism, and territorial control that shapes contemporary politics across Latin America.

Anthias, a geographer, uses rich historical and ethnographic research to trace “the evolution of the Guaraní territorial claim in Itika Guasu from its insurgent origins, through its production in cartography and law, to its growing enmeshment in hydrocarbon politics” (p. 15). A real strength is Anthias's account of the historic context for the Guaraní's land claims. In chapter 1, Anthias describes the gradual and devastating colonial process centered around cattle and oil production that stripped the Guaraní of their communal lands in the Chaco. The detailed yet straightforward narrative that Anthias constructs will assist even those with minimal knowledge of colonial history in understanding the deeply entrenched racial hierarchies that structure Latin American politics and society. In chapters 2 and 3, Anthias illustrates how the colonial legacy of racialized power inequalities effectively silenced indigenous territorial knowledge in both the mapping and titling processes of TCOs conducted by the Bolivian state. In doing so, Anthias delves into the complicated landscape of rural politics in the Andean region, with its *patrones* (landowners) and *campesinos* (peasants), settlers of indigenous and non-indigenous origins, and the many ways that these groups do and do not overlap. Political practices that are unfortunately all too common in many of Latin America's rural areas—including violence, bribery, and clientelism—proved instrumental in obstructing indigenous representation in the Chaco. Anthias documents these and other fascinating political dynamics that developed around granting legal land titles, including efforts by some small-scale *mestizo* farmers to “pass” as Guaraní in order to ensure continued access to land in TCOs (p. 104).

Anthias's work also touches on key debates on indigenous politics, multiculturalism, and sustainability as highlighted in the literature. Recent scholarship on Latin America's indigenous movements recognizes the paradox inherent in state-coordinated extractivist development: extending public services funded by hydrocarbon rents

to poor constituencies often comes at the cost of encroaching on resource-rich indigenous lands. By examining this tension at the community level, Anthias emphasizes indigenous agency in the struggle for both cultural rights and economic development. She convincingly argues that Itika Guasu's agreement with the Spanish oil company Repsol “marked a turning point” for the Guaraní and “provided the basis for a new vision of territory and autonomy” in the indigenous community's centuries-long struggle for rights and recognition (p. 5). Anthias defends indigenous groups' decisions to participate in extractive projects, highlighting a new form of “hydrocarbon citizenship” that provides an alternate forum for territorial recognition and sovereignty for communities that have long been subject to racial exclusion and dispossession (p. 246).

Yet this view is not without controversy, even among the Guaraní who stood much to gain from their “Agreement of Friendship” with Repsol. As Anthias documents in chapter 6, Itika Guasu's entry into the hydrocarbon business did little to rejuvenate the Guaraní's collective territorial project; instead it resulted in “political fragmentation, the erosion of indigenous governance structures, and the harnessing of political authority to external interests” (p. 206). The community became torn apart as movement leadership was divided between those supported by the oil company—and who were receiving salaries as a result—and those allied with Morales and the state. Though the *Limits to Decolonization* offers a clear critique of Morales's so-called post-neoliberal government, it could easily have been equally critical of the global dominance of the hydrocarbon industry and the global North's relentless consumption that demands ever-increasing oil and gas production. It is difficult to argue that the variety of neocolonialism grounded in extractivism as experienced by Itika Guasu provides any sort of real solution for indigenous groups seeking genuine sovereignty and autonomy.

Indeed, Anthias only briefly recognizes another grave paradox confronting many of Latin America's contemporary indigenous movements; namely, the long-term environmental risks for communities posed by extractivist development (pp. 219–25). As one of Anthias's participants put it, “There are some people who know, who feel, feel that they're damaging their TCO, that the oil companies damage the environment” (p. 221). Anthias's account of Itika Guasu ends by recognizing her ambivalence with respect to the sustainability—politically, economically, and environmentally—of projects like the “Agreement of Friendship” with Repsol. Future research may further explore the quality of indigenous autonomy that, as a participant in Anthias's book describes, is “based on money” and leads only to more extractivism (p. 244). Nevertheless, Anthias's contribution has inspired a constructive and realistic framework for analyzing indigenous rights movements in the era of extractivism, one that not

only appropriately contextualizes indigenous claims to territory but also places indigenous agency at the forefront of their search for autonomy.

The Good Politician: Folk Theories, Political Interaction, and the Rise of Anti-Politics. By Nick Clarke, Will Jennings, Jonathan Moss, and Gerry Stoker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. 324p. \$89.99 cloth, \$29.99 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592720001516

— Russell J. Dalton , *University of California, Irvine*
rdalton@uci.edu

The Good Politician is an innovative contribution to the burgeoning literature on public attitudes toward democratic actors and institutions in British politics. It is a thoroughly interdisciplinary work in its authorship and evidence, which is part of its innovativeness. As a result, its theoretical reach and evidence are much broader than most works in this field.

Nick Clarke and coauthors' central question is whether an "anti-politics" mood has grown among the British public over time. This links their work to the debate on the erosion of democratic political culture among established democracies, especially under a recent populist onslaught. Have citizens' images of their position in the democratic process, the behavior of elites, or the overall workings of the process changed over the past half-century? And more deeply, what has caused any changes in Britain's political culture, and what are the implications of such changes?

Three things stand out in this book. First is the use of evidence from the Mass Observation (MO) data project. This project asked an unscientifically selected panel of British citizens to comment on questions about politics and society selected by the project. The first period of the MO ran from 1939 to 1955, and it began again in 1981 continuing to the present. For each panel used in this book, the authors selectively drew 60 individuals for analysis. More than half of the book is devoted to extensive verbatim quotes from the panelists that illustrate the authors' points. Many of the quotations provide interesting views drawn from the average citizens' thoughts and give life to the authors' larger academic questions.

A second innovation is the parallel use of a diverse set of national public opinion polls to describe public opinion and track it over time. British pollsters have asked a rich variety of questions, but this variety and the changing mix of questions over time present a challenge when comparing opinions in the 1960s to those in the 2010s. In one chapter, the authors turn to Stimson's methodology to combine differently worded questions from different survey firms into an aggregate measure of the anti-politics mood of Britons over the past half-century. They find a fluctuating overall increase in anti-politics sentiment from 1965 to 2015. This is consistent with most descriptions of

the contemporary political culture in Britain and of most other affluent democracies. Citizens today are more critical of politicians, parties, and political institutions. Yet, one might be skeptical of the measure itself of the anti-politics mood. After discussing the literature highlighting the important differences between levels of political support and specific/diffuse support, all of these survey questions are mixed in the mood algorithm to produce a single number. Thus I was unsure what exactly the anti-partisan mood index measured and hence its interpretation.

Most of the other chapters focus on the responses from panelists in the MO, but there is always an effort to find parallel survey data on the topic. This blend of both methods gives more value to the findings.

A third distinguishing point is the extensive review of diverse kinds of literature related to the themes of political culture, democracy, and the trajectory of British politics. Not all the discussion of the literature is on point or still held in esteem, but it is all examined. This is a resource for those interested in the rich literature from political culture to political psychology.

As someone new to the MO research, which is quite a rare resource among democratic nations, I hoped that the authors would make greater use of this evidence. Chapter 7 is a good example of the methodology of the book. The chapter features 180 excerpts from MO panelists. These provide rich views of opinions, such as when one panelist describes David Cameron: "He's a bit like a geography teacher that sits on your desk trying to be friendly, but you know he has a bottle of Purell ready for when he goes back to his office" (p. 196). This method becomes a descriptive, largely inductive presentation, however. There are useful summaries in tables 7.1 and 7.2, but the two tables use different theoretical categories and are non-empirical. I yearned for a deductive approach, with theory-based categories and the distribution of comparable response options over MO studies. Analysis of a representative 2017 national poll complements the MO results. The authors identify the variations in political elite images across various social groups, because people are relatively less supportive of government over time. The variation in citizen opinions is perhaps just as important theoretically and politically as tracking the time trend. This analytic mix of MO and national samples extends across chapters as a positive feature of the book.

Since the MO panels are not representative, the quotes cannot substitute for evidence of the overall climate of opinion or change over time. However, could the study use social variation by class, region, gender, or other factors to systematically explore variation within panels? Are gender, age, or class patterns changing over time? Is there an additional value of the panels beyond the 60-case subset for each? In short, exploring the variation in opinions among MO panelists, as is done with the national polling data, would have been instructive.