

That being said, while he considers social heterogeneity and regionalism in his analysis (suggesting that social heterogeneity leads to aggregation failure only when the payoff is relatively small), the relevance of these contextual factors seems particularly salient in the case of developing countries and arguably merits further exploration. Hicken also establishes at the outset that he avoids “language that casts greater or lesser aggregation, fewer or more parties, or more or less nationalization as a straightforward normative choice” (3). While this effort toward objectivity is laudable, the reader is left in want of a chapter evaluating the influence of party aggregation on policymaking and democratic success—an area that Hicken acknowledges as an avenue for future research in the concluding chapter.

Despite these minor criticisms, *Building Party Systems in Developing Democracies* is an outstanding piece of scholarship that offers important theoretical and empirical insights into the role played by institutional incentives in the emergence of national party systems. As such, Hicken’s work unquestionably deserves a spot on the bookshelf of any comparativist with a serious interest in democratization or party politics—particularly in Southeast Asia—and is certain to be widely cited in the years ahead.

Jason J. Morrisette, *Marshall University*

Quotas for Women in Politics: Gender and Candidate Selection Reform Worldwide. By Mona Lena Krook. (Oxford University Press, 2009.)
doi:10.1017/S0022381610000770

Mona Lena Krook sets a number of objectives for her book *Quotas for Women in Politics: Gender and Candidate Selection Reform Worldwide*. These objectives include: (1) reframing the study of quotas for women in electoral politics from a single-case study, domestic level of analysis to studying the global pattern of quotas in a paired comparisons model, (2) using this first endeavor to also engage theoretical and methodological debates over complex causation and quantitative-qualitative methods, and (3) constructing and applying a comparative model to six country case studies. It sounds overly ambitious, but Krook goes a long way toward achieving each of these lofty goals in a couple hundred pages. Krook’s first few pieces of scholarship have synthesized a complex body of research on quotas for women in politics and have furthered the empirical study of the institutional changes in gender in a global perspective.

This study elucidates the contradictions in existing single-case study research that takes various points of emphasis and offers contending explanations of why quotas are adopted, what actors and motivations influence quota policy formations, and how impacts on institutions and representation vary. One of Krook’s central contributions is to establish the global pattern of quotas for women in candidate selection and to also recognize the rich field of cases for analysis since quotas now exist in more than a hundred states around the world, and three-fourths of these measures have been passed within the last 15 years. Beyond institutional politics and gender studies, Krook’s book also contributes to both the methodological debates and theoretical frameworks for comparative political analysis.

The study compares three types of quota policies for women (reserved seats, party quotas, and legislative quotas) in paired-comparisons research design. Her paired comparisons in the book are: Pakistan and India for reserved seats, the United Kingdom and Sweden for party quotas, and Argentina and France for legislative quotas. The criteria for case selection included the policy type, the occurrence of multiple proposals for quota reforms, and disparate outcomes in quota impacts. Krook also refines her comparisons further to categorize impacts in three different aspects of representation: systemic (formal features), practical (formal and informal practices), and normative (principles that set political goals) institutions. The methodological richness of the book actively engages the empirical data with the theoretical insights illuminated by the model. This typology offers a parsimonious model for classifying quota policies, and Krook asserts that “distinct quota types reform different kinds of political institutions: reserved seats alter systemic institutions, party quotas change practical institutions, and legislative quotas reframe normative institutions” (38).

Thus, Krook has adeptly integrated case-study, paired-comparisons model with global efforts to operationalize quantitative analysis of women’s representation in candidate selection. Her model of paired-comparison case studies demonstrates the rich theoretical insights gained from such systematic quantitative-qualitative methodology. The book offers a detailed survey of global gender quotas and a theoretical model for rich comparative analysis for understanding why some quotas are more successful than others in gaining women’s access to political office. While Krook’s work draws heavily on the study of gender in institutional politics (e.g., Dahlerup, Lovenduski, Norris, Goetz) and the existing research

on quotas (e.g., Jones, Htun, Baldez, Matland), she hones the existing research with a detailed empirical analysis of gender quotas. Krook also utilizes recent methodological innovations of causal heterogeneity and causal combinations (e.g., Mahoney and Rueschmeyer 2003; Ragin 2000) and, therefore, differences between cases are not compared along any one variable but rather in the configuration of the conditions themselves. Krook acknowledges criticisms that cases cannot be compared if matched on only one aspect of the quota type, but responds that her analysis focuses on the configuration of causal conditions rather than the causal effects of any single condition (55). This model allows for cross-case comparisons of outcomes and within case comparisons of the policymaking process while also distinguishing the adoptions of the quota policy and the implementation. Her analysis reveals how seemingly obvious assumptions—that democratic regimes are the best context for gender quota reforms, or that legislative reforms are inherently more powerful, or that women’s groups are necessary to pressure for quotas—is not always the case.

Krook’s analysis also sheds new light on the study of gender quotas, which provides an impetus to apply the model in other case studies and in analyzing reforms to existing policies. Krook’s model could be particularly enlightening in such emerging and important cases as Iraq and Afghanistan, for example. Krook’s book is an excellent piece of scholarship with multiple contributions to the field of political science, a significant advancement of the study of quotas for women, and an agenda for future research. Her work raises interesting and important questions while also providing a common framework for comparative analysis.

Tricia Gray, *University of Louisville*

God and the Founders: Madison, Washington, Jefferson.

By Vincent Philip, Muñoz. (Cambridge University Press, 2009.)

doi:10.1017/S0022381610000782

God and the Founders, Vincent Philip Muñoz’s complex new inquiry into the views of James Madison, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson on the right to religious freedom, is animated by a simple, commonsensical question: if U.S. Supreme Court Justices turn to the position of the Founders in support of their First Amendment religion clause decisions—as they have done routinely over the last 60 years—then shouldn’t they get the Founders’ position right? That they have failed in this regard, according to Muñoz, is suggested by the fact that

American case law on religious liberty stands “mired in bad history, unpersuasive precedents, and incongruous rulings” (1). Indeed, even to refer to the Founders’ position as a coherent thing, as Supreme Court opinions and constitutional law scholarship tend to do, is to obscure the matter. For careful study of these three “leading Founders,” all of whom were keenly aware of the problematic relation between religion and politics, reveals that they “disagreed about the proper separation of church and state” (207; 3, 164–65, 193–95; cf. 191–92). The objective of *God and the Founders*, then, is twofold: first, to bring badly needed intellectual clarity to scholarship on the right to religious freedom in the thought of Madison, Washington, and Jefferson; and second, to make the case that appreciating the mostly *divergent* views of these Founders can be of practical benefit for religion clause jurisprudence (208). Given the sharpness of Muñoz’s analytical eye, as well as his dexterity in applying theoretical findings to difficult practical problems, this book is successful in both respects.

Part One, Muñoz’s focused venture into American political thought, is an investigation of texts by Madison, Washington, and Jefferson on religious liberty. Its three chapters, each devoted to a single Founder, aim at discovering their individual conceptions of the proper relation between church and state, a task that proves to be more straightforward for some than others. Madison’s position, for instance, is relatively clear. Turning to his landmark “Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments,” Muñoz shows that Madison defended the principle of “state noncognizance of religion” (12). Because the right to religious freedom falls outside the purview of the social contract, the civil authority must remain entirely blind to all matters of religion (20–29, 46–48, 121). Articulating the positions of Washington and Jefferson, however, proves to be more difficult. With the possible exception of his “Farewell Address” (54–56), Washington made no single authoritative statement on religious liberty. Perhaps the most welcome addition that Muñoz has made to our understanding of the Founding period, then, is his reconstruction of a plausible Washingtonian position, reached by way of methodical research into his public writings, private correspondence, and statesmanship. Washington believed that the state could justifiably promote or burden religion, provided that its intention is to support “the legitimate duties of republican citizenship” or, more broadly, the “civic good” (49–50, 56–69, 121–3). Finally, Muñoz considers Jefferson’s analysis of religious freedom in conjunction with his ostensibly contradictory deeds, specifically his role in establishing the University of Virginia (97–100). Jefferson’s view