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López discusses the construction of the Colombian state from three theoretical approaches: the Weberian, Tilly’s bellic theory, and institutionalism. Summarizing them, she asks how the centralist regime of the Colombian state has ensured the monopoly of force, how internal conflict has shaped the state, and under which rational criteria its institutional presence has been extended across the territory. With Michael Mann, she states that the state is composed of both despotic and infrastructural power - she claims that the Colombian state has mostly increased the former through strengthening its army and defeating its competitors. Yet, “it remains incredibly precarious in its regional infrastructural power” (135). She argues that a too strong presence of military state forces without institutions that protect citizens sometimes created even more victimization. Therefore, strengthening democracy and market in rural Colombia is for her at least as important as maintaining military dominance.

López understands state building as a process of construction of infrastructural power emphasizing three elements: extraction of taxes from local regulated markets, legitimacy of the democratic model via participation of citizens, and the monopoly of coercion by the state.
The latter should materialize through a rational, legal, and functional apparatus, equally present in Colombia’s entire territory (128).

In order to determine the current state of the territorial state building process, López operationalizes these three elements (coercion, extraction and legitimacy) into 27 empirically analyzable indicators and uses them to evaluate the effect of three strategies between 1980 and 2010: (1) the public policies that were intended to bring the state to rural Colombia; (2) the demobilization of armed groups; and (3) the impact of territorial decentralization. Some of the general conclusions are:

1. Not only has despotic power developed much further than infrastructural power, but strengthening rural security and justice and local economic autonomy has not even been a goal of state programs (421). This makes the poorest municipalities too dependent on the central priorities of national governors and citizenship highly vulnerable in its rights.

2. The military strategy to combat guerrillas and drug trafficking (Plan Colombia) strengthened the despotic power of the state but also increased violence against the civilian population. In contrast, any peace process has led to an immediate reduction of violence against citizens (422). Thus, negotiated peace has been much more beneficial than armed confrontation.

3. In the municipalities where there is an organized community, all indicators of violence against the population decreased significantly. Therefore, strengthening citizen associations contributes to preventing the incidence of conflict.

4. Continuing to give the municipalities autonomy without guaranteeing state institutional presence has led to the capture of territorial power by armed actors who de facto exercise control at the local level. Now it is necessary that mayors and province governors become executors and constructors of state infrastructure.

5. It is not enough to demobilize armed groups. There is a need to overcome the poor presence of the state, which must be strengthened across half of the country that lives under the regulation of illegal armed groups. The creation of a local regulated market is essential in this process.

With this in mind, she proposes to invest 1.6% of the GDP until 2030 in incentives for participative democracy, local state provision of justice and security, and infrastructure for the creation of local markets. López suggests intervening, as a priority, in 172 rural municipalities after the FARC demobilization, and extending the program to 455 afterwards (41% of the national territory).

This book’s most remarkable contribution consists in its wide and accurate method, which gathers a set of existing indicators used in Colombian public administration. Thus, López not only evaluates the past 30 years of state-building process, but also provides a tool to carry out future evaluations of the same process. The accuracy of this method is proved by the fact that a large number of the mentioned
areas with problematic state presence widely overlap with the actual ones intervened by the peace-building policy started two years later.

One of the big deficiencies of this purpose is that it shows the relation between illegal economies (e.g., drug traffic) with rights violation in rural Colombia, but it does not mention the relation of the latter with the legal economies (e.g., large-scale mining). López avoidance to mention the effect of resource extraction industries on systematic civil rights violations is crucial here: the proposal would be partially financed by the General Royalties System (SNR), which is a public fund composed of resulting resources from extractive projects. The local market that López suggests could be an alternative to the extractive developing model, but it is not clear how this transition should unfold, especially in regions where extraction activities make the biggest local tax contributions.

In general, this work can be relevant for scholars interested in a theoretical discussion of different state-building approaches from the perspective of the recent Colombian history, on peace building process in the context of internal conflict, and on post-conflict, state-building policy.

López’s work proposes both a theoretical and practical discussion on how to approach and overcome structural Colombian issues, which are also Latin America’s deepest social problems: centralism and unequal presence of the state, rural poverty, difficult creation of local markets, drug trafficking, and the lack of democratic rights for citizens in outskirts. Few governments in the region have fully addressed them, but new progressive governments committed to transcending the pendulum between leftist and rightist authoritarianisms will have to do so.