

over which adaptations were justifiable in the circumstances. The opportunity made possible by roundtable talks in 1989 required the opposition to develop a common position against the regime, something that was a challenge as the opposition had before that time specialized primarily in arguing among themselves (chap. 6). After the first multiparty elections in which opposition intellectuals again resumed their oppositional relationships to each other (chap. 7), some intellectuals made the leap into politics while others stayed on the sidelines (chap. 8).

Bozoki makes available in English for the first time the vibrant culture of theoretical debate that existed during this period and shows how the very culture of disagreement that made Hungarian intellectual life so rich also made it challenging for the intellectual opposition either to unite in a common cause or to create a mass movement jointly with others. Intellectuals played decisive roles once the regime type was up for grabs but they did so as self-appointed, relatively isolated clusters of individuals rather than through a mass organization confronting the regime with common demands as Solidarity did in Poland.

The book's main strength is also its greatest weakness: the extraordinary level of detail that turns these 15 years among these 2,000 people into a grand sociohistorical analysis. At 600+ pages, one needs a great deal of patience (or in my case, to have personally known many of those mentioned in the book) to keep reading every word. But the detail is precisely what makes the book a masterpiece. Because it summarizes the voluminous writings of Hungarian intellectuals in this crucial period, *Rolling Transition* is not only a theoretically important analysis in its own right, but it will become a primary source that future researchers will need to understand this period.

Only Bozoki could have written this book. He was simultaneously a participant in the events he discusses and also a longtime chronicler of the political transition in Hungary. His eight-volume edited transcript (in Hungarian), *A rendszerváltás forgatókönyve: Kerekasztaltárgyalások 1989-ben (The Script of the Regime Change: Roundtable Talks in 1989, 1999–2000)* of the opposition roundtable negotiations and the one-volume analysis (in English) of the transition they ushered in (*The Roundtable Talks of 1989: The Genesis of Hungarian Democracy*, 2002) are the best sources for those pivotal discussions, along with his many books and articles that have made the Hungarian experience of transition into and out of democracy visible. *Rolling Transition* is the result of decades of interviews, archives, statistics, and experience, and it is that rarest of rare books, one that has comprehensively reconstructed how those living through a major political transition made sense of it at the time while putting their ideas in a grander theoretical context.

Those looking to understand why Hungary fell into autocracy under Viktor Orbán a mere two decades later will be disappointed, and not just because the book ends in

1994. Orbán's insistence in the opposition roundtable meetings on negotiating with the Communist party instead of with the government, and his refusal to sign onto the governance pact negotiated between the largest parties in the government and opposition after the first multiparty election in 1990, hinted that he was not a team player, but was instead unduly interested in the techniques of power monopolization. Even though he was present from 1988 onward in the debates that Bozoki catalogues, Orbán exists only at the margins of this story.

Perhaps that is as it should be. With his focus on ideas at the end of the Soviet domination of Eastern Europe, Bozoki makes accessible the impressive intellectual debates among those living through those important decades, struggling to understand their own place in a history that indeed did not end in 1989. Just as Bozoki's intellectuals had no idea that the old system could be so fundamentally transformed when it was, so too could they probably not have imagined that someone at the edges of these debates would monopolize power again so soon.

Critical Junctures and Historical Legacies: Insights and Methods for Comparative Social Sciences. Edited by

David Collier and Gerardo L. Munck. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2022. 520p. \$120.00 cloth, \$39.95 paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592723001536

— Orfeo Fioretos , Temple University
fioretos@temple.edu

Some historical junctures loom larger than others in the imaginations of political scientists. These may be the wars, revolutions, economic collapses, or other big events that have reshaped states and societies. They may be student uprisings, sovereign debt crises, terrorist attacks, or other events that equally have impacted the path of politics. But not all junctures leave legacies. Not all junctures are "critical," at least not if understood as an interval of time that marks a substantial change from the past. Some junctures may be less important for explaining later outcomes, and exaggerated attention to them may mask the actual reasons for those outcomes. For this among other reasons, researchers must remain open to examining other, prior junctures for their potentially lasting impact. However, where to stop that pursuit remains a thorny challenge for political scientists. How to deal with this so-called infinite regress problem is the core methodological rationale behind this volume.

No body of scholarship has made it a bigger priority to find solutions to the infinite regress problem than that which has become known as the critical juncture tradition. And at fully nineteen chapters and four weighty appendices, no collection offers a more complete account of this tradition than David Collier and Gerardo L. Munck's edited volume, *Critical Junctures and Historical Legacies: Insights and Methods for Comparative Social Science*. It is a

superbly edited book that details the stakes in critical juncture analysis and offers extensive guidance for how it can be used in qualitative historical research to answer whether and how specific junctures impacted “big” political developments, for example: levels of economic development after colonialism, the purpose and stability of international order after wars end, the organization of civil society after student uprisings, the social consequences of debt crisis, and more. The volume argues that a juncture is critical when it has identifiable legacies, which are understood as cases of “discontinuous change.” If there is no meaningful legacy of change beyond that which would have been the case without a juncture, then the juncture is not critical. This distinction helps resolve the problem of infinite regress.

The volume carefully reviews the existing literature on historical junctures, details the rationale for the editors’ approach, and provides extensive empirical illustrations to make a persuasive case for critical juncture analysis as a major element of the discipline’s methodological toolbox. The first section is devoted to “Basics” and opens with an excellent chapter by David Collier who details a “five-step template” with which to study historical discontinuity. The five steps concern “antecedent conditions,” “cleavages and shocks,” the “critical juncture” itself, its “aftermath,” and any “legacies” and are each carefully discussed in the context of classics and recent research contributions to comparative politics. Three chapters follow by distinguished scholars who recount how their answers to “big substantive questions” can be productively informed by critical juncture analysis. James A. Robinson examines the legacies of colonialism for paths of economic development; G. John Ikenberry examines how postwar settlements shape international political orders; and Sidney Tarrow probes the legacies of the 1960s for social mobilization in later decades.

The second section on “Frameworks and Methods” starts with Gerardo Munck’s careful dissection of how distinct challenges in critical juncture analysis can be resolved, including how to conceptualize the infinite regress problem. For Munck, critical junctures are “qualitative novelties” that designate a “before” and “after” that jointly furnish a “point of entry into the stream of history.” Other contributions entail friendly critiques, such as the deeply engaging chapter by Rachel Beatty Riedl and Kenneth M. Roberts, who contend that critical juncture analysis at times employs overly static concepts. They urge more flexibility, especially in how antecedent conditions and contingency are understood; for example, Riedl and Roberts argue that studies must be more open to considering degrees of contingency and different strengths to antecedent conditions. David Waldner wishes that studies in this tradition would double-down on causal identification and would be more precise in how they address the “problem of backdoor paths.”

These are situations where an outcome (Y) is produced not directly by a factor (X), but where X impacts a different factor (Z) that in turn causes Y. For Waldner, attention to potential backdoors is a better long-term solution than taking refuge in notions of contingency when theorizing why X sometimes causes Y and sometimes not. Munck closes the section on a collaborative note and suggests that the standard qualitative methods used by scholars in this tradition can be productively complemented by quantitative analysis.

The gears shift in the third and fourth sections to the application of critical juncture analysis in the study of political regimes and neoliberalism, mostly in Latin America. Sebastian L. Mazzuca looks at the role of state formation for economic performance over two centuries in South America. Ruth Berins Collier, who authored foundational texts in the tradition, concludes that critical juncture analysis of internal (national) dynamics more fully explains the varied ways in which labor was incorporated into the political coalitions and regimes that took form in Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Venezuela in the 1940s than do analyses focused on international factors. Kenneth M. Roberts studies the origins and impact of the neoliberal transition in Latin America and reveals that standard critical juncture analysis struggles to explain incremental patterns of change. Samuel Handlin identifies the uses and limitations of critical juncture analysis for understanding contemporary developments in the political systems of Latin America. Timothy R. Scully uses the case of political reforms in Chile to make an impassioned plea that researchers be patient in accumulating evidence and letting time pass, or, he warns, they will risk identifying “false positives” when searching for the sources behind durable change.

A smaller number of chapters reach beyond Latin America, principally to Europe. Andrew Gould examines the influence of religion on political liberalism, Robert M. Fishman examines the impact of democratization on culture in Spain and Portugal, and Danielle N. Lussier and Jody LaPorte inquire into the legacies of Communist rule for political developments in Eastern Europe. Beyond brief mentions of developments in Africa and Asia in some of the early chapters, there is not much coverage outside Latin America and Europe. While this is bound to disappoint researchers who are focused on Africa, Asia, the Middle East, North America, and other regions, the silver lining is that there now exists an analytical springboard from which to begin such explorations.

While this volume is a celebration of the contributions of critical juncture analysis, the editors are not shy to feature criticisms and acknowledge limitations. In two notable contributions, Taylor C. Boas and Robert R. Kaufman urge researchers to recognize some inherent limitations in critical juncture analysis. Boas underscores that any attempt to study the present and recent past must let considerable time pass before they have their claims

“fully evaluated,” which makes study of the present or recent past an inherently risky and analytically imprecise affair. Meanwhile, Kaufman suggests that this type of analysis is overly focused on examples of discontinuous change and does not recognize that the sources of continuity may also be found in historical junctures.

Critical Junctures and Historical Legacies concludes with a chapter by Munck, who makes a passionate case for continuously refining the means scholars use to determine if, when, and how the past has critical legacies. In considering Munck’s sage advice, researchers also may want to consult the four inspired appendices that feature a coded literature review, a glossary, a bibliography, as well as a brief summary of eight classical texts. Altogether, this volume is a milestone in critical juncture analysis that will serve as a major resource for seasoned and early career researchers alike.

Faith in Numbers: Religion, Sectarianism, and Democracy.

By Michael Hoffman. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021. 212p. \$110.00 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592723001706

— Daniel Corstange , Columbia University
daniel.corstange@columbia.edu

Let me cut to the chase at the outset: this is a good book, and you should read it.

Michael Hoffman has put together a well-conceived and nicely executed study on the connection between democratic attitudes and communal religious practice in the Middle East, a region of the world long seen as both a democratic holdout and unusually religious. Working with public opinion and experimental data, much of the book focuses on contemporary Lebanon, a bracingly complex society that regularly features in studies of communalism and religious politics, along with a complementary foray into Iraqi communal affairs. In addition to its obvious appeal to regional specialists, this book will interest scholars of religious and ethnic politics, as well as of political behavior more generally.

Let me clarify a key point up front: this book is about communalism rather than religion. It makes no pretense to offer a sweeping theory of religious politics, nor does it attempt to review the finer points of doctrine or political theology. Instead, Hoffman examines one discrete element falling under the broad banner of religious politics: communal religious practice. More specifically, he investigates how participation in *group-based* worship—attendance at religious services and communal prayer—influences people’s attitudes toward democracy and its related practices.

The answer he gives is one of context: communal practice within groups that would benefit from democracy nudges its members in a democratic direction, whereas that same form of practice in a group for which democracy seems more costly reduces its members’ support for

democratic politics. Rather than a never-ending doctrinal dispute, communal politics is ultimately a numbers game, and communal worship sensitizes people to their group-based interests. In practical terms then, worship services should push members of large groups left out of power to favor democratic governance and members of small, privileged minorities toward a skepticism of democracy.

Those familiar with contemporary Lebanese and Iraqi politics can perhaps see where this line of reasoning is going. After an introductory chapter and another that develops his argument in much greater detail, Hoffman dedicates the bulk of the book to empirical explorations of his theory in the two societies. The third chapter describes how ordinary Lebanese and Iraqi citizens think about attending religious services and questions of communal solidarity through the medium of open-response questions embedded in mass attitude surveys.

Chapters 4–6 comprise the empirical heart of the book. Chapters 4 and 5 use orthodox survey data, along with a priming experiment, to demonstrate that communal practice in Lebanon pushes members of competing communities in opposite directions on democracy: making Muslims more, and Christians less, favorable toward it in earlier periods; and making Shiites more, and Sunnis less, democratic in later periods when the axis of group conflict shifted. Chapter 6 uses analogous survey data to make an analogous point in Iraq: communal practice makes members of the large and recently empowered Shia community more favorable toward democratic governance but has the opposite effect on Sunni Arabs, a formerly privileged minority that has seen its collective fortunes wane under the majoritarian politics of the more democratic institutions currently in place. The last chapter rounds out the book with a rough test of its central thesis across some 87 societies for which World Values Survey data are available. By and large, these chapters make good use of existing survey data and complement it with original data collection to build an empirical case for Hoffman’s argument.

As I mentioned earlier, this book is really a story about communalism rather than religion qua religion, which makes it a variation on a theme that appeals to scholars of ethnic politics (although Hoffman does take pains to distinguish religious identities from ethnic ones on pp. 31–33). Does the decision to focus on the communal aspects of religion somehow weaken the book? No, it does not. Instead, it is a wise move. Religion is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon, even when we ignore questions about institutions, intellectual history, and leadership and restrict ourselves to the beliefs and behaviors of ordinary people. Rather than attempt a sweeping study of all things religious and do a superficial job on all of them, this book focuses on one element to do it well.

Hoffman is forthright that this book is not a one-stop shopping experience for readers who want to learn about