

GOVERNANCE AND REFORM
OF THE STATE
Signs of Progress?

Robert H. Wilson
The University of Texas at Austin

DECENTRALIZATION AND DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AMERICA. Edited by Alfred P. Montero and David J. Samuels. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004. Pp. 320. \$47.50 cloth, \$27.50 paper.)

FEDERALISM AND DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AMERICA. Edited by Edward L. Gibson. (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004. Pp. 377. \$49.95 cloth, \$18.95 paper.)

POLITICS BEYOND THE CAPITAL: THE DESIGN OF SUBNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN SOUTH AMERICA. By Kent Eaton. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004. Pp. 265. \$55.00 cloth.)

THE QUIET REVOLUTION: DECENTRALIZATION AND THE RISE OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN LATIN AMERICAN CITIES. By Tim Campbell. (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003. Pp. 216. \$24.95 paper.)

LEADERSHIP AND INNOVATION IN SUBNATIONAL GOVERNMENT: CASE STUDIES FROM LATIN AMERICA. Edited by Tim Campbell and Harald Fuhr. (Washington, DC: The World Bank, 2004. Pp. 450. \$36.00 paper.)

Democratization and reform of the state in Latin America have been prominent concerns during the last two decades. Responding to authoritarian governments, many constituted by military dictatorships, and to the exhaustion of the state-led development model, the region was ripe for reform. An exciting period of sweeping political and economic change has followed, driven by a range of internal and external factors but manifested according to the unique context of individual countries. The euphoria that accompanied the end of authoritarian governments and the high expectations of social reform and justice have been substantially tempered with the slow progression of the difficult work of instituting democratic governance. Although falling below

initial expectations, progress has in fact been made and sufficient time has passed to allow for more rigorous assessments of reform.

Understanding the forces of change and the roles of various actors and institutions involved in state reform is critical for several reasons. In many countries, reform of the state and consolidation of democracy are occurring simultaneously. In addition, high levels of social inequality are quite visible as urbanization rates in the region approach those of the advanced economies, not to mention the fact that the region has a significant number of the world's largest metropolitan areas. Although the period offers interesting challenges and opportunities to scholars, the stakes for establishing effective governance systems are quite high for the countries in the region.

We should expect that the causes of political change in the region include broad structural elements common to many countries as well as elements unique to individual country contexts. State reform, especially the decentralization of governmental structures, has been adopted in many countries and even promoted by multilateral institutions, including the United Nations, Inter-American Development Bank and World Bank. But relatively little formal study of the effectiveness of reform has been published and discussed in the academic literature or in policy communities.

The five books under review here are concerned with causes and consequences of state reform and democratization. Three of the books, *Decentralization and Democracy in Latin America*, edited by Alfred P. Montero and David J. Samuels, *Federalism and Democracy in Latin America*, edited by Edward L. Gibson, and *Politics Beyond the Capital: The Design of Subnational Institutions in South America*, by Kent Eaton, are research monographs intended principally for scholarly communities and political scientists in particular. The other two volumes, *The Quiet Revolution: Decentralization and the Rise of Political Participation in Latin American Cities*, by Tim Campbell, and *Leadership and Innovation in Subnational Government: Case Studies from Latin America*, edited by Tim Campbell and Harald Fuhr, are written largely for policy communities. All five books adopt a comparative research framework, although many chapters address individual countries or cases from individual countries. The volumes offer interesting and provocative findings on a wide range of issues and are a welcome addition to the literature.

The authors of *Decentralization and Democracy in Latin America* are primarily concerned with understanding the dynamics of state reform and democratization in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Uruguay, and Venezuela. In the introductory chapter, Montero and Samuels describe the conventional wisdom behind the widespread adoption of public sector decentralization in Latin America. One explanation is the promotion by multilateral institutions of neoliberal policies, including

the downsizing of the state and decentralization of political power in order to promote economic development. A second element of the conventional wisdom is that the democratization movement, observed not only in the countries emerging from military dictatorships but also in countries with civilian authoritarian structures, encourages decentralization. This view argues that effective democracy requires decentralized governmental structures.

A major thrust of the volume is the critical analysis, if not outright debunking, of the conventional wisdom. Concerning the first element of the conventional wisdom, several authors note that the process of decentralization in some countries predates the promotion of such policies by the multilateral institutions. Clarifying the sources of change is welcome but the roles of these institutions in diffusing alternative concepts of governance and in legitimizing change should not be overlooked.

Debunking the view that democratization leads to decentralization requires a more nuanced argument. First, the fact that democratization and decentralization were occurring simultaneously does not necessarily mean that the former led to the latter. In North America, historically it has been observed that a move toward democratization does not necessarily require decentralization of governmental structures. The political enfranchisement of African Americans in the United States in the 1960s relied on the U.S. Constitution and federal laws and on enforcement by the federal executive. Although the authors are correct to criticize the conflation of democracy and decentralization, there is little doubt that many expected the overthrow of authoritarian governments in Latin America in the 1970s and 1980s to lead to democratic politics at subnational levels.

Reconsidering conventional wisdom is a useful exercise, but more intriguing is the variation in the dynamics of decentralization and democratization across countries described in the volume. The authors identify the critical role of elections, electoral incentives, and sociocultural factors in the unfolding of decentralization. For example, the decisions leading to change in governmental form and fiscal systems and in the assignment of functional responsibilities are made by elected officials who will be motivated by the effects of that change on their political careers. The authors also identify institutions in country-specific contexts that play critical roles in the decentralization process. For example, military dictatorships often identified the failure of political systems and parties to govern effectively and modernize governmental structures as the justification for military intervention. Military governments frequently attempted to dismantle and reshape the political order, but these governments were largely unsuccessful in this endeavor and political structures outlasted the dictatorships. Furthermore, due to heavy-handed centralization adopted by military governments, democratization movements valued decentralization.

Two chapters of the Montero and Samuels volume are concerned with intergovernmental relations in decentralized governmental structures. One involves a comparative study of fiscal decentralization in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay. Political decentralization precedes fiscal decentralization in all cases, but the process unfolds differently in the two countries with unitary governmental structures versus the two with federalist structures. The key difference is the balance of power between center and periphery. In the federalist systems of Argentina and Brazil, governors played an important role in encouraging the process, whereas in the unitary states of Chile and Uruguay, little pressure from subnational governments or officials was brought to bear.

One chapter examines intergovernmental relations and suggests that there is no stable equilibrium between national and subnational governments, at least in geographically large and regionally diverse countries. In such contexts, mismatches between resources and responsibilities can never be entirely resolved. Regional differences in economic performance will, in fact, redefine these mismatches over time. Furthermore, actions adopted by state governments, especially in the fiscal arena, may undermine national macroeconomic policy. But the relative power of national and subnational officials can shift as well. Regional governments and political leaders tend to be more effective at the national level when presidents are relatively weak. The lack of effective horizontal politics (e.g., governors collectively negotiating with the national government) is a legacy of earlier highly centralized systems and results in unrealized negotiating power. These complex systems do not lead to stable patterns of intergovernmental relations. Although not specifically addressed in this volume in a systematic fashion, variation in intergovernmental relations across policy areas within a country would focus attention on other important elements, including bureaucracies and government agencies and their performance. The link between performance of decentralized governmental structures and electoral politics presents a promising area for future research.

Federalism and Democracy in Latin America is more explicitly theoretical than the Montero and Samuels volume. A central question concerns the role of federal institutions in shaping politics, policymaking, and democratic practice. The analysis of federalist systems by William H. Riker (*Federalism: Origin, Operation, Significance* [Boston: Little Brown, 1964]) defines several of the theoretical issues discussed in the volume, such as the origins of federalist systems, the role of the political system in federalist structures and institutions, and the degree of centralization of power.

Alfred Stepan examines the Riker propositions through a comparative politics methodology, focusing on the Latin American countries with federalist structures as well as several from other regions of the world. He addresses overrepresentation in the territorial chamber, the

assignment of policymaking responsibilities to subnational governments, and the territorial basis of party systems. He proposes a continuum, from democracy-enhancing to democracy-constraining, to assess one dimension of change in federalist structures. Decentralization that enhances the political power of traditional regional oligarchies would, sensibly, be considered democracy-constraining. In a different context, the efforts of military governments to constrain regional oligarchies through centralization of political power would similarly be classified as democracy-constraining. But in this discussion Stepan calls attention to a key factor affecting decentralization's impact, which is that the extent of political competition occurring at the subnational level determines the degree to which democracy is enhanced. Given the large size and regional diversity of these federalist countries, it is likely that some regions will develop greater political competition and more readily overturn traditional oligarchies even though all regions in the country are subject to the same set of structural reforms. Furthermore, variation across political parties within a country, particularly the ability of the national party to unify subnational political processes, may produce incentives for politicians that either strengthen or undermine the level of regional competition.

The authors in the volume convincingly argue that several of Riker's propositions provide inadequate explanations of recent developments in federalism in Latin America. Even though one might question the appropriateness of applying Riker's views on federalism, developed through the examination of the U.S. experience, to Latin America, the testing of his propositions provides a rich frame of reference which will be of great interest to scholars of federalism.

But the Gibson volume involves much more than the testing of Riker's propositions. It calls attention to several very important dimensions of federalist systems—issues of territorial representation, of the creation of multiple venues for political organization and mobilization, of constraints on policy and political systems imposed by federalist structures, and of the distribution of power among regions and regionally-based actors—that have not been present in assessments of recent decentralization. The book provides very good case studies of each country with a federalist government structure—Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and Venezuela—and several cross-country examinations of specific research questions. Constraints placed on federal governments by federalist structures and autonomy of subnational governments are central concerns. Resources available to states, political power of governors, the effectiveness of representation of subnational interests in national congress and policy jurisdictions of subnational and national governments are all factors found to affect the relative degree of autonomy in the subnational state. With higher degrees of autonomy,

one should expect increasing frequency of policies adopted by individual states to contradict or undermine federal policies. In critical arenas, such as macroeconomic policy, these conflicts may well lead to recentralization of policymaking authority.

Both the Montero and Samuels and the Gibson volumes address a fundamental dimension of governmental systems—the interplay of governmental structure and institutions and political systems. Political power in a country has a spatial basis, ranging from a predominately regionally based to a nationally based structure. This structure can be analyzed by examining the spatial basis of party systems. Among the countries discussed in these two volumes, great variation in the spatial dimension of political power exists. During the democratization process, the organization of political systems has evolved, as one should expect, but in surprising ways. In several countries military dictatorships attempted but failed to redefine political systems, often by banning existing party structures that were regionally based. Despite the attempt to reshape the political system in Brazil, the military dictatorship had no good option but to work with regional political structures to administer the vast country. Election systems themselves can facilitate the emergence of new regional political forces. The PAN (Partido Acción Nacional) in Mexico and the PT (Partido dos Trabalhadores) in Brazil started as regional political organizations before becoming important national players. In Venezuela the return to elected governors led to restructuring of political parties.

The effect of the territorial basis of representation in legislative bodies is also addressed in these books. Malapportionment in legislative bodies is an issue of geography and the uneven spatial distribution of people, resources, and social needs. A structure of territorial representation may be broadly accepted at one point in time, even though malapportioned, and one can imagine several reasons for the agreement of under-represented regions. But federalist systems, in particular, are most certainly subject to malapportionment if a chamber (usually the Senate) is constituted on the basis of territorial representation (is this not the core of the federalist pact?). Unitary governments must also address the uneven spatial distribution of resources. In all countries, however, the spatial distribution of people and resources will inevitably evolve. Uneven patterns of urbanization and regional development assure that territorially based systems will shift, if not increase, inequities in representation. But the potential inequities in policy decisions and resource allocations of malapportioned national legislative bodies will likely be reduced to the extent that political competition exists at the subnational level. Nevertheless, center-periphery tensions are inherent in political systems and one must hope that governmental and political structures have sufficient elasticity to respond as the nature and degree of tensions evolve.

Federalist structures have ample opportunities for veto players to emerge, and several authors in these volumes are correct to emphasize the complexity of political representation and policy development in federalist systems. Political leadership becomes more critical in systems with these multiple sources of power, particularly leadership to prevent the exercise of a veto, which is the power to impede or prevent action. The authors tend to address the issue of vetoes in terms of the political systems and less in terms of policy systems. Those that hold veto power will have great leverage in decisions of policy and resource allocations. But we can also observe instances where those holding veto power do not exercise it, even in instances where the outcomes may not favor the veto holders. That is to say, the focus on vetoes in political systems with less attention to policymaking may lead to an overstatement of the likelihood that political stalemate will prevail over consensus building and compromise.

An interesting example is found in the Amazon region of Brazil, a region represented by 25 percent of the country's senators, but less than 8 percent of the country's population. In 2002, the most votes a senator received in Roraima was around 95,000, while the most votes received in São Paulo was almost 10.5 million. Thus the Senate is highly malapportioned, and if the senators from the Amazon acted in unison they would have a strong hand. But political competition within the region, including links between the regional politics and national parties, reduces the likelihood of the veto being exercised. The development needs and potential in the Amazon are considerable, and the federal government has planned major infrastructure investments there in order to integrate the region with other areas of Brazil as well as with other countries. The leadership for this action did not originate in a coalition of senators or governors from the region, but rather was the outcome of a broad-based consensus around national development needs. A political system that provides a voice of more than proportional strength to less advanced regions is not necessarily a formula for political stalemate. Consideration and comparison of policy issues, to supplement the discussion of veto players and political structures, brings forth the importance of political leadership and a fuller understanding of regional political interests.

The Eaton book, *Politics Beyond the Capital*, addresses the design of subnational governments through a historical and comparative study of four southern cone countries, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay. He reminds us that tensions between national and subnational governments are inherent in governmental systems and the nature of these tensions evolve over time. He adopts a historical institutionalism perspective and identifies numerous examples of past institutional design affecting tensions and challenges of subnational governments in later

periods. Although the previously discussed books frequently use historical references—Eaton himself contributed a chapter to *Decentralization and Democracy in Latin America*—Eaton's book provides a more formal structure to contrast various historical moments of institutional design with those of the present. He convincingly argues that a particular design of subnational government should be understood as, in part, a solution to a particular set of national and subnational tensions and challenges. Challenges evolve and adjustments to the design are to be expected. Hence, recent decentralization and changes in institutional design in these countries are unique only in scope, not in nature. Furthermore, he identifies historical examples of decentralization being followed by periods of centralization as well as recent examples of incipient recentralization in the four countries.

Eaton's work also differs from the other two volumes in the attention it devotes to examining the roles played by specific policy challenges in institutional design. The compelling need for national macroeconomic policy induces centralization in the 1930s in many countries. A similar need prompts the adoption of the fiscal responsibility law in Brazil in 2003—a clear reversal of decentralization in the realm of fiscal federalism. In such instances, centralization should be viewed, at least in part, as a pragmatic solution to a pressing policy problem.

Yet another reason for the redesign or adjustments to subnational governments identified by Eaton is the unintended or unforeseen consequence of earlier institutional designs. The assignment of greater authority to governors, for example, is consistent with the decentralization objective, but the exercise of that authority can produce behavior inconsistent with other national goals. Or the enhancement of the resource base of subnational governments can reasonably be expected to strengthen those governments, but the outcomes may differ for wealthy and poor regions depending on the specific fiscal reform. Poor regions will most likely benefit from increased national government transfers while wealthy regions will be favored by devolution of tax bases. Eaton raises an interesting issue concerning recent economic reforms that are generally thought to reinforce decentralization. If poor regions perform poorly under these reforms, recentralization and expanded regional fiscal redistribution will likely appear. By adopting a policy focus, as Eaton does, one can imagine that within a single country decentralization and recentralization could be occurring simultaneously in different policy arenas.

Eaton's book may foreshadow a shift in the focus of the scholarly community. Sufficient time has passed to allow for studies of the performance of decentralized systems, both with respect to democratic consolidation and the effectiveness of the redesigned policy systems. Second, adjustments in the decentralized systems and instances of recentralization are likely to capture the attention of scholars. Eaton's

historical perspective does raise a question as to whether the proper terminology has been adopted. In considering the recent past, "recentralization" may be the proper word choice, but Eaton's historical perspective suggests that "redcentralization" would be equally appropriate to describe the recent decades. However, recognizing that we are observing a pendular movement, "centralization" and "decentralization" seem most appropriate.

The models of governance adopted in Latin America are evolving. Countries in the region struggle to consolidate democratic practice and reform of the state. These three volumes make a valuable contribution to assessing progress and explaining the complex patterns observed. A strength of the volumes is the detail provided on the intricacies of interplay between political systems and governmental structures in individual countries. The books confirm that countries in Latin America are quite diverse in political history and governmental organization. A number of common cross-national trends are identified but in the particulars we gain a much fuller understanding and appreciation of national actors.

One dimension of state reform not substantially addressed in these volumes or in the literature is the relationship among the branches of government in decentralized systems. Constitutional reform in the region has tended to provide additional powers to the legislative branch, compensating for the historical dominance of the executive in virtually all countries of the region. But the productive exercise of these powers in the legislative-executive interactions seems rather rare. The roles of party systems as well as the legislative capacity in policymaking are likely to be important elements in explaining the slow pace of legislative modernization. Similarly, the effect of state reform on the judiciary will likely become another priority area for research.

A second dimension of this transition period that merits greater attention from the research community is the effect of democratization and state reform on agenda setting and policy implementation. Democratization movements argued that the concerns of politically disenfranchised and poor populations would be more fully addressed under democratic regimes. We know that policies directed toward the needs of these populations, for example policies to increase employment, must compete with other pressing priorities. Nevertheless, democratization in Latin America was expected to produce a shift in priorities towards the needs of the poor. A related issue is whether effective public policies generate political support and affect electoral politics. The examination of shifting public policy agendas and effectiveness in policy implementation will be important in a broader assessment of the impacts of democratization and state reform. Due to decentralization, this examination must be conducted largely at the subnational level and

address specific policy areas but taking into account intergovernmental relations.

The other two books under review, *The Quiet Revolution: Decentralization and the Rise of Political Participation in Latin American Cities*, by Tim Campbell, and *Leadership and Innovation in Subnational Government: Case Studies from Latin America*, edited by Tim Campbell and Harald Fuhr, are also concerned with reform of the public sector and democratization but with different objectives. These two books focus largely on the performance of municipal governments with special attention to questions of government capacity. The audiences for these books are principally policy communities, that is, individuals engaged directly in state reform and policy practice. Although these books will be of interest to scholarly communities, there is less concern with formal theory and argumentation than in the three books previously discussed.

In *The Quiet Revolution*, Campbell states that decentralization in the region was the result of adjustments in the spatial distribution of political power within countries and not, in the first instance, a response to state reform or democratization. The links between regional political power and national political systems are concerns that Campbell's book shares with those discussed above. Campbell provides accounts of unlikely pioneers in decentralization. For example, in Pinochet's Chile, the centralization of administrative control occurred even as new administrative functions were delegated to local governments. After the return to democracy, the experiences in decentralized administration during the Pinochet period actually facilitated the introduction of more decentralized governance systems with local elections. In Mexico, rapid economic growth in some peripheral regions led to political competition at the subnational level, preceding both national political competition and decentralization of the public sector. In Colombia, civil unrest shifted political power sharing from the national to the regional level, initiating a process that resulted in governmental decentralization. Campbell's discussion of the forces of democratization and decentralization in Latin America, with an emphasis on country-specific rather than supranational causes, echoes arguments found in *Federalism and Democracy in Latin America* and *Decentralization and Democracy in Latin America*.

The Quiet Revolution and *Leadership and Innovation in Subnational Government* identify and discuss instances of success in local governance but also attempt to understand missteps. The first book draws from the experiences of many Latin American countries and the findings are organized around three principal dimensions of decentralization—revenues and expenditures, intergovernmental relations and institutions, and political participation. The second adopts a comparative case study approach, examining eleven instances, from seven countries, of innovation in the public sector.

One method of assessing the consolidation of decentralization and reform of the state is to examine changes in the structure of fiscal systems and the assignment of functional responsibilities. Adequacy of resource bases and the demands placed on the public sector will affect the performance of subnational governments. The distribution of resources vis-à-vis regional needs frequently varies across regions within a country, thus producing mismatches. Regions with weak resource bases may not be able to meet regional needs, placing local elected officials in difficult, if not untenable, situations. National strategies can be adopted to remedy these mismatches but they are subject to ineffective targeting when, for example, national poverty reduction measures miss the poor in a relatively developed and growing region.

A well-known threat to the democratic practice in decentralized systems is the enhancement of the power of traditional regional oligarchies. The most promising measure to prevent this outcome is political competition at the subnational level. This requires new political leadership able to garner political support outside the traditional structures of political power. The performance of local governments, in theory, can be used to garner this support. Campbell illustrates this point using the example of Dante Oliveira, the mayor of the Brazilian city Cuiba. Upon election Oliveira focused immediately on sanitation in peripheral residential areas and developed the governmental capacity required for meeting this need. The affected population became politically engaged and rejuvenated local government. Several important points can be derived from this case. Oliveira's success depended critically on developing governmental capacity. Elected leaders engaging citizens and raising expectations without the capacity to improve governmental services is not a sustainable model. A second lesson is that it is unlikely that such political leadership will be found uniformly dispersed across municipalities. To compensate for limited indigenous leadership, strategies for diffusing innovation are appearing, oftentimes under sponsorship of higher levels of government.

Leadership and Innovation in Subnational Government adopts a case study approach in examining innovation in local government. The case studies are outcomes of the Innovations Study, a project of the Latin American and Caribbean Technical Unit of the World Bank, conducted between 1995 and 1997. Recognizing that decentralization was imposing new demands on local governments but also creating opportunities, the book attempts to identify and examine the source of innovative actions as well as the process of their implementation and diffusion. A common set of questions and framework of analysis are used in these cases. The authors are university-based research and staff members of multilateral organizations and in-country governmental organizations. A wide range of critical elements in local governance, including fiscal

systems, managerial capacity, methods of urban service provision, and citizen participation, is considered. This volume is written for policy communities, including officials of local governments in the Americas, as well as members of the multilateral and bilateral organizations. Although it may be of less interest to scholarly communities, the book is nonetheless an important contribution to the literature. The limitations of the study of best practice for the academic community are well known. With this methodology one cannot, for example, determine the relative effectiveness of a particular policy instrument or the factors most important to determining particular outcomes. But during this period of transition, detailed and comparative case studies have an important role to play, beyond the obvious relevance to those involved in local government in the region.

Despite the number of innovative cases identified in both volumes, a lesson conveyed is that decentralization frequently occurred too quickly, before the administrative capacity of subnational governments had been developed. This point is particularly germane to intergovernmental fiscal systems. The most obvious instance of the problem is the assignment of responsibilities to subnational governments without the allocation of fiscal resources necessary to address the needs, the so-called unfunded mandates. But there are a few cases, such as in Brazil, where fiscal resources were made available to subnational governments before these governments had the administrative capacity to utilize the resources effectively. A related concern is the enhancement of "own source" revenue, which is revenue raised by subnational governments themselves through local tax bases or from other sources assigned to them. The degree of autonomy in subnational government policymaking partially depends on a government's ability and will to develop its own resource base. The source of revenue most commonly available to local governments is the property tax, but local officials may, understandably, be reluctant to increase taxes on their own constituencies. An effective governance system is one in which citizens are involved in making policy decisions as well as raising the revenues necessary to implement those policies. A mark of a mature governance system is one where government officials, elected democratically, implement revenue raising systems that impose greater burdens on their own constituencies in order to meet local needs.

According to Campbell, the prevailing wisdom views Latin American cities as incapable of effective governance and of achieving acceptable levels of performance. Furthermore, the conventional wisdom expects socio-economic inequalities in cities to grow. A policy prescription derived from this wisdom is that municipal governments must be constrained and not allowed to assume defensive postures against globalization. This reviewer agrees with Campbell that the prevailing wis-

dom must be challenged. Countries in the region have experienced economic growth and steady improvement in per capita incomes, but they retain staggering levels of inequality. Municipal governments have the opportunity, if not the obligation, to address problems of inequality, and the two volumes report encouraging developments. But the greatest challenge to democratic governance systems is the incorporation of excluded groups and the adjustment of public policies to better meet social needs. Although one can argue that effective national policies in macroeconomic management, public education, and other areas are needed, a test of democratic governance will occur at the local level. Higher levels of civic engagement by lower income groups are vital, and this engagement will hopefully lead to better public services. The prospects for this occurring are clearly linked to the effectiveness of political systems in incorporating these disadvantaged groups.

The Quiet Revolution and *Leadership and Innovation in Subnational Government* make a significant contribution to ongoing discussions of governance in Latin America. The books identify terminology and dimensions that can help structure research frameworks for the study of this complex topic. These books more fully explore the relationship between civil society and government and the capacity of subnational governments to act than do *Federalism and Democracy*, *Decentralization and Democracy*, and *Politics Beyond the Capital*. Although the latter three volumes are directed toward academic communities, the articulation of their relevance to ongoing efforts to improve governance systems would be most helpful. Given the stakes associated with democratic consolidation and good governance in the Americas, efforts to encourage exchanges between scholarly and policy communities should be a high priority.