

may well be the case, needs to be demonstrated with case-level data, which would be difficult to get and she does not provide. Data are a main obstacle to much of what she argues, but she is quite open about its problems. She situates her argument in the international relations literature, arguing that it has ignored non-governmental organizations. Given its focus on interstate relations and states as often unitary actors, this is unsurprising, although this ignores important recent work on transnational movements that do address NGOs. Why McMahon did not situate her argument in the literature on peacebuilding is not clear because there her arguments about international missions and the consequences of funding NGOs, largely international NGOs with scraps for local NGOs, and their imposed projects and outcomes—that they ignore local NGOs and have negative consequences in general—are extremely rich and make the same arguments at length. There is nothing new in this. It's particularly sad to miss reference to the work by Michael Foley, for example, or Paul Stubbs on Bosnia, and her apparent misunderstanding of why Haitians label their country, devastatingly, as The Republic of NGOs. McMahon makes a strong statement about the new economic power of NGOs, without empirical support and which my data dispute, and while she recognizes differences among types of NGOs and their goals, the analysis and data do not distinguish sufficiently. The difference between humanitarian NGOs and those related to democratization are important, but not sufficiently discussed.

The two case studies demonstrate the true difficulties for SR readers of limited field research. McMahon's evidence is largely from interviews, building in the biases of her interviewees and nothing systematic; in Bosnia, moreover, she only gathers information in the Federation, nothing in the Serb Republic, and the timing matters—she begins in Bosnia more than five years after the peace accord and in Kosovo less than two years after the NATO intervention. Nonetheless, the two cases provide superb comparative insights that I invite. The two had very different conflicts, pre-war civil societies, and international missions; the comparison would be fascinating. I encourage it. More detail on local NGOs in both cases, both before and during their conflicts, and their differences, would be very important for readers to know, as would her intriguing assertion that the “bust” era led local NGOs to create, innovate, and revive.

The many typographical errors are a disappointment (Christopher Hall instead of Hill and community instead of communist period) and factual mistakes (on the role of the US in these interventions, 40, 46; the leading role of the World Bank in needs assessments and its overall approach, 45–46, 52, 56; the origins of responsible sovereignty, 78; that Bosnia was largely Muslim, 94; her total neglect of the role of UNPROFOR, 95; the origins of the federation in Bosnia, 96; that the Helsinki Committee was one of the oldest NGOs in Bosnia, 106) in such a serious work. It is a very important topic.

SUSAN L. WOODWARD

The Graduate Center, City University of New York

The Defence of Constitutionalism: The Czech Question in Post-national Europe.

By Jiří Příbáň. Trans. Stuart Hoskins. Vaclav Havel Series. Prague: Karolinum Press, 2017. xvi, 312 pp. \$20.00, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.333

Shall we not judge a book by its cover—or shape? The book's near-square format suggests the atypical, and intriguing. Those familiar with some of Jiří Příbáň's other works can expect sophisticated insights, such as from his legal-scholarly works *Legal*

Symbolism: On Law, Time, and Legal Identity (2007) and *Dissidents of Law: On the 1989 Velvet Revolutions, Legitimations, Fictions of Legality and Contemporary Version of the Social Contract* (2102). A favorite among his books might be *Pictures of Czech Postmodernism* (2013), and though a different topic and publisher, that and the current books' formats are virtually the same. Apart from the inclusion of Czech artwork as illustrative of political phenomena, similarity ceases; so too does systematization. Do not expect an index, let alone that this book serves as a primer on Czech politics or on national identity, or on constitutionalism, whether generally or specifically Czech, or structured analysis of terms in the book's title.

Instead we receive an engaging, at times highly provocative (even occasionally sexually explicit) analysis, one eruditely underpinned by political philosophy. Some of the book is based on previous publications and interviews, and the eclecticism perhaps makes it more challenging than a typical monograph to capture in a few words. One approach is to assess aspects of the interplay between contemporary Czech politics and post-national Europe, their differences and their potential symbiosis. In other words, how different are issues in the Czech Republic from those in Europe? Also, was it intended broadly or for the EU, the latter featuring frequently.

In short, one reading of the book would be that the Czech Republic is not now much different from neighbors, including even noncommunist, European-established democracies. Among where Přebáň arguably finds the Czechs to be unusual includes criticisms of their political maturity and tolerance. A police crackdown on demonstrators in 2009 leads to the conclusion that the "ethos of universal freedom of expression is still alien to us" (219). Unsurprisingly, and rather necessarily, Přebáň tackles Czech corruption, where the analysis is that business interests have seized government. Is this ominous development decidedly Czech, and if so why? Comparison might help. Considering corruption more broadly, does it matter that Transparency International's Corruption Index in 2017 ranked the Czech Republic at forty-two, having improved over previous years, and significantly better than neighbors Slovakia, Hungary, or Romania (but behind the Baltics, Poland, and Slovenia). Would not the comment that some Czechs "suck on European funds like ticks for themselves and their business cronies" (41) be appropriate to other countries? And regarding the purpose of politics, we learn that "Unlike Britain, political conflict in the Czech Republic today is between those who still believe in sovereignty based on respect for constitutional power and the rights of the citizen, and those for whom these rights and this power are merely obstacles on the way to private goals" (183). The Magna Carta is over 800 year old, but I (similarly living in the UK) am not convinced that others here would agree with the "unlike."

Another of the apparently distinct dimensions of Czech politics is the proclivity to "expert" governments. But is this not another case that a social-science comparison would illuminate? Perhaps Italy is the European leader in producing "expert" governments. Absence of specific comparison notwithstanding, Přebáň is scathing of the phenomenon generally: "The call to 'let the crisis be managed by experts' is the biggest lie there could possibly be about society's current global crisis." Why? "[B]ecause it was the experts with their expertise and seemingly convincing rational arguments who mired us in this mess" (247). But the pushback in Britain during the Brexit referendum was notable, with Leave campaigning that "people in this country have had enough of experts." That four out of ten votes in the 2013 Czech parliamentary elections went to political parties that find "the existing political system (or representative democracy) and politics *per se* [to be] hostile targets" (236) perhaps, if disconcertingly, might have put the Czechs ahead of some voting trends in the Euro-Atlantic area.

Only infrequently does Přebáň expressly say that he does find commonality between Czech society and "all democracies in Europe and beyond" (192). If anything,

“the Czech question”—the subject of profound works for nearly two centuries—asks matters that sound universal. That might be attainment of what the first Czech premier, the free-marketneering Václav Klaus sought in the 1990s: that the new Czech Republic be a “normal country.” Normal is: rampant corruption, non-democratic and possibly counterproductive expert governments, and uncertainty about political values. Those problems are now rather generic. That is a dispiriting but necessary analysis. We can be glad all the more that Přebáň continues to keep his sharp, astute watch on matters Czech, and universal.

RICK FAWN
University of St Andrews, UK

Youth Movements and Elections in Eastern Europe. By Olena Nikolayenko. Cambridge Series in Contentious Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. xii, 260 pp. Appendix. Notes. Index. Tables. £75.00, hard bound. doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.334

In the public imagination, youth and protest go together: when we think of social movements, from Nanterre to Tiananmen to Tahrir, we tend to think of young people. After socialism, however, the connection has been far from self-evident. Low birth rates and high emigration have made it difficult for younger protesters to find strength in numbers. Social protest has often been driven by those whose ongoing working lives were disrupted by market-oriented reforms or stripped of social protections they had taken for granted. Political opposition movements, likewise, have often been dominated by veteran activists who cut their teeth battling (or defending) the old regime. More recently, political protest has once again displayed a youthful face in countries as diverse as Macedonia, Slovakia, Romania, or Russia, but the emergence of political youth movements has been anything but straightforward.

Olena Nikolayenko’s book studies one subset of such movements: organized opposition groups pursuing regime change through elections in the name of democratization. Beyond the general points she is making, the author is clearly rooting for democratic change and interested in distilling practical lessons. With this in mind, Nikolayenko’s focus is on the strategy and tactics of movement organizers regarding recruitment, mobilization, and political transformation, as well as on their interaction with political allies and opponents. Perhaps most significantly, she is interested in the cross-national diffusion of ideas and tactical know-how. Following introductory chapters that set out the political context in the countries under consideration and provide quantitative data on youth mobilization in protest and elections, she presents five national case studies, each focusing on one or two youth movements (or several small ones, in the case of Azerbaijan). The seminal case she discusses is that of the Otpor movement in Serbia, which was crucial to the ouster of President Slobodan Milošević. The remaining country chapters discuss movements active in four post-Soviet republics in the 2000s: Belarus (Zubr), Georgia (Kmara), Ukraine (“black” Pora and “yellow” Pora), and Azerbaijan (Dalga, Maqam, Yeni Fikir, and Yokh). Nikolayenko covers formative local and national conflicts, predecessor organizations, and the movements’ own successful or failed campaigns. She draws on semi-structured interviews with key movement figures that are impressive in overall numbers, though unevenly distributed among countries (eight for Azerbaijan, twenty for Ukraine). She also systematizes online and offline media sources and the gray literature produced by the movements themselves as well as local and foreign think tanks and international organizations. This is a useful effort. It can be surprisingly