Elizabeth S. Manley, *The Paradox of Paternalism: Women and the Politics of Authoritarianism in the Dominican Republic*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2017. xiii + 319 pp. (Cloth US\$89.95)

While much has been written about various aspects of the Trujillo dictatorship, and from different perspectives, much less is known about the tenure of his collaborator, Joaquín Balaguer. *The Paradox of Paternalism* examines different facets of women's political involvement in the Dominican Republic from the early twentieth century, prior to the rise of Trujillo, until the end of Balaguer's 12-year government in 1978.

Elizabeth Manley argues that the maternal role played by women was key in defining their political participation during this long period, whether they were supporting the government or in the opposition. She also maintains that women's involvement in local and national politics, at different junctures, intermixed with international women's organizations and agendas, so that there was always an external dimension to their engagement.

Manley recounts how, in their attempt to project progress and peace to the outside world, Trujillo and Balaguer relied on women's involvement. Both provided women the opportunity to engage in politics and in transnational activism, and this ultimately promoted the rise of a feminist movement. But while they facilitated the advancement of women in certain areas, they also maintained a "traditional understanding of women's innate abilities as maternal public figures" (p. 4). This insistence on maternalism was maintained regardless of the women's political orientation. Thus, paternalism prevailed despite the transformations that took place in the course of the twentieth century. Manley endorses the argument widely found in the academic literature that women's political participation under authoritarianism was maintained both during and after regime transitions.

The historical analysis unfolds with accounts of women who were both trujillistas and antitrujillistas, both balagueristas and antibalagueristas. While the analysis of these four groups is the empirical focus of the book, the women and organizations that supported the regimes of Trujillo and Balaguer are accorded greater attention.

The early chapters discuss how the pre-Trujillo suffragist movement evolved once Trujillo came to power in 1930. The significance of that movement and the growth of attention to women's issues pointed to a greater incorporation of women in the development process. Trujillo allowed for it on the idea that it would support his political aspirations on the international stage. This was essential in facilitating the connection between women favorable to his regime

and international organizations such as the Inter-American Commission of Women (IACW).

The book is rich in information about the various figures and women's organizations that shaped each period. The chapters on the 12 years of the Balaguer regime (1966–78) bring new information to light about how women were incorporated into the governing project. There was a gap in Dominican historiography about this period with respect to women, and this book makes a significant contribution in detailing how and why Balaguer included women as provincial governors and appointed them to other high-level public positions. That he did so is well known, but the specifics had been lacking. This book delivers well.

The authoritarian nature of the Trujillo and Balaguer regimes generated women of the opposition. In the early years of the Trujillo dictatorship, some of the *normalistas* refused to engage with the dictator, and later three activist sisters—Patricia, Minerva, and Maria Teresa Mirabal—became symbols of female opposition. During the Balaguer regime, there were numerous women of the left and center-left who opposed the repressive government, and would play a key role during and after the political transition of 1978.

The book makes a significant contribution to the understanding of women's political participation in the Dominican Republic during a long stretch of the twentieth century, focusing on women of both the right and the left, both progovernment and antigovernment. The analysis is solid and methodical; the reading is engaging.

What remains unclear is which of the experiences and organizations that involved women during several decades contributed to promote the feminist movement that Manley refers to on various occasions. Granted, not all female participation in politics is feminist in its ideological orientation. Or it could be argued that all female participation in politics helps directly or indirectly to promote feminism insofar it projects women into the public arena. Manley seems to take the latter position, but more information is needed to establish when and how a feminist movement truly emerged in the Dominican Republic.

Rosario Espinal

Department of Sociology, Temple University

espinal@temple.edu