

DEMOCRATIZATION IN LATIN AMERICA

Steven L. Taylor
Troy State University

- FAULT LINES OF DEMOCRACY IN POST-TRANSITION LATIN AMERICA.* Edited by Felipe Agüero and Jeffrey Stark. (Coral Gables, Fla.: North-South Center Press, 1998. Pp. 407. \$25.95 paper.)
- EXECUTIVE DECREE AUTHORITY.* Edited By John M. Carey and Matthew Soberg Shugart. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Pp. 333. \$64.95 cloth. \$24.95 paper.)
- PATHS TOWARD DEMOCRACY: THE WORKING CLASS AND ELITES IN WESTERN EUROPE AND SOUTH AMERICA.* By Ruth Berins Collier. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Pp. 230. \$49.95 cloth. \$17.95 paper.)
- DEVELOPING DEMOCRACY: TOWARD CONSOLIDATION.* By Larry Diamond. (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999. Pp. 362. \$49.95 cloth, \$17.95 paper.)
- POLITICAL LEARNING AND REDEMOCRATIZATION IN LATIN AMERICA: DO POLITICIANS LEARN FROM POLITICAL CRISES?* Edited by Jennifer L. McCoy. (Coral Gables, Fla.: North-South Center Press, 2000. Pp. 160. \$42.00 cloth, \$21.95 paper.)
- COUNTERPOINTS: SELECTED ESSAYS ON AUTHORITARIANISM AND DEMOCRACY.* By Guillermo O'Donnell. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999. Pp. 235. \$40.00 cloth, \$18.00 paper.)
- MARKETS AND DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AMERICA: CONFLICT OR CONVERGENCE?* Edited by Philip Oxhorn and Pamela K. Starr. (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1999. Pp. 283. \$55.00 cloth.)
- BUILDING DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AMERICA.* By John Peeler. (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1998. Pp. 240. \$55.00 cloth, \$19.95 paper.)
- DEEPENING DEMOCRACY? THE MODERN LEFT AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS IN CHILE AND PERU.* By Kenneth M. Roberts. (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998. Pp. 370. \$55.00 cloth. \$19.95 paper.)

It is an oft-recited but simplistic statement that all the countries in Latin America have a democratically elected leader save for Cuba. The veracity of that statement, regardless of its oversimplification, testifies to the remarkable transformation that swept the region in the 1980s and 1990s. But the fact that the statement requires qualifications indicates the complexity of democratization in Latin America and other third-wave democ-

racies.¹ For example, does Mexico qualify as a democracy? The historical record in Mexico describes the trappings of democracy sans actual contestation for power until recently. What about Peru? Did the 2001 election of President Alejandro Toledo signal a return to at least minimal democratic governance after a decade of pseudo-democracy under Alberto Fujimori? How should one classify Colombia? It can be considered one of the longest standing democracies in the region, yet it is clearly an incomplete state, wracked by ongoing political violence and lacking full control of its territory, both de jure and de facto. Such examples are but a few of the challenges in defining and evaluating democratization in the region. As Norbert Lechner observed in his essay in the Agüero and Stark volume, "Democracy in Latin America does not allow for complacent evaluations" (p. 21).

This review essay will examine nine books that address these questions of democratization in Latin America from different topical and analytical angles. They nonetheless exhibit two unifying themes: common agreement that the region has democratized, however imperfectly, and general acknowledgement that this democratization is incomplete, although opinions as to what kind of incompleteness vary. None of these works represent radical paradigmatic shifts in the study of Latin America, but they all contribute to the ongoing study of the region. To discuss their contributions, this essay is divided into three sections. The first looks at important antecedents to the current state of affairs in Latin America, the second assesses the state of democracy in the region, and the third discusses themes of relevance for long-term study.

ANTECEDENTS

The works by Guillermo O'Donnell, John Peeler, and Ruth Collier take a historical view, either entirely or in significant part. Of the three, only Collier's deals primarily with the past insofar as it centers on the transition process per se. In terms of antecedents, these books call to mind the significant changes in these regimes and also demonstrate how the region moved from authoritarian to democratic governance.

The work that most reminds readers of the great progress of the region in democratization (while also showing how far the region may have to go) is Guillermo O'Donnell's collection of essays entitled *Counterpoints: Selected Essays on Authoritarianism and Democratization*. Unlike the other books under review, this volume contains only previously published materials. Standing alone, it provides an impressive review of the contributions that O'Donnell has made to the study of authoritarianism, transi-

1. Huntington (1991) placed the first wave from 1828 to 1926, the second from 1943 to 1962, and the third from 1974 to the present. He also identified two reverse waves of authoritarianism: 1922 to 1942 and 1958 to 1962.

tions, and democracy over the past quarter-century. The book's ten essays and a new preface span all three subdivisions of this review essay, with the first five essays relevant to the issue of looking back. O'Donnell's contribution of the concept of bureaucratic authoritarianism is revisited, but more significant in thinking about democratization is his inclusion of several essays on life in authoritarian Argentina. These descriptions evoke the oppression of the day and the suffocation of civil society during the 1970s, when political scientists and other observers wondered if democracy would or even could take hold in Latin America.

The third essay, "Democracy in Argentina: Macro and Micro," is especially evocative in describing the penetration of the authoritarian mindset in the population: "We were not only stripped of political citizenship but also, in the contexts of daily life—an attempt was made to subjugate us and turn us into obedient infants. Those who had 'the right to rule' would rule tyrannically in the workplace, the school, the family, and the streets; those who had 'the duty to obey' would do so meekly and silently . . ." (p. 53).

Such passages put into perspective both the major transformations that have occurred in Latin America in the past twenty years and the depth of the problems that allowed authoritarianism to flourish in the first place. The project of establishing democracy is not just one of institutional change but a project that affects the mentality of citizens (a topic that will be explored further subsequently). The remaining essays in *Counterpoints* discuss the transition process as well as general problems in defining and analyzing the success of democratization in Latin America.

The works by John Peeler and Ruth Collier are related in the larger debate over the proper focus for understanding democratization: mass-based versus elite-based theories of democratization. Collier deals with the role of the working-class Left in democratization, while much of Peeler's book focuses on elite roles in transitions and consolidations.

Peeler's wide-ranging *Building Democracy in Latin America* analyzes "the struggle to create a human and democratic political order" in Latin America, "where such a task has more often than not seemed impossible" (p. xi). His approach is comprehensive in its historical, theoretical, and geographical scope. Peeler places the theoretical discussion in the broad intellectual history of democratic theory from Plato to the present, with particular emphasis on the liberal thinkers of the nineteenth century. While Peeler concurs that the political culture of Latin America has been largely centralist, he rejects the thesis that democracy is impossible in the region and points out some liberal elements in the region's development. Peeler further notes that alongside autocratic strands of thought were liberal threads, such as specific *fueros* (rights or privileges of particular persons or groups), the presence of constitutionalism, and popular resistance. Although tenuous, these threads provided some basis on which liberalism could stimulate the growth of democracy. Thus Peeler argues that although the dominant struc-

tures were largely centralist, enough liberal elements existed to provide the groundwork for democratic development.

Building Democracy in Latin America moves next into discussing the development of earlier Latin American democracies, like those in Costa Rica and Colombia, and then the more numerous third-wave cases. Peeler's basic argument as to why democracy developed in the early cases follows the thesis of Michael Burton, Richard Gunther, and John Higley about elites and their ability to settle on rules of the game. Peeler reemphasizes the general centralist tendencies of the politics in these cases, which isolated political extremes. He attributes this equilibrium to elite consensus. Peeler's discussion of the third-wave cases points out the absence of a single path to democratization. He notes that while the majority of countries had elite settlements (Uruguay, El Salvador, Brazil, Peru, Chile, Bolivia, and Nicaragua), hegemonic influence led to democratization in others (Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Panama, and the Dominican Republic), and in some cases, no pact existed at all (Argentina and Ecuador). Although *Building Democracy in Latin America* argues against any one overarching explanatory paradigm, it still ends up relying heavily on the idea of elite convergence and the translation of that convergence into established rules of the game. Consequently, establishing an institutionalized party system and fostering democratic citizenship are key needs for all these countries in order to deepen their democracies.

Unlike the Peeler book, Ruth Berins Collier's *Paths toward Democracy: The Working Class and Elites in Western Europe and South America* attempts to remedy what she sees as a deficiency in the literature on transitions: the excessive focus on elite actors in transitions to the detriment of understanding the role of the working class. Collier's purpose is well encapsulated in the inquiry in the title of the first chapter: "Elite Conquest or Working-Class Triumph?" In her view, the study of transitions has been overly state-centric and thereby elite-centric, ignoring or at least underestimating the role of societal actors during democratization. To address this question, Collier engages in twenty-seven case studies (seventeen historical, ten contemporary) that examine three dimensions: class, inclusion, and arena of action. Using this comparative historical approach, she ends up identifying seven possible patterns of transition. Some of them show the significance of elite actions, while others demonstrate that working-class actors were important players.

Ultimately, Collier argues that approaches that marginalize the working class minimize or totally ignore a significant set of actors. Like Peeler, she stresses the complexity of the democratization process and notes the impossibility of a unified theory of explanation. But whereas Peeler concludes his study by pointing out the vital role of elites in establishing liberal democracy, Collier ends hers by emphasizing that while the lower classes were hardly the engines of democratization, they cannot be ignored in analyzing such processes. In the end, Collier argues for integrating class-based analy-

sis into those that examine political strategizing and resource-based explanations of democratization.

ASSESSING DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AMERICA

Two subsidiary issues emerge in evaluating the current state of Latin American democracy. The first is the need to assess where the various countries of the region stand vis-à-vis the establishment of democratic rules of the game. Following Larry Diamond, my discussion will focus on placing Latin America within the third wave. Second, these books are permeated by the long-standing debate over how to define and thereby analyze and evaluate democracy.

Waves, Crests, and Riptides

Diamond's *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation* explicitly picks up the theme begun in Samuel Huntington's *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (1991). The title of Diamond's second chapter asks, "Is the Third Wave Over?" The question then arises as to the quality of democracy and the health or longevity of democracy, just as asking whether the third wave is over implies the question of whether a reverse wave is on the horizon. Diamond looks both at the absolute number of democracies and the number of "liberal democracies." In so doing, he goes beyond simply identifying the presence of elections and uses Freedom House's measures of freedom in the countries in question.² He thus identifies three basic subtypes of democracies: liberal democracies, electoral democracies, and pseudo-democracies.

How do the Latin American cases fit into the overall context of global democratization? Three countries democratized during the second wave—Colombia (1958), Costa Rica (1953), and Venezuela (1959)—while the rest of the countries (except Cuba and Mexico) democratized during the third wave, which actually crested twice in Latin America. The first crest occurred in the early to mid-1980s, with Argentina (1983), Bolivia (1985), El Salvador (1984), Guatemala (1985), Honduras (1983), and Uruguay (1985). The second crest peaked in the late 1980s and early 1990s with Brazil (1989), Chile (1989), Nicaragua (1990), Panama (1994), and Paraguay (1993).³

2. Freedom House has created an index to assess the delivery systems of basic news in countries around the world. The basic idea is that a free flow of ideas is essential to democratic governance. The index takes into account four variables: laws that regulate media, political pressure on media, economic influences over media, and acts of repression. These variables are assigned values, and based on the outcome of calculations, countries are classified as free, partially free, or not free. For more information, see <<http://www.freedomhouse.org>>.

3. Democratization is pegged to the date of the first democratic election in the given state.

No full-blown reversals have taken place thus far, although coups in Peru (1992), Guatemala (1993), and Ecuador (2000) as well as a failed coup attempt in Venezuela (1992) indicate a riptide flowing against the main wave of democratization. Given that none of these cases have produced the emergence of military governments nor the pervasive authoritarian regime types everpresent in the 1960s and 1970s, some encouragement can be taken that no strong pull exists to create a reverse wave to hit the struggling democracies in Latin America. In the cases of Guatemala and Ecuador, the periods of extraconstitutional rule were brief.

To the list above, it is now possible to add Mexico. Prior to the 1996 election, Mexico fell into Diamond's category of pseudo-democracy at best.⁴ As such, it may well represent the last splash of the third wave in Latin America. The only country left is Cuba, which remains authoritarian, although the long-term regime development in Peru and a few other countries leaves room for concern. Diamond argues in his conclusion that the third wave is over and that a fourth wave is unlikely at this time, given that the current candidates around the world have entrenched regimes, such as the Middle Eastern states and China. The project therefore is to deepen and strengthen existing democracies so as to avoid a wave of reversals.

Defining Democracy

The exact definition of democracy remains at issue, despite Diamond's three subtypes of democracy. Further, nailing down "the democratic moment" is difficult and complicated by nondemocratic actions like the coups just mentioned. A basic debate continues among several schools of thought, from a purely procedural definition dating back to Joseph Schumpeter (1962), one employed by contemporary authors like Adam Przeworski, to definitions like that of Robert Dahl (1971)—procedure plus guarantees of certain rights and privileges for citizens—and those who view substantial social justice as a component of true democracy. In short, the issue remains the conflict between looking solely at decision rules written for the purpose of choosing governmental officials and outcome-based evaluations.

4. Pinning down the exact moment of democratization is tricky. Although an argument can be made about the status of Mexico's regime type (the degree to which it has democratized), another argument can be made that Mexico has reached a level on a par with the average Latin American democracy. It is possible to designate the highly scrutinized presidential elections of 1996 as the first free and fair presidential elections in Mexican history. The subsequent electoral reforms that allowed for such institutional changes as the popular election of the mayor of Mexico City in 1997 and the independence of the Instituto Federal Electoral clearly demonstrated further movement toward procedural democracy. The PRI primary in 1999, the election of an opposition candidate to the presidency in 2000, and the competitiveness of opposition parties in recent local elections all suggest that Mexico can now be classified as democratic.

This debate has led to discussions of democracy that employ a cavalcade of adjectives to describe the type of democracy in question. The phenomenon has been well documented by David Collier and Steven Levitsky (1997), who discuss the use of modifiers for the word *democracy* as a popular sport amongst political scientists. Diamond notes that Collier and Levitsky identified more than 550 such modifications in their research. Ultimately, the main difficulty is the lack of a set definition of democracy sufficiently universal and specific that would satisfy the scholarly world. This problem arises because a simple procedural definition like Schumpeter's is considered unsatisfactory in that it accounts for nothing more than democracy as a decision rule as to who governs.

The introductory essay by Felipe Agüero in his and Jeffrey Stark's edited volume, *Fault Lines of Democracy in Post-Transition Latin America*, also assesses the plethora of modifiers attached to democracy and the issues attached to such modification. The title indicates their concern over the health and stability of democracy in the region. The concept of "fault lines" running through the bedrock on which Latin American democracy rests is an apt metaphor. The editors locate three main fault lines: representation, participation, and accountability; the rule of law and judicial power; and military and political violence. The collection points out that significant shifts along these fault lines could have "seismic ramifications" for the long-term health of democracy in the region. The presence of such points of weakness engender the basic difficulties in defining the concept of democracy by creating the need to use qualifying language to describe them. The problem is really twofold. The first part is that not all scholars hold the same definition of the ideal type of democracy. This is nothing new, to be sure—Plato and Aristotle did not share the same definition of democracy. The second part of the problem arises in applying any specific ideal type in that no existing democracy fits any given ideal type perfectly (thus the need to add caveats in discussing a particular case). The only exception would be to adopt a minimal procedural standard, à la Schumpeter. But this standard does not please the majority of those writing on the subject of democracy in Latin America, certainly not the authors of the books under review.

Thus in evaluating these books on this question, one finds that modifying the word *democracy* is the norm. Diamond seeks to discuss "liberal democracy," which he operationalizes as a constitutional state with limitations on government and basic political rights in the hands of citizens. He also notes that all "democracies" fulfill these requirements merely by being electoral democracies (having certain institutional features but not fulfilling the broader requirements of democratic governance) or pseudo-democracies. Peeler also extols the concept of a liberal democracy. Other examples in this set of works include O'Donnell's well-known concept of "delegative democracy." The contribution by Atilio Borón to the Agüero and Stark volume expressly critiques the idea of "procedural democracy."

The fragility of democracy, or at least its possible breaking points, are well identified in *Fault Lines of Democracy*. The region is consolidating (although the editors criticize the concept of “consolidation” in their introduction). But significant weaknesses undermine the foundations of the various regimes to the point that shifts could cause substantial damage to democratic governance. Agüero and Stark conclude their volume by calling for an emphasis on the always elusive “substantive democracy.”

The bottom line is, what constitutes an adequate democracy? What arrangement will constitute sufficient institutional development that will in turn allow analysts to say, “That’s democracy”?

CURRENT THEMES

In the books under review, the largest volume of material seeks to look forward. Although they all ignore the present or the past in order to examine what may be, the themes emerging from the various analyses focus on understanding the unfolding development of Latin America and drawing attention to central themes of long-term relevance. Several key questions emerge as themes for analyzing the quality and depth of democracy in the region: the question of citizenship, the importance of institutional development, and the relationship of economics to democratization.

Citizenship

Perhaps the clearest shared theme in this set of books is the need for improved democratic citizenship in Latin America. This topic ranges from the philosophical and definitional treatments of democracy in Peeler and Diamond, to the discussion of authoritarianism by O’Donnell, to the evaluation of fault lines of democracy in the Agüero and Stark collection. With the establishment of procedural democracy, long-term democratic governance relies not just on institutions of the state but also on the behaviors and mindsets of the citizens. Diamond too discusses the importance of the development of civil society in his book.

O’Donnell’s work on Argentina’s authoritarian experience as well as his notes on social perspectives in other countries of the region points to the degree to which the attitudes of citizens must change in order to experience true democratization. He discusses in several essays the role played by citizens in allowing authoritarianism to prevail and in creating or perpetuating unequal treatment of fellow citizens. If some individuals believe that they are inherently better than others, how does fundamental political equality emerge? Given that political equality is a basic element of liberal democracy as defined by Diamond (and implied by all definitions of democracy), then the lack of common respect for those rights by other citizens poses a significant problem for the healthy growth of democracy.

Several essays in the Agüero and Stark volume deal with citizenship. The “fault line” of representation and participation concerns either the way citizens are dealt with by the states or the general behavior of civil society. The contribution by Augusto Varas is titled “Democratization in Latin America: A Citizen Responsibility.” He argues that Latin America lacks sufficient citizen empowerment and that overreliance on procedural democracy eclipses the need to get citizens more involved in political life. Essays by Marysa Navarro and Susan Bourque and by Carlos Degregori focus on gender and ethnicity as areas where citizens are underrepresented.

Kenneth Roberts’s *Deepening Democracy? The Modern Left and Social Movements in Chile and Peru* is one of the more impressive works in this collection in dealing well with the significance of recent political change for the Left in Latin America. The book thus represents a new phase in the study of democracy in the region. No longer analyzing how the transitions took place or the establishment of democratic governance, works exemplifying this new phase center on the ways in which these polities can fully integrate the diverse groups in their populations into a democratic whole.

In examining the Left in Chile and Peru, Roberts scrutinizes a significant portion of the political spectrum. But he also does an excellent job of detailing how changes in structural conditions in the post-cold-war era have altered the calculations made by the Left, both strengthening democracy in some ways and underscoring many of the inherent weaknesses in representation and participation in the region in the current phase of democratization and consolidation. Beyond its specific topic, *Deepening Democracy* deals with the ways that groups must adapt to new political realities. Democratic success is actually the success of the citizens as much as it is the success of the state. Jennifer McCoy’s work on political learning, while largely linked to the question of states, applies to populations as well. In short, groups in society have to learn to behave democratically, as do elites and officials of the state apparatus.

Institutional Development

Another common theme is the need for better governance, which can be achieved via building up the democratic state. Of the books under review, only that edited by John Carey and Matthew Shugart falls explicitly into the institutionalist school in reviewing specific aspects of the formal rules that dictate executive power. *Executive Decree Authority* is cross-comparative in dealing with numerous Latin American cases but also with the United States and several European cases. The volume features chapter-length treatments of four Latin American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Venezuela), with several other regional cases covered in the overall analysis. This intriguing book provides useful conceptual tools for analyzing presidential decree authority but also shatters some myths about their usage in the Latin

American context. It has long been argued that a flaw of Latin American democracy is the prevalence of overly strong executives, often as the result of abuses of power, specifically legislative power being usurped by the head of state. While editors Carey and Shugart agree in their introduction that clear examples can be found of Latin American presidents overstepping their constitutional authorities, they dispute the conventional wisdom. In actuality, legislatures have often granted this power to executives. The editors indicate that this may not be desirable, especially in inchoate democracies, but it forces a reevaluation of the issue of decree authority and its implications.

Executive Decree Authority will be helpful both as a handbook that will inform the literature on the different practices of executive decree authority in various presidential democracies and as a work that provides a more nuanced analysis of the subject. The volume illustrates types of institutional design and then points to potential pitfalls in those designs.

Jennifer McCoy's edited volume, *Political Learning and Redemocratization in Latin America: Do Politicians Learn from Political Crises?*, poses the intriguing question of whether institutional learning is taking place in the region. The book includes case studies on Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, and Venezuela as well as overview introductory and concluding essays by McCoy. The contributions speak mainly to the reality that political actors respond to their environment over time, adapting to changing conditions and recognizing the need to alter goals and strategies. Essentially, the volume discusses the evolutionary process of developing rules of the game that can be followed consistently. The underlying conclusion to be gleaned from the cases is that Latin American countries are not locked into a particular cycle, despite what seemed to be the case earlier in the twentieth century (as in the cycle of elections and coups seen in Argentina). The analysis in *Political Learning* argues against the idea that conditions or prevalent attitudes doom Latin America to a particular type of governance. The main critique that can be leveled at the work is that it offers no overarching framework of political learning. Different contributors suggest various definitions of *political learning*. In general, the underlying concept that emerges is that actors (and by extension, institutions) can take in information and adapt, hence "learning" how to deal better with their environment.

An intriguing aspect of *Political Learning* is the discussion of the effect of traumatic events on political actors. It suggests that extreme events and experiences can cause permanent shifts in political behavior, that aversion to certain potential outcomes can cause important realignments of the way actors behave. This experience with trauma may explain why, for example, Latin America has witnessed limited movement by militaries, even when potential entrées back into political life have arisen (as in Ecuador and Peru). Perhaps members of the military as well as civilian politicians have learned from past traumatic experiences to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past.

Such learning may not guarantee the avoidance of major mistakes, but it may mean that some past patterns can be broken.

In terms of institutions, one that has traditionally been weak in Latin America is the judiciary (one of Agüero and Stark's fault lines). If democracy is understood as encompassing rights for citizens and equal access to justice (recalling Diamond's definition of liberal democracy as based on the rule of law and an independent judiciary), then a well-institutionalized court system is a must. As Hugo Frühling points out in his essay in the Agüero and Stark volume, the main protector of rights and liberties is the court system. In the same volume, James Holston and Teresa Caldeira correctly identify the judiciary as the weakest pillar of the growing democracies of Latin America, and also the most understudied.

With the rule of law runs another of Agüero and Stark's fault lines: the role of the military and the problem of organized violence. The military's historical ability to subvert democratic institutions in the region and its potential for looming in the background as a threat to current democratic regimes create a key issue for the long-term health of the region. Blatant examples are the Chilean military's constitutional prerogatives and the ongoing political violence in Colombia, which raise questions about the depth of democracy in those countries. Further, general experience with military governance and political violence in Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s (and later in some cases) prove that these tools remain available for use in the political arena. The role of force in politics will remain problematic until the military is unquestionably under civilian control (recent examples like Venezuela, Peru, and Ecuador raise warnings) and until the rules of political competition are institutionalized to the point that groups no longer find political violence to be a sometimes necessary tool of expression.

Political Economy

The issue of economics is as undying as the debate over what democracy is and is not. Much discussion of the deficiencies of Latin American democracy is directly linked to the failures of the national economies in question to provide adequately and equitably for their populations. Additionally, the overt link that has existed between the advent of democracy and neoliberalism has thrust the question of economics squarely into evaluations of democratization.

Philip Oxhorn and Pamela Starr's edited work, *Markets and Democracy in Latin America: Conflict or Convergence?*, tests the hypothesis that economic and political liberalization go hand in hand. The volume begins by presenting two opposing viewpoints on the relationship between economic and political liberalization. The first piece by Philip Oxhorn and Graciela Ducatenzeiler asserts that the two go together because of the fundamental relationship between them. The second perspective found in the volume holds that

as economies liberalize, the wealthier members of the society increase their wealth while the poorer sectors of the social order are further marginalized. The first perspective views economic change and neoliberal models as part of the long-term project of democratization. The second point of view, in contrast, perceives adoption of the neoliberal agenda as damaging democracy in the long term because most citizens are left out of the prosperity, on the outside politically speaking. Starting with this intellectual point of tension, *Markets and Democracy in Latin America* offers a combination of regional or general studies and specific case studies. In general, the volume deals with themes like the role of the state, causes of economic success or failure, the kinds of decisions made by politicians, and the motivations that affect them.

The basic conclusion of this collection is that “no clear, much less obvious, relationship exists between political and economic liberalizations” (p. 241). The concluding essay by editors Oxhorn and Starr makes the same point as several of the contributions: that economic liberalization has taken place in the region before in contexts of authoritarianism (as in the nineteenth century or in Chile under Pinochet) and that political and economic liberalization may be at odds with one another. Neoliberal reform has the potential to create greater inequality, and economic liberalization and political liberalization rely on different logics. Economic liberalization requires increased differentiation between economic winners and losers, while political liberalization requires a logic of mobilization, cooperation, and compromise (conclusions similar to those reached by Peeler). At a minimum, *Markets and Democracy in Latin America* provides thought-provoking conclusions that form the basis for further research into the political economy of the region. If there is no direct relationship between economic and political liberalization, then many of the models of deepening democracy need to be rethought, as do decisions by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund and by countries like the United States that predicate much foreign policy on that premise.

To add to the discussion, the final essay in O’Donnell’s *Counterpoints* underscores one problem that is simple to define yet seemingly intractable: poverty and inequality in Latin America. As O’Donnell points out, such situations generate issues of human needs that a democratic polity ought to address, but instead these regimes tend to favor already privileged classes. Further, the sheer number of such marginalized persons raises issues of citizenship and representation: if vast percentages of citizens in ostensibly democratic states have no voice and cannot adequately articulate their interests, then the quality of democracy has to be questioned.

All the authors under review stress the simple point that if the goal is deep, institutionalized democracy, then a way must be found to include the majority of the population in the process. In general, these authors agree that economic circumstances are greatly relevant to democracy, whether it

be the degree to which poverty and the commensurate social marginalization affect the political power of large numbers of citizens (O'Donnell, Oxhorn and Starr), the fact that neoliberalism often favors already privileged classes (Oxhorn and Starr, Agüero and Stark), or the fact that the need for economic development hampers the ability of democracy to grow (Peeler). The theme of the political effects of economic problems and reform will remain prominent in the study of democratization in Latin America.

CONCLUSIONS

As is typically the case with any group of political science works, one finds no strong consensus here, aside from general dissatisfaction with the state of democracy in Latin America. Some interesting trends can be noted nevertheless. One point is that these books all tend to start at least from a common background of literature. The basic discussion of democracy, in terms of accepting foundational concepts as well as arguing about definitional deficiencies, tends to derive from the theoretical positions taken by Schumpeter, Dahl, and Huntington. The Burton, Gunther, and Higley thesis on the role of elites in democratization often appears as well. Another trend is that more and more studies of Latin America are being conducted in a broadly cross-comparative manner rather than being regionally focused.

Otherwise, many of the debates presented are not new. The question of where one ought to focus—on elites or masses—is well covered, especially in Peeler, Collier, and Roberts. Nor are the discussions in the Agüero and Stark collection, Diamond, and Peeler on the nature of democracy groundbreaking. Of the texts reviewed here, the most useful in a general sense is Diamond's *Developing Democracy* in providing an excellent discussion of the relevant issues surrounding democratization as well as questions pertinent to ongoing research. In this regard, the Oxhorn and Starr volume raises significant questions about the relationship between economic and democratic liberalization that will require a great deal more attention. In terms of which book one ought have in one's library, the winner is O'Donnell's *Counterpoints* in terms of thematic breadth and depth of analysis. In sum, these books indicate a discipline whose practitioners at least agree that the main topic of discussion in Latin America is democracy and that the goal at hand is to further our understanding of how to deepen democracy's hold on the region as well as its quality.

REFERENCES

- BURTON, MICHAEL, RICHARD GUNTHER, AND JOHN HIGLEY
1992 "Introduction: Elite Transformation and Democratic Regimes." In *Elites and Democratic Consolidation in Latin America and Southern Europe*, edited by John Higley and Richard Gunther. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COLLIER, DAVID, AND STEVEN LEVITSKY

- 1997 "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research."
World Politics, no. 49 (Apr.):430–51.

DAHL, ROBERT

- 1971 *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

HUNTINGTON, SAMUEL P.

- 1991 *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University
of Oklahoma Press.

SCHUMPETER, JOSEPH A.

- 1962 *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. Third edition. New York: Harper.