

cases more directly about race (pp. 84, 93). From jointly analyzing NAACP and NHLA ratings and NOMINATE scores, Hero and Preuhs conclude that “ideology is the major basis for support of other groups” but “plays a lesser role regarding . . . representatives’ own racial/ethnic group’s policy positions; those are significantly animated by within-group considerations” (p. 149), a finding also echoed in other evidence (pp. 76, 96, 111).

The book does not establish that independence or even shared policy positions *causally* benefit either group or alter government outputs. While roll call results more often match black and Latino elites’ preferences when the NAACP and NHLA exhibit congruence, congruence may coincide with “wider . . . support for [the winning] position by various other groups” (p. 110). Yet independence’s importance is clear when considering issues—such as immigration (pp. 111, 144, 212)—where the *politics* of black–Latino elite conflict would surely impact the *policy process*, were it found.

The book also makes a contribution by broaching anew three questions relevant to not only minority politics but other American politics subfields, comparative politics, and public administration. One, as noted, is the conditions under which group interests trump shared ideology. A second is the role of ideology versus party in nurturing coalitions, particularly in a polarized Congress (pp. 145, 227). A third concerns the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation; there are three subquestions here: i) Do minorities offer representation different from whites of similar ideology (p. 158)? ii) Do minority legislators act as “trustees for minority interests broadly” (p. 116)? iii) Do minority representatives of one group nonetheless offer representation different from minority representatives of similar ideology from a different group (p. 160)? The last question, as Hero and Preuhs note, echoes one that Jane Mansbridge asked in 1999 (“Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent ‘Yes,’” *Journal of Politics* 61 [no. 3]: 628–57). Chapters 5 and 6 suggest that the answer to each subquestion is *yes*. Refer especially to pages 121, 159, and 162 regarding (i), 145 regarding (ii), and 173 and 180 regarding (iii). These indications that elites from different groups generate noninterchangeable representation underscore the continued need for research on racial and ethnic diversity, in public and private organizations, as a dependent and explanatory variable.

The book leaves two questions relatively open for future research. One is the degree to which elite nonconflict is owed to *time*, alongside federalism. While Hero and Preuhs find steady nonconflict starting as early as the 1970s, they note instances of conflict varying (pp. 143, 146) or declining (p. 182) over time, patterns that may merit further study. The other question is how black–Latino elite relations impact or intersect other inter- and intraminority dynamics.

The book discusses aspects of *intragroup* heterogeneity (pp. 49, 102, 206–12) and relations with smaller ethnic groups (pp. 9–11, 200–201). Yet especially regarding the 2000 Census (pp. 88–90) and Claire Kim’s work (p. 183) (“The Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans,” *Politics and Society* 27 [no. 1, 1999]: 105–38), it would be interesting to read the authors’ thoughts on what black–Latino elite nonconflict implies for smaller ethnic groups, multiracial identification, and post-ethnicity (e.g., David A. Hollinger, *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*, 2006). These are, however, issues outside the book’s intended scope. *Black–Latino Relations* estimably unpacks a complicated question from numerous angles while avoiding detours into queries that are rightly separate projects.

Hero and Preuhs thus shed new light on black–Latino relations in American politics. Elite nonconflict and independence are notable for what they render absent from the policy process—intergroup conflict—and for what they are not—coalition politics. Demonstrating that “where we look . . . has implications for what we find” (p. 6), the authors distill an enormous amount of original material into systematic data, yielding a text transparent in its organization and instructive in both content and research design. *Black–Latino Relations* will surely catalyze further scholarship on the questions it studies and suggests.

#### **Deficits, Debt, and the New Politics of Tax Policy.**

By Dennis S. Ippolito. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 296p. \$85.00 cloth, \$28.99 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S153759271400365X

— Iwan Morgan, *University College London*

In his new study, Dennis Ippolito examines the critical relationship of taxes to other components of the federal budget over the course of American history. The volume demonstrates conclusively how wars, changing conceptions of the domestic role of national government, and fluctuating views about fiscal deficits and public debt have profoundly shaped the development of tax policy. Ippolito’s mastery of his subject and his confident deployment of a mass of evidence confirms his status as one of the leading and most prolific scholars of U.S. budgetary policy.

Anyone wishing to understand key changes in federal taxation since the 1787 Constitution endowed Congress with the power of the purse can do no better than to consult this volume. In addition to cogent analysis, it offers a plethora of helpful figures and charts to trace fiscal developments over time. Ippolito traces the evolution and decline of various tax regimes from the 1790s to the present to demonstrate the changing linkage between spending, borrowing, and tax policy. His study demonstrates how the nexus between this

trinity was broadly maintained during the long ascendancy of the so-called “balanced-budget principle,” a convention whose authority prevailed for much of American history. In Ippolito’s thesis, the nexus was weakened in the 1960s and 1970s when domestic considerations – initially the promotion of economic growth and later the expansion of entitlement programs – took priority regardless of the incapacity of taxes to provide the necessary funding. It finally broke apart in the 1980s when Ronald Reagan established a quasi-wartime defense expansion while promoting tax reduction on a scale more usually found in the aftermath of war. It might be argued, of course, that ultimate Cold War victory at the start of the next decade was worth the cost of huge deficits, but fiscal imbalances would have been smaller had Reagan’s tax policy been more in tune with defense spending trends.

The restoration of outlay-revenue nexus in the 1990s proved short-lived. In explaining the spectacular transition from large deficits to large surpluses, Ippolito rightly credits policymakers for making politically tough decisions on spending restraint and tax increases, but notes the fiscal dividend reaped from the end of the Cold War that permitted large defense retrenchment. Arguably, however, he underplays another important and exceptional factor of that period—the stock market boom—which created a massive bonanza of tax revenues from capital gains and related levies that disappeared when the dot.com bubble burst. A new era of large budget deficits then came into being in the early twenty-first century, initially driven in large part by George W. Bush’s revival of the Reagan fiscal paradigm—with the important difference that his administration also promoted the expansion rather than reduction of domestic spending.

Ippolito’s historical review of budget policy provides the contextual prelude to discussion of the current deficit/debt dilemma facing the United States in the wake of the Great Recession of 2007–09 and how it might be resolved. The United States faces the risk of its public debt ultimately becoming unsustainable (if only in the sense that foreign creditors who currently permit its easy finance take flight because of concerns that it has become unmanageable). Ippolito is rightly adamant that increasing taxes—whether only on the rich or more broadly—is not the sole answer to this problem. He is equally right in insisting that holding the line against tax increases in the hope that adequate spending cuts will materialize has never worked in the past. Accordingly, it is essential that American government rediscovers the fundamental importance of taxes for revenue-raising—a reality lost since the 1960s (with the brief exception of the 1990s).

The author also contends that there should be “an informed debate over the most economically efficient way to raise revenues” [p. 267–68]. In pursuit of this, he offers some informative and, to this reviewer, sensible

policy ideas that could feature in a partisan grand bargain that agreed expenditure restraint, particularly with regard to entitlements, and revenue enhancement. However, he stops short of suggesting how informed debate to discuss these and other options might come about. This is a pity as political scientists surely have something to say on this score.

A century ago, the Progressive era witnessed a series of budget reforms—culminating in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to create a presidential budget—that improved the efficiency of the budgetary process to deal with the massive debt legacy of World War I. Today’s budget process is in similar need of an efficiency fix according to some commentators. But are there procedural reforms that might achieve similar benefits for making the budget serve national rather than partisan needs? And were this the case, should present-day parties agree on such measures, there would actually be no need for them in the first place because politicians would then also be capable of reaching more direct consensus on substantive policy.

Despairing of politicians, Francis Fukayama has suggested that the job of budgeting should be transferred to a blue-ribbon super-committee of technocrats, allowing Congress only amendment-free ‘yes’ or ‘no’ vote on its recommendations. However the capacity of technocrats to produce efficient fiscal policy is not borne out by the experience of the European Union. Moreover, the public is hardly more likely to accept austerity imposed by experts rather than by their elected representatives. In essence debt-reducing solutions that seek to depoliticize the budget ignore the reality that it is a highly political entity.

In Ippolito’s view both parties have “indulged the public” (p. 270) for decades that their competing visions of costly domestic programs (Democrats) and low taxes (Republicans) have not required pain elsewhere in the budget. This implicitly puts the blame on the people—and the quotation from Washington’s Farewell Address on page 1 about their duty to pay adequate taxes appears to confirm this. But surely the real culprits are the political classes that have failed for so long to exercise far-sighted fiscal leadership. In my opinion, a better start to the book would have been Alexander Hamilton’s words from 1782 that “when inquiry is what will *please*, not what will *benefit* the people . . . there can be nothing but temporary expenditure, fickleness and folly.”

Such carping aside, Dennis Ippolito has produced an important, insightful, and informative study. It powerfully makes the simple but fundamental point that, whatever short-term deviations may be justified, the broadly paramount goal of tax policy in the longer term has to be to raise the revenues necessary for government to achieve its purposes and run its functions. This truth has not shaped fiscal deliberations for nigh on half-a-century. Ippolito’s book will doubtless become required reading for

students and scholars of public policy, but it also deserves a more general readership that can be informed about the nature of America's fiscal problems and the ways of correcting them.

**The Substance of Representation: Congress, American Political Development, and Lawmaking.**

By John S. Lapinski. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013. 181p. \$75.00 cloth, \$24.95 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592714003661

— Sean M. Theriault, *The University of Texas at Austin*

*The Substance of Representation* makes a foray into an area that, regrettably, has been too long ignored. The simplicity of that lead sentence could not have been imagined 40 years ago when the best and brightest congressional scholars were seriously examining not only the legislative process, but also the products of the legislative process. The latter of these topics shortly thereafter went missing. This important new book from John Lapinski corrects that lapse and, hopefully, will usher in a new area of scholarship that examines the products of Congress and not just its processes.

The substance of representation—both the topic and the book—is at the intersection of Congressional studies, American political development, and policy studies. None of the subfields has made a serious or recent effort at trying to incorporate it into the larger context of policy making or political development. Such an oversight, according to Lapinski, is not just unfortunate, but more likely, damaging to each.

Lapinski reintroduces the substance of policy back into these subfields by coding all roll-call votes and public statues from 1877 to 2009 into four primary “first tier” categories (sovereignty, organization/scope, international relations, and domestic affairs) and four secondary “first tier” categories (District of Columbia, housekeeping, quasi-private bills, and public quasi-private bills). Each of the primary first tier categories has three or four “blueprint” subcategories. Each of these subcategories is further divided into 2 to 13 tier three subcategories.

The substantive chapters examine how issues affect polarization broadly (Chapter 3) and through a number of case studies (Chapter 4), as well as the influence of issue substance on legislative accomplishments (Chapter 5) and an overall explanation of lawmaking (Chapter 6). In each chapter, Lapinski, through detailed large-N quantitative analysis, demonstrates how a model that lumps all issue areas together misses something only revealed when the substance of the legislation is considered. Despite the common contention that most issues collapse onto the popular liberal-conservative ideological dimension, an intra-policy analysis reveals considerable variety. Domestic issues are nearly always polarized while the other categories show the

common divergence from Reconstruction to World War II followed by growing divergence afterward, though polarization's low point varies among the issues.

By examining the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1892, the Espionage Act of 1917, Hawaii and Alaska Statehood in the 1950s, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Lapinski shows how congressional scholars would have missed the importance of intra-policy variety had they assumed that these important issues followed the conventional wisdom. He concludes, “[a]t best, we can only partially understand lawmaking by treating the policy process as being similar across policy types” (p. 102).

The legislative accomplishment and lawmaking chapters go hand-in-hand. In the former, Lapinski introduces a second massive data set that estimates the importance of enactments from 1877 to 2009 by examining a number of sources—what he calls “raters.” These estimates are then ranked into a list of the top 500 and 3500 enactments over the same time period. Congressional productivity can then be analyzed to reveal what characteristics propel and which impede legislative enactments within the four primary categories. By examining polarization and a slew of control variables (start of presidential term, divided government, war, Vietnam War, time, House majority party advantage) in a negative binomial regression model, Lapinski finds that these variables affect sovereignty measures differently than they do the other categories. Not only does polarization increase sovereignty enactments, but some of the other control variables seem to have no effect. The other models show more consistency in the control variables' results and that polarization impedes enactments.

In the conclusion Lapinski argues that his book should be only the beginning of the exploration of the substance of legislation and its effect on the legislative process and policy development. He has done congressional scholars a useful service by pointing us in a new worthy topic of study – or, perhaps more accurately, reintroduces us to a worthy topic of study. Furthermore, by being transparent with his data collection and coding efforts and by sharing them with the community, he is engaging in the best practices of social science.

I suspect that few scholars would disagree with the overall thrust of Lapinski's argument. Clearly, a more fine-tuned analysis that takes into consideration the differences among policy areas will reveal a more complete picture of polarization and its relationship to legislative productivity. In this regard, Lapinski succeeds. In the book's final paragraph, he admits his final aim. He simply wants congressional scholars and American political development scholars to see that the “policy issue substance seems to offer a path to faithful work that can help both fields make much-needed gains in our understanding of the policy process as well as provide key insights into long-standing