



Review

Reviewed Work(s): Privatization South American Style by Luigi Manzetti

Review by: M. Victoria Murillo

Source: *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 95, No. 1 (Mar., 2001), pp. 242-243

Published by: American Political Science Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3117683>

Accessed: 30-06-2020 17:43 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



American Political Science Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Political Science Review*

interesting case studies that reflect the behavioral trends, the description reveals the results of Robert Dahl's important study of elite rule in New Haven. It overlooks, however, William Domhoff's followup, which is based on different questions to the same people interviewed by Dahl and reveals different understandings about rule and power in New Haven.

Gaps also appear in the attention to developmental theory. There is reference to Rostowian economic stage theory but no acknowledgment of A. F. K. Organski's futile attempt to apply such theory to politics. Lane reviews the criticism of structural-functionalism without linking it, for example, in the work of Gabriel Almond, to the underlying ideological belief that development appears only in systems of formal, indirect, and representative rule. What is missing in an otherwise instructive review of Samuel Huntington's notions of order in changing society is criticism of his reliance on authority and his conservative skepticism about revolutionary change for Third World society. In linking dependency theory with Marxism, Lane overlooks that few dependentistas actually relied on Marxism or failed to cite Marx. Furthermore, although Marx in the case of India emphasized the long path to socialism through development of the capitalist means of production, Lane ignores his writings on Ireland that come remarkably close to the dependency perspective.

The characterization of dependency theory as "vulgar Marxism" belies the fact that writers such as Paul Baran, André Gunder Frank, Theotonio dos Santos, and others all wrote about dependency and underdevelopment in defiance of distorted sectarian positions advocated by traditional and orthodox communist parties. These writers captivated intellectual interest about why capitalist development was not occurring in the Third World, and their views eventually became influential in mainstream North American social science. If, as Lane argues (p. 71), both Adam Smith and Karl Marx failed to outline a developmental path, leaving the task to comparative political scientists to find a different way, then it would seem that we might benefit from a close look at development in terms of capitalism and socialism as economic systems that dramatically affect politics.

Likewise, Lane's discussion of the return to the state emphasizes the work of Evans, Rueschemeyer, and Skocpol during the early 1980s without recognition of the seminal work of European political scientists, such as Ralph Miliband, Claus Offe, and Nicos Poulantzas, who elaborated a theory of the state a decade earlier. Also, Lane does not take us back to the origins of American political science, which was deeply influenced by the notion of state and formal notions of government and state in nineteenth-century German literature. Her focus on more recent theory of the bureaucratic authoritarian state overlooks the extensive literature and debates around corporatism that preceded it.

Finally, the interesting review of the new institutionalism turns to studies of the peasantry, grassroots, resistance, and rebellion. Lane elaborates on the history, principles, and influence of rational choice in the new institutionalism and sets forth an institutional model. A concluding chapter reviews various theories in an effort to justify her assertion that comparativists, working on their own over the years, have unconsciously put together the politics model she so carefully delineates throughout the book. These lapses should not deter comparativists from delving into these two interesting works which attempt to look at traditional and current thinking in new and challenging ways.

Privatization South American Style. By Luigi Manzetti. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. 373p. \$74.00.

M. Victoria Murillo, *Yale University*

Luigi Manzetti fills an important gap in the literature on market reforms in Latin America by providing a comparative analysis of privatization in Argentina, Brazil, and Peru. He engages the literature on economic reform in developing countries by focusing on the implementation of this single policy and complements a burgeoning scholarship on the economics of privatization in the region. The main contribution lies in underlining the relevance of political factors for explaining the success of privatization policies. The "South American" style, he suggests, reinforces the view of those who, like John Williamson and Stephen Haggard ("The Political Conditions of Economic Reform," in Williamson, ed. *The Political Economy of Reform*, 1994) and Guillermo O'Donnell ("Delegative Democracy," *Journal of Democracy* 5 [January 1994]: 53–69), associate the rapid implementation of market reforms with the concentration of executive authority at the expense of the checks and balances of liberal democracies.

The most extreme cases in this trend are Peru, with the self-staged coup of President Alberto Fujimori and the dismissal of nonsubservient judges, and Argentina, where President Carlos Menem packed the Supreme Court with political loyalists (p. 322). Nonetheless, Manzetti recognizes the importance of political bargaining for building coalitions in support of privatization. In particular, his comparison between the success in Brazil of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso's privatization efforts relative to those of his predecessor, President Fernando Collor, highlights the importance of bargaining in building a proprivatization coalition (chap. 4).

Manzetti proposes an analytic framework that incorporates many of the variables mentioned by the literature on economic reform in developing countries. The five main concepts are: the willingness to privatize, the political opportunity to do so, the government capabilities to implement the policies, the political responses generated by the decision to privatize, and the technical difficulties for accomplishing the process. In addition, the author presents a rich empirical description of privatization efforts by presidents Raúl Alfonsín and Carlos Menem in Argentina; presidents Fernando Collor, Itamar Franco, and Fernando Henrique Cardoso in Brazil; and presidents Fernando Belaunde Terry, Alan García, and Alberto Fujimori in Peru.

Although Manzetti compares privatization experiences across time and across countries, he could have used the rich information in the empirical chapters for comparisons across or within sectors. That approach could have answered other comparative questions, in addition to the success of privatization efforts, such as those regarding the type of privatization. Why was electricity privatized without vertical integration as a strategy to promote competition in Argentina and Peru, whereas telecommunication companies were privatized as monopolies in both countries? Why did Brazil, in contrast, include competition from the onset in the privatization of telecommunications? Although implicit comparisons are made across privatization cases in different countries, an explicit analysis of sectors might have yielded answers to this type of question. In fact, variables that Manzetti examines—such as the effect of different bureaucracies, fiscal emergency, and interest groups—influenced the decision on how to privatize. His cross-national comparisons lay the ground for future studies to undertake this task.

The organization of the book makes it difficult to test the

analytical model, especially for readers who are not country specialists. Often, too much empirical description leaves little space for an extensive discussion of alternative explanations. The author begins with a thought-provoking and easy-to-follow list of plausible hypotheses to be tested, but his summary of findings would have been clearer if he had employed a similar analytic device in the concluding chapter. A graphic summary of the qualitative measures for each case study would have highlighted the explanatory power of the model vis-à-vis alternative hypotheses, even if no quantitative measures could be provided. In addition, the use of alternative research designs, such as Charles C. Ragin's Bayesian method (*The Comparative Method*, 1986), would have allowed Manzetti to state more clearly which of his five variables are either necessary or sufficient for the success of privatization.

This detailed comparative analysis is a point of departure for future studies on privatization in the region. Manzetti illuminates the politics of a policy that reshapes developmental states and modifies the ways in which the state is used for political goals, such as patronage or subsidies, in many developing countries (e.g., Robert Bates, *Beyond the Miracle of the Market*, 1991). Building upon a field characterized by single-country monographs and a literature that usually is too technical, Manzetti provides a comprehensive synthesis of various explanations of the success of privatizations in South America while emphasizing the political character of such processes.

Policy Representation in Western Democracies. By Warren E. Miller, Roy Pierce, Jacques Thomassen, Richard Herrera, Sören Holmberg, Peter Esaiasson, and Bernhard Wessels. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 180p. \$65.00.

Valerie R. O'Regan, *North Dakota State University*

Those who study the concept of representation are undoubtedly familiar with the 1963 study by Warren Miller and Donald Stokes ("Constituency Influence in Congress," *American Political Science Review* 57 [March 1963]: 45–56), which had a profound effect on scholars' understanding of the relationship or "congruence" between representatives and constituents. Others (see Sidney Verba and Norman H. Nie, *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*, 1972; Heinz Eulau and Paul D. Karps, "The Puzzle of Representation: Specifying Components of Responsiveness," in Heinz Eulau and John C. Wahlk, eds., *The Politics of Representation*, 1978) have made their own distinguished contributions by venturing to conceptualize and measure representation in an effort to further our understanding of the relationship between the representative and the represented. In the same mode, this collection of articles contributes to the study of the mass-elite relationship by providing a variety of approaches, methods, and measures to broaden the literature.

In the past, work frequently has been limited to single case studies of various countries, including France (Philip E. Converse and Roy Pierce, *Political Representation in France*, 1986), Sweden (Sören Holmberg, "Political Representation in Sweden," *Scandinavian Political Studies* 12 [March 1989]: 1–35), and the United States (Richard F. Fenno, *Home Style: House Members and Their Districts*, 1978), among others. Difficulties regularly associated with cross-national research, such as unavailable and noncomparable data, have hindered attempts at comparative analysis. The focus on specific cases,

however, limits our understanding of any cross-national similarities and differences.

The central contribution of *Policy Representation* is its thorough, comparative analyses of five industrialized democracies. They represent various types of systems (presidential and parliamentary, two-party and multiparty, majority and party list) found in democracies throughout the world. In addition, the contributors adopt different approaches that incorporate basic theories of representation, individual and aggregate data, diverse measures, as well as innovative and established methods. Similarities can be found among some of the chapters in the application of certain models as well as the significance of communication between elites and masses in the representation process, which was a critical point made by Miller and Stokes in 1963.

An introduction explains the motivation and circumstances that resulted in this collection, followed by six different perspectives that draw on diverse theories, measures, and methods. The second chapter explores the linkages between issue positions of voters and political parties by applying the responsible party model of representation. An original measure, Pierce's Q, is used to evaluate the mass-elite issue linkages in the five political systems. In the third chapter, two models of representation are applied in the study of issue congruence, and emphasis is on the usage of the left-right dimension in communications between the masses and political elites. Chapter 4 analyzes the political discourse and levels of understanding between masses and elites. In chapter 5, the Galtung system of distribution curve shapes is used to analyze collective policy congruence. The sixth chapter examines the occurrence and effects of geographical distinctions in voters' policy views. Chapter 7 examines the relationship between the different political systems and policy representation based on the characteristics inherent in the systems. The book concludes with an overview of the findings from each chapter.

Each chapter takes a distinct approach to the subject. In most cases, the authors present their arguments, methods, and analyses logically and with originality and clarity. A couple were challenged with unexpected results that they thoughtfully explain and point to as foundation for further cross-national research on mass-elite linkages. One slight criticism involves the explanation of the curve shape analysis of mass-elite congruence. The author is so immersed in explaining methods that some confusion is created. Overall, however, the book is well written and interesting. In addition, some of the chapters offer innovative methods, such as Pierce's Q, that will advance comparative research on policy representation.

In addition to the six different approaches that can be developed in future research, a major contribution of this work is the comparative format. All the chapters incorporate data sources that allow the authors to provide a truly comparative analysis of mass-elite linkages. The study also produced a noteworthy international data pool, and it is hoped this will be expanded as future research incorporates other countries into the policy representation analysis.

Ultimately, "policy representation is a multifaceted phenomenon" (p. 111). This book does a fine job of educating the reader on the complexity and difficulty in determining what policy representation entails. Furthermore, the authors make a significant contribution to the comparative study of the subject. Those who are intrigued and challenged by the concept of representation will find this book to be an interesting piece of the policy representation puzzle.