

summary table on page 66 as a roadmap those familiar with Northrop Frye or Hayden White can readily see Olick's memory genres as low mimetic, tragic, and so forth. A step up to the next level of abstraction would open the door further to a comparative cultural sociology of the grammars of memory. Still a close focus can have its rewards, and this truly scholarly book breaks significant new ground in connecting memory to genre, event, political context, and generation.

Islam and Democracy in Indonesia: Tolerance without Liberalism. By Jeremy Menchik. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Pp. xv+207. \$105.00 (cloth); \$28.99 (paper).

Zeynep Atalay
St. Mary's College of California

Jeremy Menchik's data rich and insightful book, *Islam and Democracy in Indonesia: Tolerance without Liberalism*, is a valuable contribution to the political science scholarship on Indonesia's particular brand of democracy and religious pluralism. The book examines the ways in which Indonesia's three mass Islamic organizations—Nahdlatul Ulama (NU), Muhammadiyah, and Persatuan Islam (Persis)—understand the concept of tolerance. Employing a mixed-method approach, consisting of a comprehensive historical analysis, quantitative survey data, and ethnographic observation of the three organizations, Menchik meticulously explains how the Islamic organizations' normative values have shaped Indonesia's social and political dynamics.

In explaining the attitudes of Indonesian Islamic organizations toward other religious groups, Menchik moves beyond the two paradigms that have dominated religion and politics scholarship, namely secularization theory and the civilizational debate, and develops a "historical constructivist" approach. The first step of the book's analytical agenda is "situating religious actors in their local and historical context" (p. 5). Rationalist approaches, due to their focus on utility maximization, typically ignore the ways in which religion shapes individual attitudes, behaviors, and ultimately interests. However, those interests and attitudes can be meaningfully understood only by taking the local and historical context into account. In "Local Genealogies," the strongest analytical chapter of the book, Menchik demonstrates how the contemporary attitudes of the three Indonesian Islamic organizations toward Christians, other non-Muslims, and minority Islamic sects reflect the context-specific social cleavages—Communist/Muslim, Christian/Muslim, traditionalist/reformist—in Central, West, and East Java, dating back to the late 19th and early 20th century. These historical grievances have been crystallized through discursive traditions, political alliances, and organizational strategies through path-dependent mechanisms.

The following chapters develop historical constructivism by rethinking the mutually constitutive relationship between religion and the state. In

contrast to the state- or society-centered explanations in political theory, Menchik follows a hybrid approach that recognizes the coevolution of religion and the state. Drawing on archival material from 1950 to 1966, Menchik reveals how the integration of Islamic actors into secular politics has transformed both sides. In Indonesia, the state has reorganized the religious sphere by delineating the boundaries between religious groups. As a consequence, state's interests shaped Indonesian Islamic organizations' structure, identity, and interests to a large extent. In the process, however, the incorporation of these very organizations into the public sphere has transformed the state and produced a religious-secular, hybrid-state system.

The book's most remarkable contribution is also its most ambitious task: reimagining political theory and developing an alternative theoretical vocabulary. Menchik explains the relatively tolerant coexistence of multiple religious communities in Indonesia through what he terms "godly nationalism." Godly nationalism, departing from Benedict Anderson's conceptualization of nationalism, refers to "an imagined community bound by a common, orthodox theism and mobilized through the state in cooperation with religious organizations in society" (p. 57). The Indonesian state considers belief in God a civic virtue and the sign of good citizenship. Citizens receive state protection and receive full benefits of citizenship only if they belong to one of the six officially recognized religious communities. Liminal groups, heterodox groups, and nonbelievers are denied rights and protections and met with discrimination, hostility, and violence. Shared opposition to heterodox groups unites diverse religious communities under Godly nationalism. Intolerance against Ahmadiyah, a controversial Islamic reformist movement, for instance, has not only mended the cleavages between Muslim factions but also consolidated their commitment to Godly nationalism.

What does tolerance mean to Islamic mass organizations that operate within a sociopolitical context where citizenship rights and protections are tied to communal membership? Menchik argues that the Islamic organizations practice what he calls "communal tolerance." In stark difference from the secular-liberal model of tolerance, which is based on individual rights, the separation of church and the state, and state neutrality toward religion, Indonesian Islamic organizations' understanding of tolerance is predicated on group rights, communal self-governance, and primacy of faith and religious accommodation. "Belief in God, support for the welfare of their members, and support for the broader Islamic community" (p. 148) outweigh concerns such as individual freedom of conscience, interfaith tolerance, and religious freedom for non-Muslims.

Concepts such as godly nationalism and communal tolerance are helpful in comprehending the complexity of Indonesian pluralism, however, the book does not adequately explain what they offer to liberal Muslims and religious minorities in Indonesia. The author proposes, "Instead of asking whether Islam is compatible with democracy, researchers should investigate what kind of democracy Muslims prefer" (p. 125) and prescribes sociopolitical models built upon notions such as godly nationalism and commu-

nal tolerance as models for Muslim-majority democracies. What is unclear here is why this domestically contested version of religious pluralism, promoted by three Islamic organizations in Indonesia, could be the answer to the democratic deficits of Muslim-majority countries. Much like the case of Indonesia, the democratic deficits of these countries stem from a host of politicoeconomic factors including underdevelopment, political instability, authoritarian state tradition, abuse of political power, corruption, and politics of patronage, among others. Expanding the role of religion in the public sphere at the expense of individual rights and freedoms does not redress democratic shortcomings, as demonstrated by the political Islamic projects of the last decade.

Essentialist debates on Islam's compatibility with democracy, civil society, and modernity have occupied undue space in academic scholarship and foreign policy circles for decades and have drowned out more nuanced analyses that incorporate historical and structural processes. In that respect, Menchik's reexamination of the genealogy of the most overused concepts and assumptions of political theory is a commendable task and bound to stimulate more discussion in politics and religion scholarship.

When Solidarity Works: Labor-Civic Networks and Welfare States in the Market Reform Era. By Cheol-Sung Lee. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Pp. ix+414. \$126.00 (cloth); \$34.99 (paper).

Cybelle Fox
University of California, Berkeley

Much of the welfare state literature is focused on the study of rich democracies. In *When Solidarity Works*, Cheol-Sung Lee bucks this trend by focusing on welfare state expansion and retrenchment among developing countries. Lee suggests that theories developed to explain welfare state outcomes in rich democracies may be ill-suited to explain outcomes in developing countries. In rich democracies, democratization and welfare state expansion predated economic globalization and neoliberalism. In developing countries, by contrast, neoliberal reform pressures came on the heels of democratization and democratic consolidation. Thus, some of the same actors involved in welfare state expansion in developing countries were soon confronted by potent forces pushing for privatization, labor market deregulation, and the retrenchment of pension, health care, and other welfare services.

While some developing countries adopted universal and comprehensive social policy regimes, others did not. And where some developing countries embraced neoliberal reforms, others managed to better withstand such pressures. What then, Lee asks, explains such "strikingly different trajectories of the development and retrenchment in social policies and labor market institutions in emerging economies with newly institutionalized democracy?" (p. 4).