tant sources when crafting a political biography in Mexico. It would also seem that Calles's archives potentially would have been useful for understanding the relationship between Maximino's revolutionary mentors and Calles, and the Miguel Alemán archives in shedding more light on Maximino's presidential ambitions. Quintana is often forced to speculate about certain controversies associated with Maximino's career, and these explanations lack depth. Finally, a nagging question is whether more primary research on President Ávila Camacho, who is given little attention, would have provided additional insights into his brother's career.

In laying out the historical background of the period, Quintana provides helpful insights into the national setting, but his description and explanations of Puebla itself, where much of Maximino's rise to national prominence occurs, are brief. Throughout, he tends to blend presidential and party influence together at a time when the party and its leadership was strictly a creature of the president. Significantly, we learn that political mentors were crucial to Maximino's success in the late 1910s, equally true of politicians in the decades since the 1920s. Quintana further demonstrates that the authoritarian practices Maximino learned as a zone commander in the 1920s and 1930s prepared him for employing similar techniques in Puebla's civilian political world. The author also discovers that President Cárdenas expanded the general's military zone in 1935 to cover the entire state of Puebla, thus placing an ally in firm control of the state. His loyalty to Cárdenas led to Maximino becoming the next governor. These are all important findings, and in developing these prevailing features of national politics in the 1930s and 1940s one wishes that Quintana would have had the opportunity to flesh out Maximino's career in richer detail.

Claremont McKenna College RODERIC AI CAMP
Claremont, California

Pistoleros and Popular Movements: The Politics of State Formation in Postrevolutionary Oaxaca. By Benjamin T. Smith. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009. Pp. vii, 578. Maps. Photographs. Tables. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $35.00 paper.

In *Pistoleros and Popular Movements*, Benjamin T. Smith explores the formation of the postrevolutionary state in Mexico, focusing on the southern state of Oaxaca and the period between 1928 and 1952. Like most recent histories of revolutionary and postrevolutionary Mexico, Smith argues that popular movements, local and regional political bosses, and state-level elites confounded the efforts of the central government to expand its reach across the national territory through ongoing efforts to contest, resist, appropriate, and reshape the center's socioeconomic and political reforms. Smith goes further than most historians, however, in claiming that generalizations about state formation in Mexico are all but impossible. He contends that the three major efforts to characterize the relationship between state and society in postrevolutionary Mexico—pluralist, revisionist, and postrevisionist or neo-Gramscian—all fail to "describe the sheer panoply of regional arrangements enacted by the Mexican state" (p. 5). Smith suggests, therefore, "a move away from these overarching models of state formation and toward an analysis

of distinct, contained moments of interaction between regional elites, popular groups, and the state" (p. 9).

The first chapter of the book provides historical background on Oaxaca between 1876 and 1928, from the beginning of the Porfiriato to that of the Maximato of Plutarco Elías Calles. The next four chapters deal with the politics and policies of the Cárdenas administration of 1934-1940; the final four, save a short concluding chapter, deal with popular movements and gubernatorial politics in the period of 1940 to 1952. Throughout, Smith looks at how governors and their circles of political supporters navigated their relationships with presidents and the federal government on the one hand, and with local and regional political bosses and popular movements on the other.

The strength of this book is its nuanced and highly-detailed description of local and state politics in the 1940s and early 1950s, a period as yet little explored by historians and poorly understood by social scientists, who have tended to overstate the coherence and reach of the central government in the post-Cárdenas era. Its main weaknesses are theoretical and conceptual in nature. Smith's critique of the pluralist and revisionist approaches to postrevolutionary state formation in Mexico covers very familiar and well-trodden territory, and it is not clear how his own approach differs from the postrevisionist analyses he finds lacking. While postrevisionists do indeed emphasize the role of hegemony and co-optation in state formation, they hardly ignore the importance of state violence and coercion, or the ongoing resistance of popular movements and regional elites to the expansion of the central state. Apart from the introductory and concluding chapters, the book is almost entirely descriptive, and non-specialists are likely to be overwhelmed by the level of detail in the absence of any clear analytical framework. In a section on methodology in the introductory chapter, Smith refers briefly to concepts such as mobilization structures, movement trajectories, and repertoires of contention, derived from social movement theory, but these play virtually no role in the rest of the book.

Smith seems to be rejecting the possibility of generalizations at any level. If this is the case, does it make any sense at all to speak of state formation? Although Smith does not define what he means by the word state, and often seems to conflate it with the policies, personnel, and organizations of the central government, the concept must imply some degree of institutionalization if it is to be at all useful, however varied state-society relationships may be over time and across territory. If state formation can only be captured by "dynamic, supple, localized anti-models" (p. 10), then the concepts of state and of formation have most likely been emptied of all meaningful content. But surely there is some analytical terrain between the Leviathan of revisionism and a state that varies from one pueblo to another, across regions, classes, genders, and ethnicities, and from one moment in time to the next.

Local and state politics in the 1940s and early 1950s Mexico is largely uncharted terrain. Smith's careful archival work tells us a great deal that we did not know before about the relationships between popular movements and organizations, regional and state elites, and national politics and policies during this period. The book certainly contributes to,

even if it does not fully achieve, a better understanding of the nature of the Mexican state in the decades after the Cárdenas administration.

Boston College JENNIE PURNELL
Newton, Massachusetts

Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, Cooperation, and Accountability. By Brian Wampler. University Park: Penn State University Press, 2007. Pp xvi, 312. Tables. Appendix. Bibiliography. $55.00 cloth.

At the time of this writing there are probably over a thousand cities and towns across the world experimenting with some version of participatory budgeting (PB). A Brazilian invention dating to the early 1990s, it is at its core a blueprint for citizen involvement in decision-making about municipal budgets. This basic idea has also captured the imagination of researchers who have by now written a great deal about the advantages of implementing this system. Brian Wampler's excellent new book moves this vast debate forward by taking the discussion in a comparative direction, examining eight cities in Brazil that experimented with this system in the 1990s and 2000s. The book's main conclusion—that contextual factors matter in the eventual success of participation—is an unpretentious one, but it is also an important one, anchored as it is in carefully documented evidence and detail. It is also a conclusion to which policy makers should attend in their enthusiastic implementation of best practices.

The book develops an analytical framework before offering some background on participatory budgeting and discussing the eight cities in pairs, from the most successful ones (such as Porto Alegre) to the least successful (such as Blumenau). The variation in outcomes is determined by the interaction of two contextual factors: the capacity and willingness of civil society to be contentious and mayoral support for delegating authority to citizens. In cases where both are "high"—a potentially contentious civil society connected to a highly willing municipal executive—the outcome is, as in Porto Alegre, the most successful, creating accountability as well as participation. An uncontentious or unable civil society paired with an unwilling local executive, on the other hand, produces cynicism and a weakened civil society in turn. A partially willing executive will produce different results depending on civil society's contentiousness. With contention, such as in Recife, there will be partial participatory democracy; without it, there is co-optation (Santo André).

The book draws on a range of empirical materials. One of its methodological advances is the comparison across cities. This is a book about eight cities with a similar participatory blueprint, where it has worked for at least seven years, with vastly different outcomes. The other methodological innovation comes from the use participant surveys, which Wampler uses to dual effect: on one hand, as a pooled data source to consider PB as an institution, and on the other to discuss specific cases. So, for example, Wampler is able to test the imputed democratic effects of participatory budgeting using a broad sample of cities (as well as contextual controls), while also being able to empirically demonstrate the value of