



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**Boekbespreking van: The Dynamics of Democratization: A Comparative Approach**  
Ishiyama, J.T.

**Citation**

Ishiyama, J. T. (2002). Boekbespreking van: The Dynamics of Democratization: A Comparative Approach. *Acta Politica*, 37: 2002(3), 321-322. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3450927>

Version: Publisher's Version  
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)  
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3450927>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

informed student of war would know this before opening the book. The difficulty is making an assessment of how common this is for soldiers and societies. Maybe there are many more instances in which these things do not happen. There is no indication, however, that Goldstein (or anyone else) has made any systematic attempt to determine the relative frequency of feminization and/or symbolic rape. Thus, how we end up with a judgment that the evidence 'mostly' supports the hypothesis as opposed to 'slightly' remains a mystery to me (and, of course, if 'depends' indicates a necessary condition, even a single disconfirming case should lead to a rejection of the hypothesis).

The example of hypothesis 5C is similarly frustrating. This hypothesis "proposes that women do not participate in combat because their peaceful natures make them oppose war" (p. 322). One sentence later Goldstein tells us that "a sizable number of women – generally somewhat more women than men, and often acting in the name of their gender – do oppose wars and work for peace" (emphasis added). Furthermore, "at the local level, many individual women... buffer intermale violence in a number of ways." On the basis of these observations alone, one might anticipate that the hypothesis would be judged at least 'slightly supported.' One would be wrong, however: Goldstein judges the proposition 'not supported' (p. 405). How does he reach this conclusion? He notes that "this hypothesis cannot be supported... given evidence that many women actively support wars" (p. 322). But this clearly will not do. By the same logic, if there was any evidence that many men have participated in combat without feminizing or symbolically raping the enemy, hypothesis 6B would have had to be rejected. Now, maybe every soldier and army has feminized the enemy and/or engaged in symbolic rape, but I doubt it. Thus, I fail to see the basis on which one hypothesis is 'mostly' supported while the other is not supported at all. As a result, for much of the time I was confused. I was hardly ever able to accurately anticipate whether Goldstein would eventually classify a hypothesis as 'mostly' or 'slightly' supported from his discussion of the evidence.

I do not think I have ever read a book that left me with such mixed feelings. On the one hand, *War and Gender* provides a consistently intelligent and fascinating discussion of a vitally important and usually ignored topic. On the other hand, the pseudo-precision of Goldstein's attempts to evaluate specific hypotheses was frequently frustrating, unconvincing and occasionally annoying. I learned a great deal from *War and Gender*, as will anyone else who reads it. This is a book that deserves a wide audience. I only wish Goldstein had dispensed entirely with his attempts to isolate and judge specific 'hypotheses'.

Keith L. Shimko

Geoffrey Pridham, *The Dynamics of Democratization: A Comparative Approach*. London and New York: Continuum, 2000, ISBN 0-8264-5038-5, £ 55.00

Since the beginning of the so-called third wave of democratization, not a single comprehensive work has been published that provides an overarching view of the phenomenon of 'democratization', that is both accessible to students and useful for seasoned scholars. To be sure, there have been many works that have focused on democratization. Most of these have been either very area specific, usually involving either the investigation of specific cases in comparative perspective (such as many studies based on the Latin American or Southern European experience), or they have been only very broadly theoretical. This work both systematically links the lessons from area specific literature into a coherent comparative approach to democratization. In this book Geoffrey Pridham, has made a significant contribution to the literature, and this work represents a major advance in the development of a coherent theory of comparative democratization.

This book offers a very comprehensive overview of the existing approaches to democratization. Chapter 1 provides a useful and succinct introduction to some key themes and concepts, and offers a critical review of the existing 'transitological' and 'consolidological' literature. In particular, Pridham identifies three general 'families' of existing theories in the literature. The first are the 'functionalist theories' associated with modernization theory and its emphasis on structural and socio-economic conditions that affect the development of democracy. The second is what Pridham calls the 'transnational theories', which emphasize external factors, global waves of democratic change, and the diffusion of democracy. The third group is referred to as 'genetic theories', which emphasize the particularities of individual national transition experiences and the role of individuals in affecting the course of democratic transition. The chapter also offers an 'interactive model of democratization', a model that provides an outline of the themes explored by the rest of the book. These themes include: historical determinants (e.g., background conditions, legacies of the previous authoritarian regime); the processes of authoritarian breakdown and collapse (i.e., how the previous regime collapsed and the kind of transition process that took place); institutional design (constitutional factors and choices); the actions of political actors; economic transformation and democratization (or the dual transformation); the development of civil society; national identity (i.e., the third transformation); and finally the international dimensions that affect regime change.

The methodology employed by the book is broadly comparative. The chapters address themes as opposed to using case studies. When case study material is used this is derived from the European experience (Western, Southern and East-Central Europe), in part because the use of a limited number of illustrative cases allows for the systematic comparison of countries that are very different, but which share some common features (such as the European tendency to have relatively better developed and structured party systems). In part, I suspect, it is also due to the author's own

extensive experience studying Southern European and more recently, East-Central European democratic transitions.

In summary, Pridham argues that none of the dimensions in the interactive model taken individually are sufficient to explain the complex processes of democratic transition and consolidation. For instance, although the legacies of the past play an important role in shaping transition politics and can be an important factor affecting whether democracy is consolidated, historical influences do not determine what comes about under democratization. Like other economic, socio-cultural and international structural factors, legacies establish the scope conditions under which political elites operate. Indeed, decisions made by newly empowered democratic elites play a vital role in determining the ultimate outcome of democratic transition and the process of consolidation. Political elites decide institutional designs and determine how stateness and minority problems as issues affect the prospects for democratic consolidation. However, these political choices made by elites are constrained. Thus, political crafting and elite settlements alone (or the 'genetic approach') do not explain transitions or processes of consolidation – they can only be understood by appreciating the different and very often conflicting domestic and international contexts in which political decisions are made.

This work can hardly be criticized. The theoretical coverage of the work is impressive, and the design and organization of the book systematic and well thought out. In addition, the methodology employed is fully justified and compelling. If there is a 'shortcoming' at all it is something the author himself acknowledges in the book – that there is a trade off between breadth and depth in comparative analysis by only focusing on the European cases after 1945. As Pridham acknowledges, there are many special factors pertaining to Europe that make it different from the rest of the world. For example, there is clearly a preference among countries that engaged in post-1945 European transitions (including the post-communist transitions) for parliamentary over presidential systems, whereas many transitions elsewhere have opted for a presidential model. Thus, scholars studying transitions further eastward, particularly among the post-Soviet states, may find that this book has less to offer. Indeed, Pridham himself notes that the prospects for democratic development in these states are considerably dimmer than those in the former Eastern Europe, but does not venture to say why that is the case.

In sum, this book represents a fine addition to the literature on democratization. It is perhaps one of the most systematically structured studies on democratic transition and consolidation that I have yet seen available in print. In particular, this book will prove to be indispensable reading for scholars who seek to better understand not only the dynamics of democratization, but also for those who seek to be more systematic in comparing across European cases. Further, it represents an excellent starting point for any student interested in pursuing further comparative studies of democratic transitions and processes of consolidation elsewhere in the world.

John T. Ishiyama

R. Koopmans and P. Statham (eds.), *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Politics. Comparative European Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, ISBN 0-198-29560-8, £ 20.99.

Although Europe has been a *de facto* immigration continent since the late 1960s, it was not until the 1990s that immigration and immigrant integration emerged as hotly disputed political issues in many European countries. Three developments were important in this respect. Firstly, the growing stream of refugees and asylum seekers in the 1990s made it clear that a stop on the recruitment of guest workers and the drying up of the subsequent stream of family migration would not bring a halt to immigration to Europe. Secondly, all European countries witnessed a growing opposition to new and old immigrants, which led, in some countries, to a growth of anti-immigrant parties. Thirdly, the maturing of the so-called second generation created a category of 'immigrants' who – in a more politicized and assertive manner than their parents – claimed a right to retain their identity as equal citizens of the 'host country'. In some countries, such as the Netherlands, developments were rapid. Here, immigrant integration moved from being an almost completely de-politicized issue until the late 1980s to becoming an institutionalized policy field, headed by a separate 'Minister for Integration'.

For a long time, social geographers and anthropologists dominated European academic research on immigration and ethnic relations, respectively. Basically, social geographers studied the push-and-pull factors of immigration, while anthropologists studied the dynamics of acculturation and identity retention. In these studies, politics was largely neglected. Roger Brubaker's *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1992) paved the way for research that explicitly focused on the political dimension of immigration and integration. More importantly, Brubaker (re-) introduced the concepts of citizenship and nationhood as key analytical tools for analysing differences in immigration and integration politics and policies between countries.

Brubaker's study proved to be a major inspiration for many, as a large stream of studies of a similar kind followed it (sometimes even with quite similar titles). Several of these studies disagreed with Brubaker's (rather static) juxtaposition of political nations based on *ius soli* and ethnic nations based on *ius sanguinis*. Yet, the importance of nationhood and citizenship as key concepts for understanding politics and policies surrounding immigrant integration was generally accepted. Unfortunately, it also led to many edited volumes containing articles merely restating familiar arguments and insights, thus adding little or nothing empirically, conceptually or theoretically.

*Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relation Politics* aims to be a different kind of edited volume. Statham and Koopmans explicitly aim to "carry this research agenda forward." This, they argue, requires more systematic cross-national and longitudinal research. At first, this may sound like a rather redundant remark: would not all research benefit from more systematic, cross-national and longitudinal research? But given the sometimes rather impressionistic and anecdotic research conducted in this