

variations within agencies, but many officers are on the high side of these stops, not just a problematic few. Leadership in a law enforcement agency can make a difference, but the general pattern is an absence of interest in reducing or eliminating racial impacts.

Why might this be? The authors convincingly argue that the issue is not the individual animus of police officers toward African American and Latino drivers. If it were, the consequences of pretextual stops would be more severe than disproportionate stops and searches. The triviality of the stops is evident from the lack of arrests that occur in these cases. Rather, what seems to be at work is a tendency to suspect Black and Latino drivers, especially young males, of criminal activity, and to discount the emotional toll of frequent stops on these communities. That lack of consideration for the individual stopped is evident in common justifications for stops like “You’ve got to kiss a lot of frogs before you get your prince.”

The data on which this study was based are publicly available. The authors benefited from a 1999 North Carolina law requiring police to record detailed data on race and gender for every traffic stop. The legislature makes that data public, but has taken no steps to analyze it (despite the law’s prescriptions). North Carolina created this massive dataset, ironically, to put an end to controversy over racial bias in traffic stops. Persistent advocacy by a few black legislators got the issue on the table. Conservative white Republican legislators joined the effort, convinced that the evidence would show no racial bias. The authors describe the controversy that brought this dataset into being to help explain why the problem of racial discrimination in traffic stops persists and gets so little political traction. Whites just do not see this as a problem because they do not experience it, and their networks often do not include its victims.

The authors offer two reforms to reduce racial bias in traffic policing: an end to investigatory stops and a requirement of written consent before a search can be undertaken. Both proposals have met with fierce resistance from police chiefs and sheriffs. Nevertheless, with some pressure from city governments and changes in police leadership, the written consent reform has been undertaken in some places. No law enforcement leaders have taken the opportunity to use the data to improve the performance of individual officers.

*Suspect Citizens* documents the reasons why reform is needed by exploring the consequences of overpolicing and by suggesting why reform has not been a priority in many jurisdictions. They conclude that Black political power is key to attracting attention to this issue, and that failure to address it creates serious problems of alienation from law enforcement and government. This is the part of the book that is necessarily most speculative, but it serves as a reminder of the importance of seeing overpolicing as

an aspect of American racism that should be of concern to everyone.

This book is an important primer for policy makers and advocates, which does not mean that it is always an easy read. The need to lay out all the evidence in detail and to construct chapters that can be disaggregated as needed makes for some repetition and tendentiousness that students might not appreciate. The authors, however, do a good job of speaking to multiple audiences. They cite the relevant criminological, sociological, social-psychology, and political science literature appropriately. The discussion of legal precedents is apt, and their knowledge of policing practices is very helpful in creating a persuasive brief for reform.

**The Primary Rules: Parties, Voters, and Presidential Nominations.** By Caitlin E. Jewitt. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2019. 320p. \$80.00 cloth.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592719001750

— Jay Wendland, *Daemen College*

Preventing another raucous nominating convention in which the Democratic Party would fight over delegate selection rules was the goal of the McGovern-Fraser Commission. The commission’s work revolutionized and democratized the presidential nominating process, concluding that it needed to provide voters with opportunities for meaningful and timely participation. This conclusion led to the proliferation of primaries and caucuses that are now the main event of the presidential nominating process. Despite the democratization of the process, however, the parties still have a great deal of power over the process by endorsing candidates and, more importantly, by setting the rules with which both candidates and voters must comply.

*The Primary Rules* helps us navigate these rules surrounding the nominating process. Every four years the major parties tweak the rules to correct for problems that arose in the previous nomination cycle, making extra work for voters, candidates, and scholars trying to follow the process. Caitlin Jewitt provides the first comprehensive view of how the rules have changed after institution of the commission’s reforms, analyzing all nominating contests since 1972. Although the nomination process has indeed been democratized, Jewitt clearly demonstrates that the parties still have a tremendous amount of power over the process through their ability to set the rules; this power is just not as explicit as it was pre-reform.

Jewitt’s argument is clear and concise: to better understand presidential nominations, we need to better understand how the rules affect the nominating process. These rules, set by the parties, determine how the nomination contest will unfold, affecting candidates and voters both. She correctly asserts that “the parties are private organizations and are free to prioritize whichever objectives they deem most important, as well as select

presidential candidates through any manner they choose” (p. 221). However, what would have strengthened this argument is a larger discussion of how the rules often dictate candidate strategy. Jewitt acknowledges the rules’ impact, noting that “behavior is likely to change under different rules. Candidates and campaigns are strategic and seek to maximize benefits given the constraints at play” (p. 207). What she fails to acknowledge is that the rules allow for party control not only of how nominating contests are run but also of how candidates campaign. If candidates are devising strategies based on rules changes, this provides the party another avenue of power.

The opening chapter highlights nicely the various pieces of the complex process of nominating presidential candidates, laying the foundation for Jewitt’s thesis that rules matter and both candidates and voters are largely bound by those rules. She contextualizes well the roles of voters and parties in the current, post-reform process. The second chapter builds on this contextualization by thoroughly discussing, as the title of the chapter states, how we got here. It is mostly an historical analysis of the evolution of the nomination process, from “King Caucus” to our current system. Additionally, she provides significant detail on the several commissions put together post-reform to tinker with the rules in response to the various foibles that inevitably come with each round of nominating contests.

A major concern of both parties over roughly the past three decades has been an increasingly front-loaded calendar, which is the subject of the third chapter. An important contribution of *The Primary Rules* comes in this chapter, in which Jewitt explicates her novel measure: the “front-loading discount score.” This score provides nominations scholars with a useful quantitative measurement of front-loading, based largely on the timing of the contest while accounting for the “linearly diminishing” feature of front-loading (p. 69). It also provides a singular measurement of front-loading for each nomination contest and allows for a comparative analysis of the amount that occurs across cycles. Using this measure, Jewitt is able to demonstrate that front-loading has indeed become more common recently, but it is not the case that each contest has become more front-loaded than the last.

This new front-loading discount score is used in the fourth chapter to test for the impact of front-loading on turnout rates. Jewitt demonstrates that the conventional wisdom that front-loaded nominating contests tend to end sooner, leaving less time for meaningful participation, is not always the case. Through her thorough analysis of all contests post-reform, she concludes that front-loading actually provides voters with an increased ability to meaningfully participate because the attrition process has not effectively winnowed the candidate field down to a singular presumptive nominee in a majority of states, especially when a contest includes multiple strong candidates. Although this implication goes unmentioned, this finding

seems to support the rationale for a same-day national primary. Reform plans are not the centerpiece of *The Primary Rules*, yet this finding raises an interesting question of whether parties are attempting to reduce front-loading in an effort to diminish the idea of a national primary.

The fifth chapter examines the impact of the rules—specifically the type, openness, and timing of contests and delegate allocation rules—on turnout rates, while controlling for competitiveness. The interesting finding here is that delegate allocation rules have no impact on turnout rates, with similar null results for the timing of the contest. However, coefficient testing of the appropriate linear combinations of this timing measure does demonstrate that turnout is positive or statistically significant in several cases. This implies that front-loading does not lead to increased turnout, with Jewitt concluding that “turnout is boosted when a contest is held later in the competitive portion of the nomination” (p. 157). This is a compelling finding, but would benefit from a more detailed explication of these linear combination tests, as well as a larger discussion of how state parties may best be able to predict when the competitive window will close.

Finally, in the sixth chapter, Jewitt offers a comprehensive analysis of how all post-reform nomination outcomes would have changed under different delegate allocation rules, finding that several contests would have resulted in a different nominee had the rules been different. This is indeed an interesting exercise that clearly demonstrates the importance of the rules governing nominating contests. However, and Jewitt does acknowledge this, changing the allocation rules would also change the behavior of the candidates. Candidates devise strategies based on the rules used; thus it is impossible to tell whether the actual results would have changed if the rules were different.

This criticism regarding candidate behavior is largely beyond the scope of *The Primary Rules*. Jewitt’s goal in her comprehensive look at the rules governing nominating contests post-reform is to demonstrate the power parties have over the nomination process because of their ability to set the rules. Considering the increasing complexity of these rules, this is a laudable goal and one Jewitt undeniably accomplishes.

**The Six-Shooter State: Public and Private Violence in American Politics.** By Jonathan Obert. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018. 284p. \$99.99 cloth, \$29.99 paper.

**The Lives of Guns.** Edited by Jonathan Obert, Andrew Poe, and Austin Sarat. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. 232p. \$34.95 cloth.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592719001622

— Robert J. Spitzer, *SUNY College at Cortland*

These two new books both seem to be aimed at expanding perspectives on gun policy. The first, despite