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discussion in circles concerned with reconstructing Marxism. What remains unclear is just how much, if anything, of the theoretical underpinning of classical Marxism theory of value, classes, revolution is to be retained and how it informs contemporary socialist strategy. Most, if not all, of Kagarlitsky’s conclusions would be shared in varying degrees by many non-Marxists and even anti-Marxists (e.g., C. A. R. Crossland, who is not mentioned in the book). Though there is little new here for the specialist on the societies described, Kagarlitsky’s comparative approach and sociological insight have novel features that single out his book as one of the best on contemporary European society to have emanated from the contemporary Soviet Union.
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Until not so long ago, the literature on peasant politics tended to focus either on bold, mass rebellion or on meek, acquiescent subordination. The new “everyday forms of resistance” literature transcends that dichotomy, broadening and deepening our understanding of political behavior. Everyday Politics in the Philippines is an excellent complement to James Scott’s now classic Weapons of the Weak (1985). The two also coedited Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance in Southeast Asia (1986).

Kerkvliet’s Everyday Politics in the Philippines is of significant interest far beyond an area studies audience, since it addresses fundamental questions about how subordinated people understand the power relations in which they are enmeshed. Political values and preferences cannot be assumed or imputed from “public” actions or socioeconomic position alone. Kerkvliet brilliantly demonstrates that ideas about justice matter a great deal to those on the brink of survival. Based on 17 years of intimate ethnographic village study, he shows how rural workers and peasants act politically based on strongly held normative values, though always constrained by their available resources, as well as perceived risks and opportunities.

The conventional approach to rural politics in the Philippines highlights vertical patron-client relations and political factions, complicated by religion and kinship. These institutions are often associated with a harmonious political culture, celebrated by ritualistic electoral “fiestas.” This certainly captures part of the picture: the rural poor do seek out patrons, and elections in the Philippines are rarely the arena for class- and issue-based contestation. Yet there are several problems with this approach. It cannot account for repeated waves of mass, class-based political mobilization, sometimes nonviolent, sometimes armed. Moreover, the “political faction” approach assumes that when rural workers and peasants are not in open rebellion, they are therefore acquiescing to sharp class and status differences. This study shows, in contrast, that the rich clearly do not have ideological hegemony.

For Kerkvliet, “politics consists of the debates, conflicts, decisions, and cooperation among individuals, groups, and organizations regarding the control, allocation and use of resources and the values and ideas underlying those activities” (p. 11). For most of the villagers during the “war era” (1941–52), this meant active support for the anti-Japanese resistance and later the Huk rebels. (See Kerkvliet’s definitive Huk Rebellion, 1977.) The government responded with tenancy reforms that the villagers considered meaningful; but, since then the increased capitalization of agriculture sharply aggra
dated landlessness. Most poor people feel worse off, and they certainly do not blame themselves. This does not mean that they have turned to overt opposition to the government, however. Kerkvliet reports that the armed revolutionary movement that swelled much of the upland countryside in the late 1970s and early 1980s has not made much headway in this central lowland region.

In everyday village politics, the political discourse of the majority strongly upholds rights to both security and dignity (although in practice they may conflict). Among the employers, landlords, moneylenders, and traders who most directly shape the terms of the majority’s existence, some are seen as more unfair than others. Apparently small differences turn out to matter a great deal, such as the quality of the midday snack employers provide to rice transplanted. (Each employer is expected to provide according to their ability, but the poorest turn out to be the most generous.) Elites who treat people with more dignity are sought out as patrons, while those who are disrespectful provoke reciprocal treatment: pilfering of harvests, stealing of tools, rocks thrown in the middle of the night. Most everyday resistance is angrily spontaneous, but not all is individual. Mass collective action is chosen when people unite around common grievances that seem “winnable” and the government is seen as relatively unlikely to intervene.

The book convincingly argues that for most people most of the time politics is informal and stays within the village. Yet we also learn that some villagers repeatedly participate in regional and national movements to increase peasant representation and accountability in the political system as a whole, usually through nonviolent mass movements—first in the 1930s, then in 1946, and again in the late 1960s. In spite of martial law, the Association of Central Luzon Farmers emerged in 1981 to lead smallholder and landless movements in the region. The organization is clearly very important to villagers (pp. 141–43), but we learn relatively little about how it relates to the community. Kerkvliet readily acknowledges that villagers see local leaders and larger organizational allies as quite important but does not focus on their dynamics. Where are the “everyday politics of organization building?” To move beyond everyday resistance to understand the limits and possibilities for the broader democratization of the countryside, we will need to learn much more about how the organizations of the rural poor manage to survive and grow in such inhospitable environments.
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Michael Laver and Norman Schofield offer us the first comprehensive survey of coalition government in nearly two decades. In their preface, the authors claim