

historical, comparative, and security scholarship and would be of equal interest to historians, political scientists, and regional scholars alike.

Huron University College at Western, London

JENNIFER MUSTAPHA

**BEHIND THE FAÇADE: Elections under Authoritarianism in Southeast Asia.** By Lee Morgenbesser. Albany: SUNY Press, 2016. 292 pp. US\$95.00, cloth. ISBN 978-1-4384-6287-5.

How do autocrats use elections to maintain and secure their political regimes? *Behind the Façade: Elections under Authoritarianism in Southeast Asia* explores this question and the seeming puzzle of authoritarian elections in the context of contemporary Southeast Asia. In doing so, the book draws from a growing literature on authoritarian institutions to explore and explain the ways in which autocrats across the region have used elections to maintain and secure their respective regimes. The book thus stands in contrast to adjacent literatures on democratization and liberal peace-building which argue that elections can have important democratizing and pacifying effects, thereby eroding the very foundations of authoritarian regimes. In contrast, the book argues that the function of elections has largely been to shore up the foundations of such regimes in Southeast Asia, though the ways that elections have done so have varied widely within the region.

The book contributes to the literature on authoritarian institutions in three principle ways: first, it proposes a novel framework to map out and make sense of the myriad functions that the literature suggests elections might serve for autocrats; second, it draws attention to an important distinction between manifest and latent functions often elided in this literature. Simply put, scholars cannot conclude that institutions like elections serve a specific function based upon the mere presence of the institution or its consequences. Only careful study of the institution in context can allow scholars to distinguish between the manifest or established functions that elections actually play and those that remain latent. Third, and in line with the second contribution, the book provides a series of carefully researched case studies that uncover and demonstrate the manifest and established functions of authoritarian elections across the region.

The book is structured into four main chapters. Following a brief introduction in which the author lays out the puzzle of authoritarian elections, the first chapter describes the range of functions that elections can serve for autocrats, develops the novel framework used to assess the functions of elections, and explains the logic of case selection. The subsequent three chapters apply this framework to investigate the established functions that elections have served in selected case studies from across the region. The second chapter focuses on Cambodia and the ways in which the ruling

Cambodian People's Party (CPP) has used elections to reinforce its neo-patrimonial style of rule. The third chapter shifts its focus to Myanmar and argues that the country's military rulers have instead used elections to reinforce their rule through the legitimation and elite management functions. The fourth chapter presents the final case of Singapore where the author argues that the ruling People's Action Party (PAP), similar to Myanmar's military rulers, has consistently used the legitimation and elite management functions of elections to reinforce its rule. In contrast to much literature on authoritarian institutions that points to the use of elections as a mechanism to collect information from society, the book suggests that autocrats in Southeast Asia have eschewed using elections for this purpose.

Different audiences will no doubt appreciate the book in different ways. Those who approach it with a disciplinary focus and with an interest in authoritarian institutions or democratization but limited knowledge of Southeast Asia will appreciate it as a valuable resource on the many ways in which incumbents in the region use elections to maintain and secure their control over states and societies. By virtue of the distinction that the author draws between the manifest and latent functions, such readers will also likely appreciate it as a resource on the ways in which these same incumbents presumably could, but nevertheless have not, used elections to such ends. Such a resource is useful in guarding against unintended mis-readings of the functions of autocratic elections in Southeast Asia.

Besides readers who approach the book with a disciplinary focus, those who approach it with an area studies or country-specific focus will also find it a valuable resource worthy of a place on their bookshelf. Of course, the book is comparative in its orientation, and scholars with deep country-specific knowledge of any of the cases may not find the information presented or the conclusions all that surprising. Nevertheless, the value of the book is in the sincere effort the author makes to bridge the gap between area studies and discipline-oriented research. This is evident from the carefully researched cases and the author's painstaking efforts to situate the established functions of elections in context rather than in abstract as well as to explain the historical roots, emergence, and development of these functions. In doing so, this reflects a worthy effort to bring together the best of both traditions of scholarship.

On a concluding note, it is worth pointing out that these case studies make for excellent additions as readings on course syllabi for either graduate or undergraduate courses on topics including but not limited to comparative authoritarianism and Southeast Asian politics. The accessibility and clarity of the writing along with the rich information and detail allow for students with even limited knowledge to quickly gain a sense of the cases and provides an adequate basis for seminar discussions. Furthermore, the distinction between manifest and latent functions maintained throughout the book is useful in driving home the point that the mechanisms through which elections might

stabilize electoral authoritarian regimes are not everywhere the same or always the product of intentional design.

Yale-NUS College, Singapore

STEVEN OLIVER

**TRANSLATING THE BODY: Medical Education in Southeast Asia. History of Medicine in Southeast Asia. Edited by Hans Pols, C. Michele Thompson, and John Harley Warner.** Singapore: NUS Press; The University of Chicago Press [distributor], 2018. ix, 370 pp. (Graphs, figures, B&W photos.) US\$34.00, paper. ISBN 978-981-4722-05-6.

In *Translating the Body* the editors bring together 11 essays, which, together with their own wide-ranging overview, add materially to our understanding of disease and health across Southeast Asia and present fresh insights and invigorating analysis that merit further consideration for this region and beyond. Although each essay focusses on a single country and so limits the opportunity to explore common trends and mutual influences, collectively the contributors span Southeast Asia from Malaysia and Indonesia to the Philippines and Vietnam. In covering the period from high imperialism almost to the present, they usefully connect colonial strategies and shortcomings to postcolonial nation-building, international aid, and Cold War politics. The essays explore two interrelated themes—how modern Western scientific medicine was (or failed to be) “translated” into vernacular knowledge, and how, through what is broadly identified as “education,” indigenous populations were trained as doctors and nurses, or the wider public was persuaded (or not) to accept new medical concepts and practices or came to adopt and reinterpret them in the light of local traditions and political needs. Pivotal to both these issues were the “medical go-betweens,” the locally recruited men and women who were required to negotiate between very different ways of understanding (and languages for expressing) health, disease, and the clinical body. Three of the opening essays focus on women. Liesbeth Hesselink considers the career of the Dutchwoman Nel Stokvis-Cohen Stuart, who sought to enlist Indonesian women to become nurses and midwives—only to confront the social obstacles and pedagogic difficulties involved in recruiting, training, and retaining suitable candidates, especially through a language (Malay) which was “neither for them nor for us our native tongue” (45). Rosemary Wall and Anne Marie Rafferty address the question of nursing in British Malaya and, in a theme of conflicting or divergent “models” to which several other contributors relate, discuss the tension between the British practice of nursing and the North American public health scheme promoted by the Rockefeller Foundation. They remind us of how, far from being monolithic, “the West” represented not just different political powers but also very different approaches to health and