Susan C. Stokes, *Mandates and Democracy: Neoliberalism by Surprise in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

This book provides a unique and insightful analysis of the dual process of democratization and economic liberalization in Latin America. It centers on the "policy switches" of presidential candidates who announced "security-oriented" or traditional populist policies during their campaigns but implemented "efficiency" or neoliberal policies as soon as they were inaugurated. By focusing on the relationship between politicians and voters, this excellent study contributes to both our understanding of Latin American campaigns and elections and the political theory of democratic representation. This combination increases the scope and importance of this book for political science.

Mandates and Democracy provides a careful study of the recent Latin American cases in which the campaign mandate is not consistent with the policies implemented during the first six months in office. Analysis focuses on a similar time frame during the presidents' campaigns and subsequent honeymoons. On twelve occasions between 1982 and 1995, Latin American democratic presidents ignored their campaign pledges and implemented opposing policies. The unique contribution of this book is that it systematically develops and then tests a theory of representation that aims to explain this widely acknowledged phenomenon. The discussion of democratic mandates, moreover, adds a novel view to the debate on whether these policy switches hinder the quality of new democracies or, instead, retrospective voting serves to control unresponsive politicians.

Stokes's analysis also illuminates the uncertainty of Latin American voters after the debt crisis eroded the appeal of state-centered development policies and facilitated the process of convergence toward "efficiency-oriented" policies. She finds 33 cases of "efficiency" governments and only 10 cases of "security" governments elected between 1982 and 1995. But only five of the "security" governments were inaugurated after 1985, and, since the second half of the eighties, all policy switchers reoriented from "security-oriented" campaigns toward "efficiency-oriented" policies. This evidence of a strong tendency toward policy convergence, consistent with other studies, raises questions about the ability of democracies to provide policy alternatives. Acknowledging this point, the book digs deeper, seeking to analyze whether political options and ideological beliefs are hidden within the same efficiency label despite the hegemonic trend implicit in the convergence.

Stokes uses her theory of democratic representation to explain policy switches from the four scenarios provided by a set of campaigns and elections in Latin America. In two of these cases, politicians remained consistent with their campaigns messages, whether they were security or efficiency oriented. In those cases, Stokes's empirical analysis shows that a strong political party, a larger democratic trajectory, the candidate's ideology, and his/her past actions contributed to the consistency between campaigns and policies. Moreover, these cases were the majority,

thus showing that most politicians did not mislead their electors, and campaigns provided useful information for citizens in the region. Citizens, in turn, preferred efficiency-oriented candidates to fight against inflation and security-oriented ones to deal with sluggish growth. A third scenario of vague campaigns, which did not create mandate expectations, was almost a residual case.

Finally, when politicians ignored their campaign pledges, and, thus, the mandate of the electorate, policy switches occurred. Stokes argues that policy switching implies that politicians were representative, although unresponsive in the sense that they misled voters for the common good. She shows that "when politicians began their term by switching policies, their party's electoral performance at the end of the term was somewhat more sensitive to economic performance in the years leading up to the next election" (89) than when they acted consistently. However, policy switchers obtained higher growth during the studied period. Additionally, other policies also entered into the calculus of consent. For instance, in Peru, the lower classes supported "policy switcher" Fujimori because he defeated terrorism, whereas the upper classes supported him due to his economic policies (133). Thus, as Stokes analyzes in chapter six, representation could be of different kinds, and retrospective voting could provide accountability for the citizens after policy switches.

According to Stokes, politicians misled their voters under two circumstances: (1) when the conditions under which they had to operate were different from what they expected, a change that rendered their original policy proposal inappropriate, or (2) when they believed that the appropriateness of the new policies would only become evident after implementation. Her empirical study shows that close races, conflicting beliefs between politicians and voters, young political parties, and minority governments increased the probability of policy switches in Latin America.

Politicians' beliefs, thus, are at the core of Stokes's discussion of representation, in particular when politicians purposefully lie during the campaign because voters do not understand the need for efficiency-oriented policies. Yet, as she acknowledges in the conclusion, ascertaining these beliefs requires more research and innovative indicators. Indeed, we have to rely on the word of actors to assess their beliefs in this study, whereas there are several indicators for the ex-post conversion of politicians that perceived the change in circumstances once elected. This situation makes it harder to isolate the effect of corruption or campaign financing, which, as Stokes points out, have been mentioned but not proved as alternative explanations for the policy switches. Her conclusion calls for the study of politicians' beliefs and the role of ideology in the construction of those beliefs. This call should be answered. The systematic study of those beliefs with both theoretical and empirical instruments should be part of the agenda of political scientists trying to understand the links between policy making and representation in democratic polities.

Stokes finds that policy switches do not end with democratic accountability, but she cautions about their deleterious effect on democratic in-

stitutions. She concludes that policy switching increases the risk of voters electing rent-seekers and decreases the value of representation because politicians do not educate voters so as to enhance their ability to interpret conditions accurately. Campaigns, she argues, should serve as commitment devices, which empower politicians by increasing trust among their constituencies. Instead, violating campaign expectations threatens to debase all campaign messages. Moreover, if unusual circumstances force politicians to change promised policies, they should explain why they abandon their electoral pledges in order to maintain citizens' trust in democratic institutions. Hence, the minority of Latin American politicians who misled their voters contributed to increasing distrust of politicians in new democracies. Stokes's conclusions provide an appealing ex-ante explanation for the 2001 Argentine election, when citizens who had been misled in previous electoral campaigns chose in large numbers—a quarter of voters—the null or blank ballots to show their increasing distrust of politicians.

M. Victoria Murillo
Yale University

Bruce J. Dickson, *Democratization in China and Taiwan: The Adaptability of Leninist Parties*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

What Samuel Huntington called the "third wave of democratization" has swept away a high percentage of authoritarian regimes of the left and right over the past three decades. The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) has proven stubbornly resistant to this trend, and one of its arguments against "democracy" is that Chinese culture is based on a set of "Asian values" for which the chaos and unpredictability of bourgeois democracy are just not suitable. Fortunately for comparative social scientists, as well as for most of the people who live there, the Chinese society of Taiwan, right across the Taiwan Strait from mainland China, has undergone what appears to have been a successful democratic transition. This provides on one level an excellent test case of the possibility of successful democratic transition in a Chinese or other Asian society. Of even more theoretical interest is the fact that the long-term ruling party of Taiwan, the Nationalists (Kuomintang, or KMT), had a Leninist structure and heritage in many ways similar to its cousin across the Strait. This offers something of a natural experiment: if the Leninist (or "quasi-Leninist") KMT could initiate and preside over a democratic transition and maintain power, does this show the CCP a vision of its future as well? (It should be noted that not all scholars accept the premise that the KMT qualifies as "Leninist.")

These are some of the questions behind Bruce Dickson's very well reasoned and extremely detailed monograph. He sets out to explain why these two Leninist parties have adapted in different ways to environmental changes, reminding us that such parties were designed to change societies, not be changed by them. The KMT was changed fundamentally by challenges from its environment, while the CCP has so far avoided this outcome.