

greater effects of district and national partisan tides in such elections.

The analysis of the pivotal 1994 House elections is particularly good. In a departure from the past, Republican candidates for open seats ran substantially ahead of the normal GOP vote in most districts, especially in the South. This was so even when GOP candidates faced better funded and more experienced Democratic rivals. Gaddie and Bullock argue convincingly that the GOP's performance in open seat contests was a crucial component of the party's majority in Congress, helped make possible the Republican realignment in the South, and in turn produced the profound policy reverberations still felt today.

Gaddie and Bullock also explore patterns in financing campaigns for open seats. It is relatively easy for donors to determine recipients in incumbent races, but the choice is murkier without that cue. The authors find, interestingly, that past political experience has little bearing on the size of the campaign war chest, but the amount of money raised by an opponent is a significant predictor of one's own campaign resources. A very intriguing finding in this regard is the authors' inability to explain open seat funding in 1994: For other years, the goodness-of-fit of their models is quite respectable, but the model for 1994 accounts for almost no funding variation whatsoever. They attribute this to substantive changes in variables that had been strong predictors of fundraising levels for open-seat candidates in past years. For example, party spending on open seats increased in 1994 and was more evenly distributed across candidates for open seats. By not supporting specific races more heavily, the parties sent weaker signals to other donors as to whom to support; as a result, the level of party funding was not a significant determinant of fundraising by candidates for open seats that year.

Those who hope for greater gender balance in Congress can take heart from this analysis. Gaddie and Bullock note that the imbalance will most likely change through the same means as the partisan balance shifted, via open seats. Furthermore, they find that women with sufficient political experience and campaign financing fare just as well in open seat elections as comparably experienced and funded males. This is a noteworthy addition to the growing literature that documents the decline of barriers confronting women who seek high elective office.

The analysis is methodologically sound and, in places, highly sophisticated, yet the conclusions are not beyond the grasp of an educated lay person. The discussion of the PRE interpretation of the logit analyses, for example, is especially clear. Overall (see below for one caveat), the models seem well specified; as noted, in most instances the hypothesized relationships are statistically significant, and the models account for an impressive proportion of variation in the dependent variables.

The strength of the statistical models is best demonstrated in the final chapter, wherein Gaddie and Bullock venture beyond the safe ground of explaining past events and predict future outcomes. Writing in 1999, they estimated the vote in open seat races in the 2000 elections. They deserve credit for their bravery and their accuracy. In Table 7.6 (p. 182), the authors predict the GOP vote percentage in 25 expected open seat House contests. In checking how well they fared, I eliminated three contests—one in which the incumbent did not retire as anticipated, and two with circumstances (a three-way race in Missouri, a four-way battle in Rhode Island) the authors could not have foreseen. For the remaining 22 contests, their model of the GOP vote share performs

remarkably well: The average error is only about three percentage points. Gaddie and Bullock's predictions about the partisan outcome in these races are presented alongside those of political commentators Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. Gaddie-Bullock and Evans-Novak agreed on the outcome of thirteen of the contests; among the nine in which their predictions differed, Gaddie and Bullock were right about five, Evans and Novak about four. Score one for the political scientists over the pundits.

The book is not flawless. The authors point out that open seats are the means through which partisan change in Congress can be effected. But the House is only half the institution, and no consideration is given to whether the findings can be generalized to the U.S. Senate. Understandably, such difficulties as amassing a sufficient number of cases and treating states as homogeneous political jurisdictions would make extending the model to Senate contests tricky. Nonetheless, some speculation as to whether the authors' conclusions might hold in the other chamber seems warranted.

Also, a factor that some scholars have identified as an important determinant of open seat contests—media treatment of the candidates—is missing here. Paul Herrnson's (*Congressional Elections*, 1998) analysis of open House seats in 1992 found that candidates who received more favorable media coverage than their opponents accrued an advantage of nearly four percentage points. The Gaddie and Bullock models include factors that may lead to such an advantage in media treatment (a candidate's past experience, campaign war chest, and so on), but the authors might have addressed this difference between their models and those used in prior work.

*Of less substantive importance are the errors not normally found in a work from a reputable publisher (and responsibility for which lies more with the editors than with the authors).* For example, the maps depicting gerrymandering in Indiana in 1982 (pp. 26–7) are fuzzy, such that considerable effort is required to discern the substantive point discussed in the text. In the section on future predictions, the authors state: "At the time of this writing (winter 2000), not all open seats are known" (p. 178). By winter 2000, of course, not only were the seats known, but also the outcomes had been decided; surely, Gaddie and Bullock were writing in winter 1999. Finally, the presentation of both *R*-squared and adjusted *R*-squared in many (but not all) regression tables is curious. In most instances, the figures reported differ very little, and when they do, the text interpretation invariably relies on the more conservative adjusted goodness-of-fit measure. One wonders why the *R*-squared is presented at all.

Overall, this work is a genuine contribution to the literature on congressional elections. The book makes a powerful case for studying open seat races and lays the groundwork for future exploration in the field. It deserves a spot in the library of all students of Congress and elections.

**Urban Exodus: Why the Jews Left Boston and the Catholics Stayed.** By Gerald Gamm. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999. 384p. \$39.95 cloth, \$19.95 paper.

Robert Huckfeldt, *Indiana University*

Gerald Gamm seeks to explain the different rates at which Jews and Catholics left the Roxbury and Dorchester areas of Boston for nearby suburbs during the middle decades of the twentieth century. As Sam Bass Warner shows (*Streetcar*

*Suburbs*, 1978), Roxbury and Dorchester were the first ring of streetcar suburbs around the city and became thriving neighborhoods during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The subsequent development of the automobile and more distant suburbs, coupled with continued migration into the Boston area, increased centrifugal pressures on the city's spatial development. As African Americans and other minorities began moving into Roxbury and Dorchester, many white residents left for new and more distant suburban locales.

As in other American cities, Jewish residents of Boston were among the first to leave their old neighborhood, and Catholics were among the last. In an effort to explain these migration patterns, Gamm accomplishes a number of feats. He provides a more sophisticated understanding of individual involvement in urban institutions as well as the importance of institutional rules for the vitality of urban groups. He encourages us to think more deeply about the institutional basis of urban social contexts. And he forces us to reconsider explanations for urban decay, the vitality of urban communities, and the potential for diverse urban neighborhoods.

Why did Jews leave more rapidly than Catholics? Some controversy surrounds this issue, but the core of Gamm's argument revolves around distinctive institutional features in the organization of Catholic parishes and Jewish synagogues. The life of the parish is defined in terms of geography and hierarchy. Catholics cannot belong to the parish church unless they reside within the boundaries of the parish. Church property does not belong to parishioners but to the diocese. Finally, priests are assigned and reassigned to particular parishes at the discretion of the diocese. In contrast, the location of a Jewish synagogue is determined by the congregational members who own it, and membership is an individual choice that is unaffected by location of residence. Moreover, the rabbi is responsible to the synagogue that provides his employment contract and salary. Hence, when Catholics move from the city to the suburb, they leave behind the parish and the church as well as a parish-specific network of social contacts. When Jews leave the city for the suburb, they can maintain their membership in the urban synagogue.

According to Gamm, the geographic definition of the Catholic parish creates a credible commitment to the people who reside in that area. Catholic residents know that the church will not leave. Moreover, they know that *other* residents know the church will not leave. One might say that Catholic residents are discouraged from leaving by the necessary loss of ties to their parish and church, and they are encouraged to stay by the assurance that others are also unlikely to leave. In contrast, the freedom of departing Jewish residents to continue their involvement within the synagogue makes leaving easier. This individual freedom of mobility, along with the ability of Jewish congregations to close down operations at one site and relocate to another, undermines the group's commitment to a particular locale. Hence, an individual Jewish resident might anticipate the departure of both the synagogue and its membership, which makes it more likely that the individual will leave.

In many ways, Gamm provides a story of unforeseen consequences and short time horizons. When Jewish residents of Dorchester moved to Brookline, they may have fully expected to maintain their involvement at the old synagogue. Similarly, when the urban synagogue provided services to its suburban members through satellite facilities, its leadership based these actions on the future survival of the synagogue. In fact, both sets of actions led to the inevitable demise of one institution and the formation of another. Freedom of associ-

ation and location inevitably led to distinctive patterns of migration, decline, and institutional rebirth.

What are the consequences of these patterns for urban politics and the vitality of urban communities? Who are the winners and who are the losers? Here again, short-term dynamics often run at cross purposes to long-term dynamics. In the short run, locally based Jewish institutions lose support and disappear, a fact that is particularly unfortunate for the typically less affluent Jewish residents who are left behind. In contrast, Catholic parishes endure, and many of the churches once populated by Irish Americans ultimately become the religious homes of other ethnic groups, thereby providing institutional continuity in the context of sometimes rapidly changing population composition.

At the same time, the geographical basis of the Catholic parish does not provide a uniformly happy tale. The same factors that make Catholic residents less willing to leave also create and exacerbate higher levels of hostility toward newcomers to the neighborhood, and this hostility is a major theme of Boston politics throughout much of the twentieth century. In short, we should not forget that race and class and ethnicity lie at the heart of this story. Ironically, in their rapid desertion of Roxbury and Dorchester, the departing Jewish residents made possible a somewhat easier in-migration of African Americans and others who were in dire need of their own homes, neighborhoods, and communities.

Finally, and perhaps most important, Gamm contributes important new insight regarding the institutional basis of urban communities. There is an important component of individual choice and preference in the patterns of association and networks of interaction that underlie these communities, but the incidence and likelihood of particular interactions is enhanced by some institutional arrangements and diminished by others. Hence, the form and function of urban communities, and the vitality of urban groups, are not accidental, even if they are frequently unintended. Gamm's rich and compelling account of the institutional basis for these groups and communities provides an indispensable element to our understanding of the roles played by space and location in urban communities and urban politics.

**The Legacies of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.** Edited by Bernard Grofman. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000. 320p. \$55.00 cloth, \$16.50 paper.

Mary Coleman, *Jackson State University*

Under what conditions, if any, do policies designed to enhance black Americans' citizenship succeed? At what pace and with what apparent and real benefits and costs to the public interest and public good do they do so? These are questions that this important volume seeks to evoke in readers. The contributors offer approaches and answers that are often robust and often at variance one with the other. Most provide insights that could lead to demonstrably better research programs for social policy than exist presently.

David B. Filvaroff and Raymond E. Wolfinger examine the intersection of policy interests at the executive and legislative levels and the protest and leadership mobilization in communities of good will throughout the nation. The nonviolent movement's message of citizenship and justice for blacks resonated throughout the world and gave rise to policy mobilization of unprecedented magnitude. This chapter alone should be of interest to students of Congress, to scholars of mass movements and public policy, and to stu-