

Japanese civil society” in a way that would benefit the general foreign-resident population (p. 121).

In the end, Chung maintains that the Koreans’ movements have had a strong impact on the policies, institutions, and ideas that define the position of other foreign residents in Japan today. Her case is strong when it comes to civil and social rights and to innovations in the vanguard communities, mainly those with substantial Korean populations, which have developed inclusive approaches to foreign residents. When it comes to local government measures to support new foreigners and include their voices, I think she overstates the movements’ impact. This group’s needs are quite different from those of multi-generation Koreans; even if local measures to respond appear similar on the surface, the underlying considerations are often more complicated, include a view of foreign residents as a social problem, and are informed by multiple models of incorporating new immigrants.

This book’s major strength is its discussion of the construction of local citizenship and the position of foreign residents in Japan from a social movement perspective. Readers should not expect a close examination of how policies change. The book minimally addresses how foreign residents’ movements and the local governments that support them have achieved influence within elite political circles or how local governments have weighed the issues when implementing changes. However, this is a must-read for anyone wishing to understand contemporary citizenship and naturalization politics in Japan. The book’s comparative lens on Japan’s citizenship laws and rights for foreign residents will ensure that Japan is included in comparative discussions of citizenship politics.

DEBORAH J. MILLY

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Islamist Terrorism and Democracy in the Middle East by *Katerina Dalacoura*. New York, Cambridge University Press, 2011. 224 pp. \$85.00.

Democracy will save the Middle East. This perspective was promulgated for eight years by the administration of George W. Bush, and because of it, the United States became embroiled in two long-term conflicts in the Middle East and South Asia, spent billions of dollars on the war on terrorism, restructured the intelligence and homeland security communities, and passed legislation at home that many believe negatively impacted our civil liberties. Because of this, we want to believe that it was worth the lives lost and the flagrant spending that had a significant impact on our economic situation today. In her scholarly book, *Islamist Terrorism and Democracy in the Middle East*, Katerina Dalacoura asks whether “a convincing case can be made that Islamist terrorism in the Middle East has political causes stemming from non-democratic or authoritarian structures” (p. 23). The author presents a convincing argument that political causes are not the strongest explanation for Islamist terrorism.

Through a series of well-researched case studies on different groups, she examines this central question. The case studies are categorized as transnational, national liberation, and domestic insurgencies. These include groups such as al Qaeda (transnational), Hezbollah (national liberation), and the Algerian Armed Islamic Group (domestic). By contrast, also examined is whether political participation encourages moderation. To investigate this, the cases of the Jordanian and Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood and al-Nadha are presented. Dalacoura also advances alternative explanations for why groups resort to terrorism, such as material/structural causes. These are categorized as social, economic, political, and strategic/instrumental. In doing so, she rejects ideational causes that are psychological, millenarian, religious/cultural, or ideological.

For example, in the discussion of the Armed Islamic Group, she provides background on the complicated evolution of the group, beginning with the political party, the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS). After the Party was banned by the Algerian government in 1992, the FIS fragmented, leading to the formation of other groups poised for combat with the repressive government. Eventually, the Armed Islamic group emerged in late 1992–early 1993, led by Abdelhak Layada. Layada and other core members were veterans of the Afghan war against the Soviets. The group believed there were two camps, “supporters of jihad” and “enemies of Islam” (p. 110), and conducted a violent campaign against its purported enemies. Dalacoura concludes that political factors did have a role, but socioeconomic factors appeared as an important part explaining the violence of the group.

While the author offers a strong line of reasoning against the democracy–terrorism link, the alternative explanations for why these groups resort to terrorism are not equally developed. Further, the dismissal of psychological associations leaves the analysis incomplete. First, *psychological* is defined as a consequence of a disturbed personality. While many would agree that this has been proven a faulty explanation, outside of this, there is a lot the psychological literature can contribute. Nevertheless, Dalacoura brings up important alternative views to those frequently touted as fully explaining the emergence of terrorism.

This book was also written before the Arab spring, where we witnessed sweeping “democratic” changes in the Middle East and North Africa. An afterward of the original book is definitely in order. If Dalacoura’s hypothesis holds true, we should expect that terrorism will continue to thrive despite the participation in the emerging political processes established through the Arab spring uprisings.

Some groups do take advantage of a democratic opening through the “armalite and ballot box strategy,” as seen with Hezbollah and Hamas, but this does not seem to eliminate their participation in terrorism. We can hope that eventually this may result in a full transition from terrorism to political participation, such as in the case of the Provisional IRA in Northern Ireland. However, in the end, even in the absence of terrorism, we may not like the

end result of what participation brings to the country. Even worse, the democratic process can allow groups to take full political control and transition to the role of conducting state-sponsored terrorism.

ELENA MASTORS
American Military University

Rural Protest and the Making of Modern Democracy in Mexico, 1968–2000 by Dolores Trevizo. *University Park, Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011. 240 pp. \$64.95.*

This book explores how rural activism in Mexico, fostered in part by the repression of the 1968 student movement, and of the Mexican Communist Party during the subsequent decade, promoted the eventual democratization of the polity. While many have analyzed the impacts of the 1968 student movement, identifying it as the beginning of the erosion of the regime's legitimacy, this book is the most-systematic treatment, to date, of one of its central consequences. The author argues that state repression radicalized student leaders and local communist cadres, leading them to engage with, and organize, non-violent peasant movements across the country. This peasant agitation, in turn, activated landed interests to create organizations in order to defend their interests. The interplay between these conflicting organizations nurtured the growth of both the left and the right. Moreover, the political activation of the landed business class and the peasantry undermined longstanding arrangements between the state, peasants, and the business elite. All of this debilitated Mexican corporatist structures and the ruling party (the PRI—Party of the Institutionalized Revolution) while revitalizing the PAN (National Action Party), on the right, and the PRD (Party of the Democratic Revolution), on the left.

The author includes a nuanced analysis of how peasant activism in southern Mexico promoted support for the PRD and shows how these developments encouraged the even-more-extensive activation of the PAN, primarily in the northern part of the country.

Most interestingly and originally, the book powerfully reveals how developments in rural Mexico fostered electoral democratization, manifested in the victory of the opposition (the PAN) in the 2000 and 2006 presidential elections. Most scholars primarily link democratization in Mexico to the growth of a civil society in urban areas and the impact of a conjunction of factors, including international pressures. Above all, years of economic decline and a number of serious missteps, including the repression of the 1968 student movement and the government's handling of the 1985 earthquake in Mexico City, undermined the regime's legitimacy. These factors, according to a number of analyses, forced the political elite to gradually change electoral rules, ultimately creating the space for the opposition's victory. While this book examines these explanations, it adds a very important dimension to our understanding of the emergence