

Canada. It is not the case that party elites are completely at the mercy of the whims of the mass public. They have the power to restructure voter coalitions. And this has considerable relevance for the continued development of Canadian politics, as party elites have polarized along ideological lines (Christopher Cochrane, *Left and Right: The Small World of Political Ideas*, 2015), which may have trickled down to influence the attitudes and identities of the mass public (Anthony Kevins and Stuart Soroka, “Growing Apart: Partisan Sorting in Canada, 1992–2015,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 51 [1], 2017).

Next, Godbout describes how political leaders adapted to this realignment by reducing the power of private members in the early twentieth century (chapter 8, pp. 188–96). He highlights the lower levels of party loyalty found among Western and Francophone MPs after World War I (see fig. 8.4) and uses historical evidence to link these legislative rule changes to the decision of these MPs to exit the party system (pp. 199–207). In doing so, he highlights the potential of parliamentary rules not only to influence the behavior of political elites but to fundamentally reshape party systems as well.

Godbout concludes his empirical analyses with a chapter illustrating the remarkable growth of party unity in the Senate (chapter 9; see fig. 9.3). Again he highlights the important insights that can be gleaned from this new dataset, indirectly illustrating the salience of ideological cohesion in fostering party unity, because party leaders have considerably less leverage over unelected senators.

Godbout artfully combines historical inquiry with rich quantitative description and analysis. *Lost on Division* is an engaging and highly accessible read that raises plenty of questions for future research. For instance, how much of these changes in unity were driven by party cohesion rather than discipline, which are observationally equivalent (pp. 79–80)? Under what conditions can legislative rule changes—or parliamentary behavior more broadly—reshape electoral politics and party systems? We know that third parties have emerged sporadically in Canada for reasons unrelated to parliamentary behavior and legislative rule changes (e.g., the Reform Party).

The observational nature of these data makes it difficult to pin down causality, as Godbout acknowledges to his credit (pp. 92–93). For example, was the increasing internal cohesion engendered by the “Catholic Sort” crucial to the implementation of parliamentary rules curbing the power of private members (p. 196)? It appears that *disunity* drove the implementation of the cloture rule change by Prime Minister Borden, for instance (p. 196). And escalating demands on government time surely mattered in precipitating a desire for more agenda control throughout this period. To put it another way, in a counterfactual world where the major parties remained internally divided by religion, would private members have maintained more of their power? Is the Catholic Sort

a necessary or sufficient condition for the legislative rule changes we observe? We can ask similar questions regarding Godbout’s contentions that elite sorting in Parliament influenced voter behavior and that legislative rule changes caused the breakup of the first party system and the subsequent increase in party unity.

These are all very tough questions to answer, but Godbout does an admirable job making his case. *Lost on Division* is a must-read for scholars of political parties and party systems, and indeed anyone interested in the marriage of historical analysis and quantitative data.

### **Who Speaks for Nature? Indigenous Movements, Public Opinion, and the Petro-State in Ecuador.**

By Todd A. Eisenstadt and Karleen Jones West. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019. 288p. \$78.00 cloth.

### **Resource Radicals: From Petro-Nationalism to Post-Extractivism in Ecuador.**

By Thea Riofrancos. Durham: Duke University Press, 2020. 264p. \$99.95 cloth, \$26.95 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592721001572

— Roberta Rice, *University of Calgary*  
roberta.rice@ucalgary.ca

The books under consideration in this review are a study in contrasts. Although both studies are concerned with understanding resource conflicts in contemporary Ecuador, they do so using very different research methods and approaches. Todd Eisenstadt and Karleen Jones West’s study is based on a nationwide public opinion survey on environmental attitudes and relies on statistical analysis, whereas Thea Riofrancos’s work is an archival and ethnographic study of mining conflict that uses discourse analysis. Interestingly, the studies have similar findings with regard to the deep division within the country between those factions in favor and those opposed to the extractivist model of development. This rift divides political parties, government officials, civil society, communities, and even individual households. Yet, the two works provide distinct theoretical explanations for this dynamic. Whereas Eisenstadt and Jones West’s theory of resource conflict centers on environmental vulnerability, Riofrancos’s work highlights environmental epistemology.

Both books are welcome additions to the literature on Indigenous rights and resource governance in Latin America. Ecuador has become a global leader for Indigenous and environmental rights; its 2008 constitution was the first in the world to recognize the rights of Nature and the plurinational character of the state. Thus, this small but important country is worthy of the single case study treatment that these authors give it. This has not always been the case within the discipline. In the acknowledgments section of her book, Riofrancos recounts a conversation with her dissertation adviser (very similar to one that I had with mine) about the relevance of Ecuador as a case study (p. viii).

Ecuador is a prime example of how neoliberalism has produced distinctive waves of protest in Latin America. The first wave of austerity protests in the region, which occurred from the mid-1970s through the 1980s, was led by the urban working class, precisely the sector that bore the brunt of the effects of economic restructuring. The second wave of anti-neoliberal protests of the 1990s and 2000s was led by new social and political actors, such as Indigenous peoples, who filled a political void and helped elect Latin America's "Left Turn" governments. The third and latest protest wave, which is the subject matter of the books reviewed here, arose in response to the social and environmental impacts of the expansion of extractive industry into new frontiers and is led by anti-extractive movements and environmentalists.

Eisenstadt and Jones West's volume, provocatively titled *Who Speaks for Nature?* is sure to generate serious debate among environmental politics scholars over its central claim that environmentalism in the Global South is driven by self-interest rather than postmaterialist values (see chapter 1). The authors' findings are supported by a nationwide public opinion survey of 1,781 Ecuadorians in 2014 that was designed by the authors and complemented by personal interviews to contextualize the results (detailed in chapter 2). The study outlines three potential groups who claim to "speak for Nature" in Ecuador: Indigenous and rural communities whose livelihoods depend on the land, the government of Rafael Correa (2007–17) whose "extractive populism" championed Indigenous and environmental rights while advancing extractive industry, and Indigenous leaders and public intellectuals who advocate for the rights of Nature as an alternative to development.

The study argues that Indigenous and rural communities, particularly those in the Amazon, are the most effective representatives of the environment but that their advocacy is driven by self-preservation owing to their geographic proximity to existing or proposed resource extraction sites. Based on a comparison of survey results from the north, central, and southern extractive frontiers in Ecuador (see chapter 4), the authors demonstrate that those individuals whose lands are already degraded tend to value extraction over the environment, whereas those opposed to extraction are individuals whose lands have not yet been contaminated but where extraction is being proposed or debated. The authors' theory of vulnerability politics goes a long way toward explaining the variety of stances that Indigenous communities take on extractive industry.

A controversial aspect of the book is the authors' suggestion that "indigenous identity has little to do with environmental mobilization" (p. 9), despite the fact that Ecuador's Indigenous movement and its affiliated political party have led the country's anti-mining efforts. Interestingly, even though the public opinion survey used by Eisenstadt and Jones West purposely targeted Indigenous peoples (40.2% of respondents self-identified as Indigenous), the Indigenous identity variable was not statistically significant in any of

their models. The authors interpret this non-finding to mean that vulnerability matters more to environmental mobilization than does ethnic identity and that Indigenous groups should therefore abandon a multicultural strategy in favor of "polycentrism," a pluralist form of interest representation in which multiple groups work to solve issues on different fronts (p. 216).

A curious omission in the study is any discussion of the gendered dimension of resource conflicts or even a survey variable on the sex of the respondents. There is a growing literature on resource conflicts in Latin America indicating that Indigenous women play a key role in anti-extractivist resistance efforts and do so at great personal cost. In addition to the risk of repression and criminalization of their activities, in some cases when women step out of their traditional roles to mobilize collectively against mining and other extractive operations, they may trigger deeply ingrained hostility toward them from the men in their communities. It is entirely possible that, if the Indigenous identity variable used in Eisenstadt and Jones West's study were disaggregated by gender, Indigenous men, who are more likely to be employed either directly or indirectly by the extractive sector, might hold different opinions on the environment and extractive industry than do Indigenous women. At the very least, this is an important new avenue of research for public opinion survey research.

*Resource Radicals* by Thea Riofrancos offers a highly contextualized theory of the politicization of resource extraction in Ecuador under the Correa administration. Based on extensive fieldwork and archival research carried out by the author between 2010 and 2016, Riofrancos's book documents the dramatic shift among the country's popular sector organizations from a position of radical resource nationalism to anti-extractivism. Her study seeks to explain why Ecuadorian activists, who protested against neoliberalism for decades, turned against a leftist government that proclaimed the end of neoliberalism (p. 3). Riofrancos's work brings into focus how grassroots activists were able to craft critiques of extraction and enact processes of resistance that became the primary source of discord between what she terms the "Left-in-power" and the "Left-in-resistance" (detailed in the book's conclusion).

The author identifies two forms of resource radicalism at play in Ecuador: radical resource nationalism, which demands the collective ownership of nonrenewable resources and the equitable distribution of its proceeds, and anti-extractivism—which rejects the extractivist model of development in favor of a post-extractive future. In the space of less than a decade, the Correa administration's top-down, technical approach to "sustainable mining" generated two opposing camps within state and society holding contrasting notions of development and democracy. In one of the most fascinating chapters of the book (chapter 5), Riofrancos describes the information war between state actors and community members that led

each to claim epistemic authority over the other. From the point of view of the state, communities oppose mining because they are “misinformed” and lack sufficient technical information. From the point of view of the communities (and some bureaucrats), the state’s information is hopelessly deficient and biased, because it lacks expertise of its own and relies on corporate studies. Community activists directly contest the authority of and information from the state and corporations when they articulate alternative, nontechnical expertise grounded in their own local knowledge of their territories (p. 154).

Riofrancos notes in her conclusion that the fragmented and territorialized nature of extraction leaves directly affected communities isolated and vulnerable to repression. In stark contrast to Eisenstadt and Jones West’s theory of environmental vulnerability, Riofrancos argues that “geography, however, is not destiny” (p. 179). Instead, she advocates for strong alliances and organized solidarity across the country. She suggests that any explanation for the form of resistance to the uneven territoriality of extraction must also consider such factors as project type, scale, and ownership, in addition to legal norms and the extent of community-level political organization.

Riofrancos’s work is based on a unique historical moment in Ecuador, and its features are not found in other cases in the region. Nevertheless, the book does offer sobering lessons for Latin America’s leftist governments. At its heart, *Resource Radicals* is a story of how the Left cannibalized itself in Ecuador and, in so doing, inadvertently opened the door to a right-wing resurgence in the 2021 presidential elections. According to Riofrancos, in Ecuador, “two forms of leftism confronted one another in a dispute that became so polarized that each saw in the other a political enemy more dangerous than neoliberalism” (p. 182). She concludes the book with a call for the two projects of the Left to work together to bring to life their egalitarian and ecological visions. Important words indeed.

The two books reviewed here not only demonstrate the theoretical and empirical benefits of a single case study approach to a unique country such as Ecuador but also reveal the merits of methodological pluralism within political science. These are must-read books for scholars interested in issues of Indigenous rights, extractivist resistance, environmental justice, and the future of humanity.

**Regimes of Inequality: The Political Economy of Health and Wealth.** By Julia Lynch. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020. 294p. \$99.99 cloth, \$34.99 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592721001468

— Jonas Pontusson , University of Geneva  
jonas.pontusson@unige.ch

Julia Lynch’s *Regimes of Inequality* represents a welcome addition to the burgeoning literature on the politics of

inequality in liberal democracies. Like many recent contributors to this literature, Lynch struggles with the puzzle—call it the “Piketty puzzle” (Thomas Piketty, *Capital and Ideology*, 2020)—of why it is that democratically elected governments have not done more to counteract the concentration of income at the top of the income distribution. In parallel, she brings to the fore another puzzle, the “Lynch puzzle”: in Britain, France, and Finland alike, apparently determined government efforts to reduce health inequalities have made very little difference.

We can distinguish two quite separate strands of research on the politics of income inequality. One strand focuses on how inequality affects the policy preferences and political behavior of citizens. According to scholars pursuing this path, the key to the Piketty puzzle is that rising inequality has not been accompanied by any significant increase in public support for redistribution. Citizens misperceive inequality, they consider unequal rewards to be fair, they do not believe that government can fix the problem, or they consider other (“cultural”) issues to be more salient. The second strand of research focuses on income bias in the responsiveness of elected politicians and other policy makers to citizens’ demands, suggesting that this responsiveness has become more unequal with rising income inequality.

Lynch makes an important contribution to the literature on the politics of inequality by bringing health inequality into the picture (a prescient move, indeed, in light of the pandemic of the last year). Equally important, she contributes to this literature by articulating a new approach to the politics of inequality. In contrast to the preferences-for-redistribution and the unequal-responsiveness literatures, the question of how political elites—in the first instance, elected politicians but also civil servants and other policy advisers—understand “the problem of inequality” occupies center stage in Lynch’s approach to the politics of inequality. More specifically, Lynch insists that the way that politicians frame the problem of inequality defines the set of feasible policy options (the “Overton window”) and also shapes the effectiveness of their efforts to reduce inequality.

The three country chapters that constitute the book’s empirical core are primarily concerned with the question of where policy frames come from and the process through which they change. In each of these chapters, Lynch shows how center-left political parties and other progressive political forces have reframed the problem of inequality to render it more consistent with the neoliberal economic policy paradigm that has prevailed since the 1980s (Britain) or the 1990s (France and Finland). The British story, as retold by Lynch, is a simple one: convinced that traditional redistributive policies were no longer economically or politically viable, New Labour reframed the problem of inequality in terms of health, rather than income and wealth. Although the “social determinants of health” policy frame adopted by the WHO and the EU