Few scholars are likely to disagree with Tilly's well-reasoned theories, although many are likely to object to the methodology he adopts to prove them. Typical of his approach to the study of political phenomena, his historical-analytical framework is literally all over the place. It spans centuries and incorporates a disparate collection of empirical experiences ranging from medieval Europe to contemporary Mexican and Spanish politics. Certainly, this is likely to be a source of frustration for those who like their social science research agendas neatly packaged into well-defined historical narratives.

A more substantial criticism of the book, however, is the way in which Tilly and many others continue to regard trust (however defined) as the only compass for understanding the workings and fate of democracy. It is high time to rediscover the democratic virtues of a guarded—and indeed mistrusting—public.

Omar G. Encarnación
Bard College


Susan Rose-Ackerman’s latest book is the clearest statement yet of the inadequacy of mechanistic indicators of democracy. Free elections, the existence of political parties, and even freedom of speech and association are necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for a government that is answerable to the citizens it serves. They can help to remove officials from office, and introduce their replacements; but they cannot ensure that governments will fulfill their electoral programs, provide public goods instead of seeking private benefits, or reflect popular needs.

This study of the channels of accountability in two post-communist democracies powerfully demonstrates that to achieve policy-making accountability, in which policies reflect the “interests and needs of the population” (p. 5), several additional institutional channels have to connect governments and citizens. Rose-Ackerman examines five of these: the demands of external organizations, specifically the EU; formal institutions of oversight and control, such as ombudsmen, constitutional courts, or audit offices; decentralized government institutions, such as elected local officials and regional governments; government procedures for public consultation and participation in policy making; and civil society groups and the policy input they provide.

The key finding of the book is that as critical as these five channels are, they have developed unevenly, and often with considerable flaws, in post-communist democracies. For example, even nominally independent audit commissions and ombudsmen are subject to parliamentary approval, and thus to political nominations. Civil service organizations, whether environmentalists in Hungary
or student groups in Poland, are rarely taken into account when government policies on natural resources or education are formulated. Such organizations, even when formally included in consultations, suffer from under-funding and lack of outreach. As a result, Rose-Ackerman argues, two-pronged reforms are necessary: first, an open accounting by the government of the reasons and justifications for its policy proposals; and second, a new framework for the funding and support of civil society organizations. Throughout, the argument is buttressed by carefully researched and extremely well documented evidence, ranging from government statistics to extensive interviews with key policy makers and activists.

As compelling as the study is, the analysis raises two critical questions. First, why compare Poland to Hungary? Since there is little variation in any of the five dimensions between the two countries (with some exceptions, such as elected regional governments in Poland and the distinct preferences for devolution in the two countries), what theoretical leverage do we gain from this comparison? In other words, are Poland and Hungary different enough to illuminate key causal mechanisms or policy prescriptions? What broader population of countries or issues do they represent—could, for example, this comparison shed light on the more problematic post-communist regimes of Russia or the Balkans? Second, in arguing that the existing structures are inadequate, the question becomes: compared to what? Rose-Ackerman argues that the United States provides several examples of public participation and oversight in the policy process—but it is not clear whether these provide the most effective solutions available, or ones that best meet her criteria.

Nonetheless, these concerns do not subtract from what is a beautifully clear, meticulous work of scholarship that is as concerned with analyzing the shortcomings of post-communist democracy as it is focused on providing potential solutions.

Anna Grzymala-Busse
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor


One of the obvious consequences of September 11 is a renewed interest in the phenomenon of terrorism. Dozens of books and articles have been published on this subject matter in the last four years, but unfortunately, as in the 1970s, when there was another wave of publications, resulting from the emergence of revolutionary terrorism in many developed countries, most of them have very little added value and do not employ the analytical and methodological tools of the social sciences.