
States and facing an economic crisis at the end of the Cold War), concluded that economic liberalization was essential to Mexico's future. From their positions of political control in a semi-authoritarian system, the "technocrats" were able to implement economic reform fairly easily.

Democratization was not on the agenda for technocrats or capitalists, however. Democratization was instead driven by the demands of other elite groups, mostly within their younger generations, whose appetite for democratization was only deepened by incremental political reform. The political opposition, intellectuals, the church, and even the military began to demand open and clean elections. The technocrats responded by offering limited democratic advances in exchange for the acquiescence of these competing elite groups to economic reform. These incremental reforms ultimately produced enough political reform to permit the election of an opposition president in 2000.

In the final chapter of the book, Camp employs his power elite analysis to offer some interesting speculations about the future direction of policy-making in Mexico. The overriding message of this final chapter, however, is that elites and elite mentors will continue to be essential analytic variables in the understanding of policy-making in Mexico.

Mexico's Mandarins is a book that only Roderic Camp could have written. It is a capstone work that builds on decades of research into Mexican politics and society. As such, it illuminates the nature and policy impact of Mexican elites with a degree of detail and a depth of understanding that no other author could have provided. It is essential reading for anyone who hopes to understand Mexico, its past process of liberalization, and its likely future policy direction.

Pamela K. Starr

Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM)

KENT EATON: *Politicians and Economic Reform in New Democracies: Argentina and the Philippines in the 1990s*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.

Most political scientists nowadays adhere to some version of institutionalism. In the study of Latin American politics, the rational-choice variant of this approach has been on the advance in recent years. These investigations commonly focus on the input side of politics. Many authors have analyzed electoral rules and their impact on party systems. Presidents' constitutional attributions and interactions with Congress have also attracted considerable

attention. By contrast, the output side of politics, especially policy-making and program implementation, has been neglected.

Kent Eaton's fine book helps to rectify this imbalance by offering a thorough, careful analysis of the important role that Congress played in tax policy reform in the Philippines and Argentina. Since this policy arena is crucial for the fiscal sustenance of the state, efforts to reform tax systems were a central component of the market-oriented reform programs that have swept across the world during the last two decades. Neo-liberal experts advocated the elimination of tax breaks and other special benefits, and the institution of broadly applicable taxes at moderate rates that would burden all sectors equally and thus avoid distorting the market. But the political success of these universalistic efforts has differed greatly. Whereas some countries advanced far, concerted opposition from powerful socioeconomic groups and party politicians blocked many changes in other nations. What accounts for this differential success?

Eaton stresses the importance of electoral rules. The Philippine electoral system gives politicians strong incentives to build personal reputations and thus pursue candidate-centered strategies; by contrast, electoral rules in Argentina induce politicians to follow the guidelines set by party leaders and thus pursue party-centered strategies. According to Eaton, this difference in political incentives profoundly shapes the decision-making of legislators on crucial policy issues. In the Philippines, parliamentarians tended to oppose presidential efforts to turn tax rules more universalistic. They defended particularistic norms, which allowed them to benefit important constituents and thus strengthen their personal support networks. By contrast, Argentine legislators did not face such incentives for particularism. Therefore, they tended to support universalistic tax reforms, allowing the neo-liberal program to advance much farther than in the Philippines.

Eaton supports these arguments with an admirably thorough, well-researched, and systematic analysis of a variety of fiscal reforms. After analyzing policy changes (chapters 4-5), he examines tax administration and the decentralization of fiscal authority (chapters 6-7). Thereafter, he broadens his view, discussing other components of market reform in Argentina and the Philippines (chapter 8) and tax reform in other Latin American countries (chapter 9). Thus, the author applies an exemplary methodological procedure, explicating and documenting his arguments first through in-depth case studies and then multiplying the observable implications of his theory and assessing them through secondary research.

Besides the above-mentioned extension of the institutionalist literature, this volume makes several significant contributions. For instance, it demonstrates the important role that legislatures have played in market-oriented reform.

Since presidents usually initiate the move to neo-liberalism by decreeing drastic adjustment plans, most analysts have focused on the executive branch. Therefore, legislatures have not figured prominently in the political-economy literature on the politics of neo-liberalism. As Eaton convincingly shows, this skewed attention is problematic. Congress influenced the advance of market reform, especially after the initial round of adjustment measures. In particular, fundamental institutional changes, such as comprehensive tax or social security reform, had to be enacted by law, rather than presidential decree. Eaton demonstrates that on these issues, legislators' policy preferences, which reflected their electoral incentives, strongly influenced decision-making. Presidents did not enjoy political supremacy, being able to coax, cajole, or bully Congress into supporting their bills unconditionally. With these arguments, the author helps to rectify an imbalance in the literature on market reforms.

Eaton's book also provides an admirably clear, lucid, and interesting treatment of tax policy. This issue area is often regarded as highly technical—the domain of economists or tax lawyers. Despite the crucial significance of fiscal policy for the state and despite the outpouring of state-centered writings since the 1980s, political scientists have rarely dared to tread on this ground. Eaton's volume offers a thoroughly political analysis of this complicated issue area and demonstrates its great relevance.

Despite its many strengths, however, Eaton's book also has a slight weakness. The author pushes his institutionalist argument a bit too single-mindedly, underestimating the crucial role of other factors, especially structural conditions. The differential success of tax reforms seems to arise in good part from the different severity of the economic problems plaguing the Philippines and Argentina. Whereas Argentina suffered from repeated bouts of hyperinflation, which threatened to cause an economic meltdown and began to unleash social chaos, the Philippines never experienced such a grave threat. As many Argentina specialists have stressed, the traumatic experience of hyperinflation decisively shaped President Carlos Menem's decision to push ahead with far-reaching market reforms, Congressional acquiescence in this bold program, and the surprisingly high level of popular support for costly adjustment measures. Concentrating on his institutionalist argument, Eaton underrates the importance of this factor and downplays it in his final—and belated—discussion of alternative arguments (294-96).

The varying gravity of Argentina's crisis is also crucial for explaining the changing fate of tax reform initiatives over time, which Eaton attributes mostly to institutional factors, such as the president's lame-duck status after his reelection in 1995. The experience and looming danger of hyperinflation accounts for the deference of Congress to presidential initiatives from 1989 to

1991; economic recovery after 1991 gradually weakened both Menem's push for further reforms and Congressional support for them; only the Mexican *peso* crisis prompted a new round of reform measures in 1995, which came to an end with the fairly quick recovery of 1996. In paying insufficient attention to the crisis variable. Eaton emphasizes institutional factors too exclusively.

Notwithstanding this quibble, Eaton's fine book is an important contribution to the literature on institutionalism and on market reform.

Kurt Weyland

University of Texas at Austin

LUIS RONIGER, CARLOS H. WAISMAN (eds.): *Globality and Multiple Perspectives: Comparative North American and Latin American Perspectives*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2002.

Este volumen de ensayos está formado por colaboraciones interdisciplinarias de un alto nivel intelectual que fueron presentadas en el congreso "The Americas-Distinct Patterns of Modernity" (Universidad de Erfurt, Alemania, diciembre de 1998). Este congreso formaba parte de un programa de colaboración entre centros de estudios de Uppsala, Jerusalén, Heidelberg y Erfurt, mediante el cual se investigaba la confluencia de factores culturales e institucionales en el desarrollo de la identidad colectiva, las esferas públicas y el orden político en las sociedades americanas en la época moderna.

El concepto central de estas investigaciones es la existencia de múltiples modernidades. A diferencia de la idea de una sola modernidad, que es sucedida cronológicamente por la post-modernidad, la noción de múltiples modernidades hace referencia a procesos continuos de reformulación de lo moderno, propiciados por actores y grupos sociales diferentes que propugnan divergentes nociones sobre la modernidad. La aclaración, realizada desde el prólogo, sobre la imposibilidad de asociar modernidad con Occidente y éste con Europa sirve para problematizar lo moderno. Tal afirmación equivale a un giro de carácter innovador, ya que se descarta el tradicional enfoque de una modernidad única que prevalece en Occidente. También se amplía lo que constituye la modernidad al hacer lugar a las diferentes formas que ésta adopta en las Américas.

El volumen consta de tres partes. La primera reúne las contribuciones de los editores. Luis Roniger examina cómo los modelos occidentales – España, Francia y Estados Unidos–, para las sociedades latinoamericanas,