managerial competence; ultimately, corruption scandals undermined this line of argument, and both parties failed to live up to their promise of being more competent than their rivals. In chapter 5, Rachel Beatty Riedl argues that the ASPs in Africa that were able to maintain linkages to important elites (echoing the themes expounded on by Kitschelt and Singer in chapter 1) were more likely to persist under democratic competition. However, when some of these parties tried to reach out to other constituencies, they collapsed. In chapter 6, which is also about sub-Saharan ASPs, Adrienne LeBas argues that strong competition faced by ASPs strengthened them and made them more cohesive (and successful) in response. In chapter 7, Timothy Power argues that the two ASPs in Brazil—the PDS (the former ruling party) and the PFL (the “authoritarian reactive party”)—differed in their ability to persist in the period of democratic competition. The PDS performed well in the post-authoritarian period because it retained access to state resources. Not surprisingly the PFL did not do well because it lost such access.

Finally, in part III, three chapters examine the impact that ASPs have had on democracy. In chapter 8 Gustavo A. Flores-Macías argues that the Institutional Revolutionary Party’s (PRI) survival has been harmful to democracy in Mexico, interestingly for the very reasons that earlier chapters contended enabled ASP persistence and electoral success. By maintaining ties with constituencies that promoted subnational authoritarianism, corruption, and human rights abuses, the PFRI has done much to undermine Mexico’s path toward democracy. In chapter 9 Dan Slater and Joseph Wong, in contrast, argue that the KMT in Taiwan, South Korea’s DLP, and Indonesia’s GOLKAR have contributed to democracy-building because they have provided channels for representation of important interests that supported the authoritarian regime, bringing in groups that may have opposed democratization. Finally, in chapter 10 Daniel Ziblatt examines “old regime conservative parties” from the nineteenth century and their transformation into parties promoting democracy, thereby bringing old regime elites into democratic competition.

Although this book is a welcome contribution to the existing literature on party transformation, it has, in my view some conceptual and theoretical problems. First, it is interesting that Loxton uses Sartori to defend the use of abstraction in defining ASPs. Sartori, it should be remembered, also warned against conceptual “stretching” (“Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics,” American Political Science Review, 64, 1970). The current definition of ASPs includes not only parties that ruled but also those that did not rule (but presumably were formed from authoritarian elites). For me, ASPs are not just any party that emerged from authoritarian regimes, but are akin to what Kitschelt and Singer call “former authoritarian ruling parties” in chapter 1. For instance, what made the CSPs “successor” parties was that they used to be the parties that ruled: they inherited the bulk of the ruling parties’ resources and did not have to start from scratch. This is what made them a specific type of party that competed in the postcommunist space. Some of the “reactive” parties that are included in Loxton’s definition would include parties that started from “scratch,” although they were formed by some authoritarian elites (which would include the parties discussed in chapter 10 by Daniel Ziblatt). Are they successor parties or what many in the political party literature call “elite” or “cadre” parties?

This leads me to my second concern with this book. There appears to be little attempt to link the major themes developed in the volume with mainstream theoretical work on political parties and party change. Mention of the literature on the evolution of party species or families and on party change would have been very helpful in conceptualizing ASPs and moving their study into the mainstream of the literature on political parties (see, for instance, Richard Gunther and Larry Diamond, “Species of Political Parties: A New Typology,” Party Politics, 9, 2003; Peter Mair and Cas Mudde, “The Party Family and its Study,” Annual Review of Political Science, 1, 1998; Robert Harmel and Kenneth Janda, “An Integrated Theory of Party Goals and Party Change” Journal of Theoretical Politics, 6, 1994).

As a result of these conceptual and theoretical issues, there are a variety of different types of parties included in this book, all under the heading of ASPs. Adopting such a broad conceptualization of an ASP detracts from its identification as a clear party subtype (which the early literature on the CSPs identified). Further, as suggested by much of the mainstream literature on party change, the CSPs evolved into parties familiar to existing typologies, and the conceptual utility of continuing to label them a distinct subtype in postcommunist politics disappeared. Surely the ASPs have done the same, evolving into organizations that fit into existing party frameworks. Or do they remain unique? I think the book could have done a better job of engaging with the existing literature on political party change to frame the study of ASPs.

Nonetheless, despite these criticisms, I believe that this book is an important contribution to the literature on party change. It should be included in the list of required readings for any scholar interested in the question of how party organizations change.


— Christina Maags, SOAS University of London cm62@soas.ac.uk

The news that the One Child Policy has resulted in 20 million females “missing” from the Chinese population
census shocked many worldwide. Hitherto, academic scholarship and newspaper articles have argued that the skewed sex ratio of 118 men to 100 females and the resulting 20 million fewer females are due to either sex-selective abortion or infanticide. The book *Lost and Found: The “Missing Girls” in Rural China* by John James Kennedy and Yaojiang Shi presents a different interpretation of this phenomenon. As they argue, only 10 million Chinese females are truly missing from the population census. The remaining 10 million are in fact alive and remain hidden from public view because of village leaders and families’ mutual noncompliance with the One Child Policy.

Kennedy and Shi’s work constitutes a valuable contribution to our understanding of the “missing girls phenomenon.” Building on Michael Lipsky’s (1980) work on *Street-Level Bureaucracy*, the authors explain how after 1978 village leaders were faced with contradictory policy incentives. On the one hand, the One Child Policy introduced in 1979 stipulates that each family may only have one child, punishing additional births with heavy fines. On the other hand, the household responsibility system established in 1981, which allowed families to farm and lease their own land, created the incentive of having more children, because land was allocated according to family size and children were needed as labor. As the authors contend, village leaders used their local autonomy to turn a blind eye to villagers’ violations of the One Child Policy by underreporting population births to higher government authorities. During “policy pushes,” village leaders were under extreme pressure to implement the One Child Policy, at times with draconian measures such as forced abortions and sterilizations. In between these policy pushes, however, both families and village leaders engaged in mutual noncompliance. Consequently, children’s births, often female, were registered either late or not at all, leading to incomplete national statistics. For this reason, around 10 million females in fact “appear” in older cohorts of subsequent population censuses. The authors therefore conclude that only 10 million of the supposedly 20 million “missing” girls are truly missing either due to sex-selective abortions or infanticides.

Kennedy and Shi substantiate this claim by introducing the reader to Lipsky’s work and how it supports their argument of mutual noncompliance (chap. 2). The authors then outline how underreporting has occurred throughout Chinese history and examine population census data to demonstrate that underreporting has resulted in 10 million females not appearing in population census data (chap. 3). They subsequently turn in chapter 4 to the challenges arising with birth registration across time before presenting in-depth qualitative interviews with cadres (chap. 5), as well as families and missing girls (chap. 6). The main findings of the book are summarized in a brief conclusion.

The book has many key strengths. First, the authors make a very convincing case that fewer females are in fact “missing” than assumed because of mutual noncompliance. In each chapter, they meticulously contrast their findings to other scholarly work to demonstrate how the current perception of the “missing girls phenomenon” needs to be corrected.

Moreover, their focus on local governance processes contributes to our understanding not only of the “missing girls phenomenon” but also of village politics as a whole. The authors’ use of Lipsky’s work on street-level bureaucracy is an excellent choice, because the application of the theory sheds light on the many contradictions any grassroots bureaucracy needs to resolve when implementing national policy, regardless of the country or time under study. Second, although the focus of the book is on the 1980s to the 2000s, their work is embedded in a thorough historical analysis of local registration and reporting procedures, including birth and marriage registration and over- or underreporting of grain, land, and household size. The authors’ focus on local governance therefore showcases the difficulty of compiling national statistics in general.

The combination of qualitative with quantitative data is another strength of the book. Whereas the analysis of population census data in chapter 2 convincingly demonstrates that a large number of females disappear in later cohorts, the historical analysis of local procedures combined with in-depth interviews sheds light on why and how females are hidden from the population census. Because the book includes interviews with family planning and public security bureau cadres at the village, township, and county levels, it speaks to larger political dynamics and issues such as the cadre management system and bureaucratic coordination problems. The interviews with family members and a missing girl, newspaper reports, and survey data moreover provide a fascinating glimpse into family decision making, gender preferences, and measures taken to hide members of the family from higher authorities.

Despite its many strengths the book also demonstrates a few shortcomings. First, the authors’ main contribution is the finding that local noncompliance has resulted in as much as 10 million “missing girls,” and the in-depth interviews of actors substantiate that noncompliance. It, however, appears as if the authors claim that the finding of mutual noncompliance as such is novel and of theoretical significance (pp. 13–14). Yet that local leaders use their autonomy to underreport or not comply with central policy is well documented in the scholarly literature in relation to the underreporting of births (Daniel Goodkind, “Child Underreporting, Fertility, and Sex Ratio Imbalance in China,” *Demography*, 48 (1), 2011) and in other policy areas (Kenneth Lieberthal and Michael Oksenberg, *Policy-Making in China*, 1988). Hence, the authors’ main finding is not as novel as it seems.
Second, the data presentation in chapters 5 and 6 appears eclectic. In chapter 5 each interview is summarized in the form of a report, and those reports are presented one after another, leading to some repetition of findings. The presentation of interviews with family members in chapter 6 is more accessible, because it is structured according to the different reasons why families hide their children. In this chapter, the reader finds four subsections: interview material with family members, survey data demonstrating preferences for sons or girls, one in-depth interview with a missing girl, and newspaper reports on missing girls. Although all of these data illustrate interesting findings, the reader might find their presentation somewhat heterogenous.

Finally, the book feels repetitive in other respects as well. For instance, although the history of local registration and reporting procedures is outlined in chapter 3, many findings reappear in chapter 4, which again details in great depth how local reporting of birth registration has operated since imperial times. At the same time, whereas the issue of birth registration is important for understanding the “missing girls phenomenon” in China, other significant factors identified in chapter 2, such as fines or elementary school reforms (pp. 88–89), do not receive as much attention. They appear mostly within the discussion of the interview material in chapters 5 and 6.

Despite these minor shortcomings, Kennedy and Shi’s work presents a valuable in-depth analysis of the missing girls phenomenon. By focusing on the role of local governance, it contributes to our understanding of this trend as such, as well as of Chinese grassroots politics more broadly. It is therefore a must read for anyone interested in the One Child Policy, population control, and local governance in China.


— Jason Brownlee, University of Texas at Austin
brownlee@austin.utexas.edu

Scholars of authoritarianism in the Middle East have long pursued two major concerns: macrolevel institutional and broad-based social movements. In his latest book, *Jordan and the Arab Uprisings: Regime Survival and Politics Beyond the State*, Curtis R. Ryan covers both phenomena and provides a rigorous account of why one of the world’s most seemingly unstable autocracies withstood, but also responded to, the recent gales of revolution in the region.

Establishing the research puzzle, Ryan notes that Jordan has been chronically “on the brink” for generations (p. 1). Indeed, given Jordan’s material conditions and anachronistic institutions, the ruling regime has persisted much longer than most social scientists might expect. After losing badly to Israel in the 1967 Six-Day War, King Hussein bin Talal (r. 1952–99) ruled for another three decades. That period included a serious economic recession (in the late 1980s) and the king’s decision to align with Iraq during the 1990–91 Gulf War. In the remainder of his reign, Hussein adroitly corrected course, signed a peace treaty with Israel, and launched Jordan toward a free-trade agreement with the United States. Hussein’s successor, King Abdullah II (r. 1999–present), closed the trade deal (in 2000) and continued his father’s neoliberal project. GDP grew rapidly during the 2000s. But when the Arab uprisings began, Jordan’s economy again lost steam. Unemployment crept up, nearing 20% in 2018, according to the Congressional Research Service (CRS). Youth unemployment may be much higher.

Regional crises would seem to have only compounded Jordan’s fiscal burdens. The country has been at the epicenter of the human displacement crisis that began with the 2003 Iraq invasion and mushroomed after 2011 with the Syrian civil war. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reported in February 2019 that Jordan was hosting more than 750,000 refugees, nearly 90% of them Syrians. Today only one other country, Lebanon, hosts more refugees on a per capita basis.

As for its political system, Jordan has defied expectations that monarchs cannot withstand modernity. Even among today’s kingdoms and emirates, however, the regime is an outlier. Michael Herb’s seminal work on monarchical durability established that it is dynastic monarchies, those that spread plum ministries and the chance to wear the crown among family members, that are most cohesive. By contrast, nondynastic monarchies, a category that includes both the fallen Pahlavi dynasty of Iran and the Jordanian case, are ripe for intra-elite conflict and regime breakdown. The tenures of Hussein and Abdullah II defy this pattern and make the Jordanian regime as long-lived as most dynastic monarchies.

To make sense of Jordan’s anomalous record, Ryan draws on decades of experience conducting fieldwork in the country and the wider region. His methodology makes extensive use of original interviews with Jordanians at all levels of the state and society, including the king and the queen consort, Rania al-Abdullah. Ryan also synthesizes and applies the vast secondary literature on comparative authoritarianism and Middle East politics. The result is a careful and compelling account of how the Jordanian regime operates amid multiple crises.

Ryan delivers this account across nine detailed chapters, each of which closes with a discussion of “continuity and change.” Chapters 1–4 situate Jordan’s recent protests and new social movements in comparative context. Jordan was not one of the half-dozen Arab countries that witnessed a sustained uprising in the Arab Spring (Tunisia, Egypt, Yemen, Bahrain, Libya, and Syria). Ryan makes clear, however, that political scientists will miss a great deal if they dismiss Jordan as a moribund case where the people