ments in the twentieth century, at the same time offering a highly valuable and carefully researched case study showing how a failed system actually operated.
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*Drugs and Democracy* is a bold and informative study about the forms and functionings of illegal social networks in three distinct communities in Rio de Janeiro: Vigário, Tubarão, and Santa Ana (also referred to by the author as *favelas* or urban shantytowns). More broadly, it is a book that makes an argument about how governments might begin to address the persistent problem of urban violence in the context of democracy building. The focus of the book is on the ways in which drug traffickers mobilize their ‘power and activities through their local connections, not only with other residents in their communities, but also with actors in civil society and the state. The approach used throughout the book is one known as social networking analysis, which is a paradigm that is at once powerful and limiting.

The author, Enrique Desmond Arias, a professor at the John Jay School of Criminal Justice in New York, asks two questions relevant to Latin American cities that are considered central by scholars of the region. “Why is there so much violence in Rio?” and “What can be done to improve the situation?” Given that the author spent substantial time in each of these communities, the book is ethnographic in many ways. For instance, it is particularly innovative in identifying the Residents’ Associations (AMs) as central to the organization of criminal networks. One of the many benefits of the social networking model is that it enables the author to compare across cases and to locate similar processes in diverse contexts. Another benefit is that it provides a close-up examination of the role of AMs as critical nodes of interaction between drug traffickers, residents, and the broader political spectrum of actors. One of the model’s many drawbacks is that it precludes attention to the ethnographic voices of the actors, instead focusing on the structure of the network itself, rather than its *raison d’être*. To be fair, an anthropologist is writing this review, and the drawbacks to this approach are more of a comment on the methodological distance between anthropology and political science than a flaw of the book.

Arias explains that criminal drug traffickers, by establishing and using a series of social networks, can effectively take on long-term illegal activities with minimal external opposition. By taking advantage of both governmental resources and existing social capital, drug traffickers undermine and co-opt states and social efforts to control drug trafficking. What is especially appealing about Arias’s approach is that he provides a clear picture of the process of building networks as well as a direction for solutions in thinking through this dilemma. He suggests that Rio’s favelas be understood by governments not as peripheral but rather as at the center of political life and democracy-building. This shift would require considerable resources to enable “competing networks [to] bring residents, civic leaders, and state actors together to collectively resolve drug trafficking and local violence” (p. 206). The book is self-consciously comparative, first addressing the cases of three communities within Rio de Janeiro, and then in the final two chapters, applying the analysis to other countries and contexts that are also suffering from deeply entrenched criminal networks.

One of the crucial arguments of *Drugs and Democracy* has to do with the ways in which drug traffickers gain power in places where it appears that the state is absent. For many years, scholars of democratic transition and of crime and violence in Brazil have argued that in these impoverished communities—which are existentially distant from a functioning day-to-day rule of law—the state is absent. This scholarly trend has also argued that drug traffickers function in these locations as a kind of parallel state, a separate power base that competes in the local arena by providing local residents with protection, employment, and even some social services. The details of this networking process, as outlined by Arias, turn the drug traffickers into highly active agents of local transformation. Arias’s comparative
method of reviewing this process in three distinct communities in Rio proves to be convincing: he provides tangible and crucial new evidence that while the state may “appear” to be absent, it is in fact present, but in a way altered by the networking skills of the drug traffickers. The network model argued by Arias “suggests that the rule of law fails as a result of the specific types of relationships that emerge in the broader political system and how those relationships foster and link to alternative political structures operating in ‘brown’ zones” (p. 53). According to Arias, “the limitations of the rule of law reflect not the weaknesses of institutions but the way in which the strengths of institutions are deployed in the interests of powerful criminal or authoritarian actors” (p. 53).

Arias effectively and in detail describes how the leaders of the AMs navigate the relationship between residents, drug traffickers, and the state. But his social networking analysis ends up downplaying the problematic or even explanatory nature of entities that fall outside of its model. For instance, it can downplay the important role AM leaders play in protecting residents from violence. And it can move the ever-present problem of corruption among the police forces in the Rio context to the background of the paradigm. One could just as easily start an inquiry in a different place, such as with the lack of credibility of the police forces by residents of impoverished communities.

The model bears both the strengths and weaknesses of its structural functionalist antecedents: it explains the constitution of powerful criminal networks as part of a contemporary process of social networking by community actors disenfranchised from other forms of political power, while leaving other (arguably) equally salient problems less analyzed: the historical formation and continued presence of corrupt police forces; entrenched attitudes across classes regarding the relationship between poverty and criminality; and the economic and social problems facing masses of disenfranchised youth who have ready access to guns and who are angry with their place in the world. Drugs and Democracy recognizes this reality clearly, chooses a point of entry, and skillfully provides us with one perceptive new lens with which to view urban violence in Rio de Janeiro. The limitations of this model notwithstanding, this analysis offers comparative insight about criminal networks and an acute understanding of how these networks form and sustain themselves, qualities that traditional ethnographies often cannot deliver. Finally, this book offers an important contribution to policy analysts of urban violence who are seeking lucid points of entry to a complex problem.
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This book traces how ethnic nationalism became a dominant force that has defined the collective identity of North and South Koreans and shaped postcolonial politics in the Korean Peninsula for the past six decades or so. Building on existing social science literature on nationalism, it elaborates on a common perception (in South Korea) that nationalism was the source of resistance to Japanese colonialism.

Part I examines various aspects of cultural politics through which a blood-based view of the Korean nation became prominent over other competing categories of collective identity, based on an Asian region, the Japanese empire, and class. Chapters 1, 2, and 3 employ diverse forms of texts to convey vibrancy of pan-Asianism, colonial racism, and international socialism and their interactions with nationalism in the contexts of the declining Choson Dynasty (1392–1910) and Japanese colonial rule (1910–1945). Reading against the grain of the popular perception of the nation as the community of shared ancestry in North and South Koreas, Shin argues that this ethnic view of nation is not so much an expression of a natural entity as an outcome of political struggle. In particular, Japan’s annexation of Korea in 1905 was critical to the decline of pan-Asianism. As a result, ethnic nationalism gained enduring strength among the Koreans during their collective struggle against colonial racism and international socialism. Both of these ideologies failed to appeal to the Koreans because politics based on them, promoting the Japanese empire and the international