significantly reduce the capacity of the political machine in monopolizing control and distribution of resources?

And third, how similar would the findings be when the theoretical approach is employed in a more rural setting? The author’s use of a single case study provides rich empirical detail on the nature of politics in Naga City. However, further research that attempts to answer the third question may yield substantial insights on the salience of state institutions as explanatory variables that are independent of the process of urbanization.

This short but rich book is thus significant not only because of the attempt to explain the parallel existence of good governance and political machines in local politics, but also because it provokes additional questions that are important in more accurately understanding the nature of local politics in the Philippines.

ANTONIO PEDRO, JR.
Department of Political Science
De La Salle University – Manila
Philippines


What is the relationship between globalization and democracy? For the most part the chapters in this book are concerned to explore the argument that the processes entailed in the economic, financial and cultural manifestations of globalization cannot be assumed necessarily to facilitate democratization. Historical and cultural factors can play the role of independent variables, and in Asia especially there can be observed a wide range of political and social outcomes even in ostensibly democratized states.

In reviewing the causes and consequences of the Asian financial crisis, Lowell Dittmer argues the case that the crisis marks the end of “Asian exceptionalism”, global market forces now having “gained the upper hand” (p. 36). But this is not to assume that globalization will henceforth clear the way for a more thorough democratization. In reviewing the Indian case, Aswini Ray argues that local democracy has often been overwhelmed by such forces, and in the six chapters that follow, which are devoted specifically to the impact of globalization on particular Asian democracies, this message is
reinforced. In South Korea, Geir Helgesen finds democratic forms to co-exist with distinctive (perhaps pre-democratic) social norms, and of Indonesia Richard Robison argues that the formal democratization of 1999 has not yet consolidated democratic practices, there being a struggle within the forces of democracy between those who would have the state exercise regulatory powers as opposed to those who would seek to mobilize its institutions in pursuit of “predatory” policies redolent of the dictatorial past.

The emergence of non-government and “non-profit” organizations in Japan, focused especially on security, environmental and gender issues and facilitated, once again, by the forces of globalization, marks a somewhat contradictory development. Hugo Dobson argues that this phenomenon has led to increased demands for government transparency and accountability, though the definitive response of the state is still unclear. By contrast, Anders Uhlin, in reviewing the experience of Malaysia and Thailand, cautions against the assumption that the empowering of civil society as a result of the operation of globalizing forces is necessarily a democratic development. What can be safely concluded, however, is that globalization opens a new space for political contestation, though what outcome that contest will have depends to a large extent on the nature of the political system in question. Similarly Bishnu Mohapatra, writing on India, observes that the emergence of the discourse of “minority rights” has undermined, to some extent, the claims of citizenship in the interests of a sometimes narrow exceptionalism.

This case study introduces the second thesis of this collection, namely that “identity” comprises a major item if not the “missing link” in the study of the link between globalization and democracy. There can be no doubt that the forces and technologies associated with globalization have helped to stimulate the emergence of local identities in various Asian societies, as four of the chapters (devoted respectively to India, Malaysia, China and Indonesia) demonstrate. However, the question of whether these new assertions of identity can be harmonized within their existing national political contexts would seem to depend on the nature of the states in question. The transnational “Chinese” networks identified by Shamsul A.B. would seem to gain their impetus, in the Malaysian case, from the dominance within the Malaysian political system of a particular discourse of ethnicity (itself facilitated in part by globalization) which limits the role of “non-Malay” citizens. Nevertheless, as the Malaysian case also illustrates, even such a relatively authoritarian system has been able to respond more positively to the rise of environmentalist groups stimulated by the same globalizing forces.
The importance of the nature of the state is underlined by Vivienne Shue. In her analysis of the Beijing government’s response to the Falun Gong movement, she illustrates “how the state has struggled to adjust its course so as to steer between the paradigmatic extremes of modernism, on the one hand—which it finds ineradicably contaminated by Western ideals and values—and of nativism, on the other hand—which it finds ineradicably contaminated by popular mysticism and magic” (p. 225). The fact that the Chinese government possesses, even after more than 20 years of reform and marketization, such latitude as to determine which belief systems its citizens may or may not hold is the crucial factor in this episode.

What is the conclusion of this study? For some of the contributors, the connection between globalization and democracy is so qualified, nuanced and contextual that a generalization can hardly be advanced. As one of the editors observes, in her own chapter on Vietnam and Laos, “globalization today reinforces existing processes [derived in those societies respectively from ‘the legitimacy of socialist rule’ and from ‘economic and societal development’], processes partially running parallel to globalization, and the outcome of these processes is unpredictable due to the ambivalent effects of globalization. Globalization may lead to democratization, but the result may also be a shift in power to groups in society that are not interested in democratic reforms” (pp. 127–8). It is also pertinent to observe that the subject of this book is a fast moving target. To take the Korean case, for example, the election of Roh Moo Hyun as president in 2002 has led to the displacement of many of the conventions, with their basis in “cultural” notions of hierarchy and authority, which characterized Korean politics to that point. Roh was elected as a result of his strong following amongst younger voters, and his initial cabinet and other appointments have set aside seniority and gender criteria, much to the consternation of the national establishment. Even the patriarchy noted by Helgesen as a major and enduring social force is now subject to more vigorous contestation. And many of these changes can be traced to the impact, in various ways, of globalization. But there is no disputing the judgment that this book makes a useful contribution to advancing the thesis that the shape of democracies in Asia, as elsewhere, bears the powerful imprint of global forces.

James Cotton
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