

need of further recognition and study. Vibert's work challenges scholars to think about accountability and democracy in a new light while recognizing a fundamental change in global governance practices. Rather than altogether resisting the idea that democracy may not require elected officials, readers will find themselves inspecting the ways in which democracy and governance are changing and the new approaches required to conceptualize such transformations.

James M. Smith
University of Illinois at Chicago

REFERENCES

- Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1962). The two faces of power. *American Political Science Review*, 56 (4), 947–952.
- Tetlock, P. (2005). *Expert political judgment: How good is it? How can we know?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Crucibles of Political Loyalty: Church Institutions and Electoral Continuity in Hungary. By Jason Wittenberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 293 pp.

This is both a complicated study and a highly ambitious one. It deserves serious attention. The focus is on an “unlikely case,” “. . . Hungary’s path from democracy to communism and back to democracy during the twentieth century” (p. 6). This would seem to be canvass enough for one research project but the author has broader objectives. These range from the best deployment of a path dependency methodology to the reliance of the findings for Eastern European and other nations undergoing processes of transformation. He writes:

“Why do mass political loyalties persist even amid prolonged social upheaval, disruptive economic development, and demographic transformation? The paradox of political persistence has bedeviled researchers . . . After nearly a century of research there remains little consensus even on how to identify continuity, much less what might account for it. This book has tackled these problems by zeroing in on countries emerging from communism [the main focus is Hungary]. If there were ever cases in which mass political attitudes should have been transformed, it would have been during state-socialism, when Communist Party dictatorships strove so vigorously to create loyal socialist citizens.” (p. 237)

The key is a focus on microlevel developments, particularly those at the local level. In this study, that means the essential role of the church in the community in

opposing communism quietly but effectively and in the process reinforcing and protecting traditional values, in this case conservative political tendencies and support patterns. These reemerge in the post-communist multiparty democratic system, showing marked similarities to related behavioral commitments of pre-communist Hungary.

Wittenberg argues that:

. . . this particular approach confers two big advantages . . . expanding the universe of potential instances of political continuity to include both redemocratizing countries and stable democracies brings key inadequacies of received theory into high relief. Tailored for systems that feature regularly scheduled competitive elections and genuine multiparty politics, these explanations are inadequate when applied to countries where democratic politics gets usurped for lengthy periods. If political persistence can occur even after a regime as intrusive as state-socialism, then the theories adduced to explicate the phenomenon for stable democracies, while perhaps sufficient within the domain for which they were formulated, cannot serve as general explanations. A more general theory of persistence cannot presuppose background conditions that exist only in stable democracies. Focusing on redemocratizing regimes, then, is not merely a matter of ‘increasing N,’ . . . but of using unusual instances of political persistence to shed light on similar political dynamics within older democracies. Perhaps what happened in the East is also happening in the West. (pp. 15–16)

Secondly, the author opts for a “causally deep” (his term) focus on “empirical depth and within-nation comparisons.” There is a time frame of almost 50 years and the unit of analysis is the selected communities and their over-time political behavior patterns as indicated by the party vote: “I document and explain political continuity through a combination of large-N statistical methods and detailed historical and interpretative analyses of settlement samples” (p. 16). In this regard, the range of data points such efforts put into the research analysis are impressive.

Following this approach, Wittenberg then explores the strengths and liabilities of varying research perspectives. He covers the manner in which they apply in the Hungarian situation, the confrontation between church and religion and communism and conditions prior to and after 1956 and “normalization.” He also discusses the statistical evidence and sensitivity to differences in patterns of the Rightist rebirth and in conclusion the relevance of the research for broader explanations and applications as to the survivability and resurfacing of traditional political attitudes in different nations.

Two points deserve attention before proceeding to a discussion of the conclusions. The processes of immersion in the Soviet communist culture within the country prior to 1989 bears emphasis as does the dynamics of the forces resisting

such messages. “. . . for roughly forty years the Hungarian and other Eastern European communist regions enjoyed virtual monopoly control of the culture, education, and media instruments with which socialist attitudes could be inculcated. Radio, television, newspapers, magazines, books, schools, music, and organizational involvement were all harnessed . . . toward this end” (p. 12). In addition, the institutional power of the state could be used to suppress dissent, restrict nonsponsored activities, and regulate, as examples, the timing of church services and even to a degree the substance of its teachings and rites. State control, while not total (much came to be a product of negotiation, especially after the 1956 uprising) was impressive and omnipresent.

Then again the obstacles to fundamental attitudinal and behavioral change were formidable. Hungary had a distinctive historical development. The churches, specifically the Roman (and Greek) Catholic Churches and the Reformed (Calvinist) Church, exercised considerable influence over the people and their culture. Wittenberg describes the upper echelons of the churches as susceptible to persuasion cooption by the government despite the Vatican’s unrelenting opposition to communism. The local church hierarchies had to engage in constant battles with authorities to retain a degree of independence and a role in influencing local views. According to Wittenberg, the local churches prevailed, resulting in the continuation of Rightist political and religious commitments and a fertile breeding ground for post-1989 Rightist political revival.

In addition, the communist agenda being forced on the country by an occupying power was in total contradiction to the practice and assumptions underlying Hungarian government prior to the Soviet takeover. Furthermore, the communists recognized the pull of religion on its adherents and chose to openly confront only those “antidemocratic” religious elements it needed to suppress. It could prove a fine line: “. . . the policy reflected a desire not to alienate potential allies among believers . . . However . . . in practice the Party vigorously sought to discourage religious practice . . . and to ‘persuade’ believers of the fallacy of religion” (p. 118).

Supplementing one ideology for another is not easy. To accomplish this, a project “frustrated by clumsy implementation,” the Party relied “on often undereducated, ill-informed and ill-prepared local cadres to wage the real battles” (p. 118). “. . . the foot soldiers . . . were to be ordinary Party members, who had to be educated in the contradictions between religion and communism” and additionally had to serve as role models for the workers (p. 161). Advantage here would appear to be with the established churches.

This study can be viewed on many levels. In one form or another it touches on or explores: postcommunist/communist studies; differing theoretical and methodological approaches; attitudinal/behavioral analyses; democratization/redemocratization concerns; area studies (Southeastern Europe); demographic and electoral analysis; the role of religion in the state and society; intrareligion differences; and political change and continuity, among other things. Much is combined in a book of less than three hundred pages.

Questions can arise as to the approaches taken or their interpretative use or the perspectives most relevant to uncovering the dynamics at work in such situations. Could it be for example that the real challenge is to explain social and attitudinal changes that are fundamental enough to restructure a society and its values? Possibly this is simply another way of refocusing what the study has shown. The value of whatever focal point informs the analyses is, as the author argues repeatedly, a potential model of adoption for other nations faced with profound social change.

The study is an important research contribution, challenging in analytic approach and the relevancy of its findings, and one that can be approached on a number of levels.

William Crotty
Northeastern University

Democracy. By Charles Tilly. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 2007. 246 pp.

Democratization is one of the most saturated fields of study in political science—not a place where one would expect to find an original, inventive contribution to the literature. Yet this is exactly what Charles Tilly provides in *Democracy*. Professor Tilly casts aside much of the recent focus on economic determinants, cultural affinities, and institutional design, in favor of a macro-sociological investigation of the historical processes that generate broad and equal inclusion of citizens in the political sphere. The search for “necessary conditions” is futile. But “democratization never occurs without at least partial realization of three large processes: integration of interpersonal trust networks into public politics; insulation of public politics from categorical inequalities; and elimination or neutralization of autonomous, coercion-controlling power centers in ways that augment the influence of ordinary people over public politics and increase the control of public politics over state performance” (p. 78). Understanding these three processes, and the complex ways in which they interact with varying levels of state capacity, will allow us to explain all cases of democratization and de-democratization, across the globe, for all of “democracy’s several centuries of history” (p. 78).

Tilly’s conceptualization of democracy keeps the focus on “process.” The fundamental characteristics of democracy are not to be found in a particular type of constitution or even in the implementation of free and fair elections. Rather, Tilly concentrates our attention on the relationship between the state and its citizens: “a regime is democratic to the degree that political relations between the state and its citizens feature broad, equal, protected, and mutually binding con-