

Throughout the book, Jamal also notes the geopolitical conditions that facilitated specific aid objectives in Palestine versus those in El Salvador and affected the relationship of these recipient countries to Western donors. She argues that whereas the end of the Cold War changed the nature of Western—and specifically US interest in El Salvador, opening up space for local agency and more inclusive political development, the situation in Palestine was quite different. Palestine's unique position in relation to US and Israeli security interests meant that, to foster a political settlement that upheld the "post-Cold War liberal order," Western intervention and aid had to facilitate exclusionary practices. The author notes, "The West and many dominant political groups embrace the notion of democratic governance that is based on exclusion" (p. 15).

This acknowledgment of the very different geopolitical space that each country occupies complicates Jamal's argument a great deal. The reader would benefit from having these differences explained in more detail. Why did the end of the Cold War facilitate a sort of withdrawal of Western intervention in a case like El Salvador but greater, more politically motivated intervention in a case like Palestine? One can think of a few explanations—including the importance of the Middle East region to US hegemony—but it would have been useful for the reader to see how the author clarifies these issues and accounts for them more explicitly in her theoretical argument. The causal graph (on p. 8) that summarizes Jamal's argument does not take into consideration this apparently very important antecedent variable, which seems to be determining why Western intervention varies across cases.

Moreover, this issue complicates the causal story. There is a great deal of evidence one can draw from the book that supports the notion that Western intervention in fact *determined* the nature of political settlement and the degree of inclusivity, rather than simply played a mediating factor after the fact. For instance, on the one hand (starting on p. 98) Jamal notes that the Oslo Accords between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization—emerging out of secret negotiations backed by Western powers—had deliberately excluded certain segments of the opposition forces, as well as parts of the PLO itself. Western powers only elevated those groups and actors within the Palestinian political sphere who were willing to concede on certain issues in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. This set the conditions for the exclusionary system of governance that followed in the Palestinian territories. In that way, the political settlement that emerged had a divisive impact on Palestinian political groups.

In contrast, Western intervention during the postconflict time period in El Salvador did not affect the inclusivity of the political settlement. Subsequent foreign aid to the country was quite different than that for Palestine: it was not only lower in amount but also much more nonpolitical

in its objectives. The key difference between the two cases seems to be the geopolitical considerations of Western powers, in particular the United States. Preventing possible Soviet allies from coming to power in El Salvador was no longer a priority for the United States after the fall of the Soviet Union, whereas the centrality of Israel in US foreign policy continued.

It would also have been useful for Jamal to explore how the nature of conflict in the two main cases affected the type of political settlement that emerged. In El Salvador, the political settlement ended a civil war between two parties with ideological and class differences. In Palestine, the political settlement was intended to end a national liberation struggle between an Indigenous population and an occupying force—but this process was never completed. The role of Israel was not tangential but rather was a key complicating factor in how dynamics played out in terms of democratic accountability. For example, concerns over Israeli security prompted exclusion both in the original peace accords and in subsequent developments in Palestinian politics, including most starkly the overturning of elections when the Islamist party Hamas won in 2006. Thus, the two cases differ dramatically not just in the dependent variable/outcome but also in key independent variables: primacy in US/Western foreign policy and type of conflict. Both variables affected subsequent conflict and policies of exclusion. This complicates the argument further: it becomes difficult to disentangle which variables are actually doing the work in the causal argument, given the plausible alternative explanations that are unaccounted for.

Nevertheless, Jamal's cross-regional comparisons are a very useful contribution and a crucial starting point for further study of foreign aid and its impacts. Often, political science studies with a focus on the Middle East do not attempt to generalize the lessons learned from the study of the region and engage less with the broader discipline. Jamal's contribution here is commendable for using cases from different regions and attempting to bring the Middle East into conversation with the larger subfield of comparative politics. Her generalizable argument, together with the rich detail of her case studies, makes for a thought-provoking read and will surely generate future inquiry.

Multilevel Democracy: How Local Institutions and Civil Society Shape the Modern State. By Jeffrey M. Sellers,

Anders Lidström, and Yooil Bae. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. 396p. \$120.00 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592721000402

— Arjan H. Schakel , University of Bergen
arjan.schakel@uib.no

Multilevel Democracy is a highly original study that examines how local institutions and local civil societies became

incorporated into contemporary developed democracies. Jefferey Sellers, Anders Lidström, and Yooil Bae develop an innovative classification of multilevel democracies, and they reveal how three types of multilevel democracy vary with regard to policy performance and the quality of democracy up to present times. The historical analysis that substantiates the three types of multilevel democracy is based on an extraordinary wealth of literature, and the exceptional data collection that underpins the analyses of impacts of the three types of multilevel democracy is an extraordinary tour de force.

Sellers, Lidström, and Bae start with developing types of multilevel democracy on the basis of two overarching dimensions (chapter 2). The first dimension encompasses vertical intergovernmental relationships between the local and national state, and the second dimension involves the engagement and inclusion of citizens through political, economic, and civic interests and associations (pp. 26–27). A combination of high or low scores on each dimension yields a two-by-two table with four types of multilevel democracy. *Nationalized* democracies, such as Sweden, score high on both dimensions and combine national and local accountability with national and local contestation. The United States is exemplary of a *civic localist* democracy where the local state is not tightly integrated into the national state, but accountability and civic engagement are secured at the local level. Limited accountability and contestation at the local level can be found in *local elitist* democracies such as France, which score low on both dimensions. The local state becomes rather insignificant in *elitist* democracies where local elites are held accountable by national elites only and contestation mainly takes place at the national level. Elitist democracies are not further considered in the book because this kind of multilevel democracy cannot be found in contemporary developed democracies (p. 28).

The bulk of the book grounds the three types of multilevel democracy in an exceptional large empirical foundation. In chapter 3, the authors perform a cluster analysis on a remarkably wide range of indicators ranging from politico-administrative and fiscal capacities to geopolitical fragmentation and supra-local supervision. The cluster analysis generates three clusters of 21 developed democracies that clearly overlap with the three types of multilevel democracy. This classification is a major contribution, considering that most typologies of local governance have focused on geographic correspondences instead of being based on a systematic institutional comparison. Unfortunately, the analytical parsimony of the three types of multilevel democracy declines considerably when Sellers, Lidström, and Bae amend their classification by separating “hybrid” from “core” countries, which leads to a three-by-three table in which “hybrid” countries are placed in multiple and different cells (Table 3.12, p. 117).

Chapters 4 and 5 present an illuminating comparative historical analysis that significantly challenges our understanding of state formation. The authors convincingly show that “the contemporary developed world is inherently a multilevel state” (p. 7) and that prevailing understandings of state formation have underestimated the importance of the local dimension in explaining the dynamics of state formation (pp. 119–20). Long-standing differences between local institutions and local civic societies have not only survived forceful processes of nationalization but have also shaped the national institutions that characterize nationalized, civic localist, and local elitist multilevel democracies.

In chapters 6 and 7, the authors attempt to substantiate the claim that nationalized multilevel democracies outperform local elitist and civic localist multilevel democracies in terms of welfare state policy and the quality of democracy (pp. 19–20 and pp. 340–41). This is the least convincing part of the book. The three types of multilevel democracy are supported by a solid and meticulous cluster analysis (chapter 3) and comprehensive comparative historical analyses that are subsequently corroborated by Boolean analyses (chapters 4–5). Despite the wealth of collected quantitative data, the “analyses” of the impact of multilevel democracy on policy performance (chapter 6) and on the quality of democracy (chapter 7) are restricted to comparing averages across the three types of multilevel democracy, in which the statistical significances of these differences are not explored. Nevertheless, these chapters convincingly show that local institutions are an important element for understanding a country’s policy performance and democratic quality.

Multilevel Democracy is exemplary of a recent and growing literature that addresses “methodological nationalism” in political and social science. Theories of state-building focus on the nation-state and “might have directed political scientists’ attention away from important sub-state dynamics, disguising their character and hiding their full extent” (Charlie Jeffery and Daniel Wincott, “The Challenge of Territorial Politics,” in Colin Hay, ed., *New Directions in Political Science*, 2010, pp. 169–170). In a nutshell, the critique raised by methodological nationalism is that territorial effects have been a “constant presence in European politics” (Michael Keating, *The New Regionalism in Western Europe*, 1998, p. ix). Yet, political and social scientists have largely ignored territorial effects or not given these effects their due weight in theory. Sellers, Lidström, and Bae provide a powerful corrective to the omnipresence of methodological nationalism in state-building theories by exposing how local institutions became incorporated and shaped the multilevel state.

Multilevel Democracy also successfully addresses the challenges posed by methodological nationalism in another way. Because of a long-standing social-scientific preoccupation with the nation-state as a unit of analysis,

political and social scientists have typically sought to collect data for their research at that scale (Charlie Jeffery and Arjan H. Schakel, "Editorial: Towards a Regional Political Science," *Regional Studies* 47, 2013). Consequently, Sellers, Lidström, and Bae have to rely on country-level data and historical narratives that focus on the nation-state. They effectively use this data to produce outstanding research, but further grounding of the three types of multilevel democracy on the basis of local-level data would be very welcome. However, this will most likely remain a utopian undertaking, considering that the required local-level data are simply not available. *Multilevel Democracy* also shows that addressing methodological nationalism entails a tremendous amount of work. A glimpse of the authors' Herculean effort to collect historical and quantitative data for a wide range of political and social variables is provided by the online supplemental document, which can be accessed without restrictions at <http://www.cambridge.org/MultilevelDemocracy>.

In conclusion, *Multilevel Democracy* offers a significant contribution to the broad field of comparative political science and is a must-read for a wide range of political scientists interested in state-building, civil society, democracy, federalism, institutions, political mobilization, and governance. By successfully addressing methodological nationalism, *Multilevel Democracy* is a groundbreaking study that will provide an invaluable step forward in the development of an emerging (sub-)field within political science on comparative *territorial* politics.

The Caravan: Abdallah Azzam and the Rise of Global Jihad. By Thomas Hegghammer. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020. 718p. \$34.99 cloth.

Your Sons Are at Your Service: Tunisia's Missionaries of Jihad. By Aaron Y. Zelin. New York: Columbia University Press, 2020. 400p. \$120.00 cloth, \$40.00 paper,

Unmasking Boko Haram: Exploring Global Jihad in Nigeria. By Jacob Zenn. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2020. 415p. \$95.00 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592721000293

— Sebastian Elischer, *University of Florida*
selischer@ufl.edu

Recent decades have seen an increase in the number of studies on violent Islamic extremism. Scholarship on this topic has discussed the theological content of jihadi Salafism and its intention, the challenges of internal coherence and leadership within jihadi organizations, the drivers of jihadi recruitment, and the role of the state as a (de)radicalizer of violent extremism. Thomas Hegghammer, Aaron Zelin, and Jacob Zenn examine the phenomenon of violent Islamic extremism in different world regions and at different moments in time.

In *The Caravan: Abdallah Azzam and the Rise of Global Jihad*, Hegghammer reexamines the life of Abdallah Azzam, the Palestinian cleric who led the mobilization of Arab fighters to Afghanistan in the 1980s and who is considered to be the founding father of transnational jihadism. The book thus discusses the historical role played by a particular individual in the spread of transnational jihadi ideology. By contrast, Zelin's *Your Sons Are at Your Service: Tunisia's Missionaries of Jihad* and Zenn's *Unmasking Boko Haram: Exploring Global Jihad in Nigeria* analyze the formation, subsequent rise, and further evolution of jihadi terrorist organizations. All three emphasize the role of Salafi jihadi ideology and extensively refer to the particular political and socioeconomic context in which Islamic extremism manifests itself. The books are clearly written and cover extensive historical and analytical ground. All three add substantial knowledge to the existing canon on jihadism.

The research question that Hegghammer tries to answer is "why jihad went global" (p. 1). The conflict in Afghanistan, which began with the Soviet invasion in 1979, was the first to attract foreign fighters, and it came to be "the most transnational rebel history in modern history" (p. 2). Azzam was able to reorient Islamic extremists from their respective domestic locales to Afghanistan. The emergence of the so-called Afghan Arabs therefore was a formative event, which so far has not been analyzed in the Anglophone literature. This study, which the author began to research in 2007, draws on previously published books about Azzam's life in Arabic, jihadi publications, recorded lectures, and interviews with people who engaged with Azzam. It provides an in-depth chronological account of the various stages in Azzam's life: his birth in Palestine, his first contacts with the Muslim Brotherhood, his career as a university academic, his conservative teachings and writings, the conditions in Afghanistan at the end of 1981, the background to Azzam's fatwa calling for Muslims worldwide to come to Afghanistan and fight global jihad, the dire modalities of the recruitment of foreign fighters, the fragmentation of the jihadi movement in Afghanistan, and the assassination of Azzam on November 24, 1989, under mysterious circumstances. The book comes with an online companion (www.azzambook.net) that allows scholars to access an array of primary sources and can also be used as a teaching tool.

Reading through the main corpus of the book—508 pages, excluding the extensive bibliography—never gets tiring. This is the result of two factors, the first of which is the exceptional clarity of Hegghammer's writing. Despite the complex and multifaceted nature of the topic at hand, the book is a pleasure to read. The second factor, which is related to the first one, is the author's ability to link Azzam's thinking to the unfolding political situation in the Middle East from the end of World War