

power are the democratic “rules of the game.” Overall, Kyle finds generally low participation and success rates by recycled dictators in all 12 cases. In a combined 63 presidential candidacies by recycled dictators, only 7 resulted in victory (53). The largely weak performance of recycled dictators in elections is convincing evidence in support of the author’s conclusion that democracy is now the only game in town.

There are, however, some questions that linger after reading the book. It is somewhat unclear whether it is a stable and competitive party system or time under democracy before dictatorship that is doing most of the heavy lifting in a given case. His historical chapters emphasize party consolidation, which itself may be endogenous to structural factors other than democratic continuity, such as variability in political coalitions due to landholding inequality, urbanization, or the impact of earlier agrarian reforms (see Michael Albertus, *Autocracy and Redistribution: The Politics of Land Reform*, 2015). I would be interested in a lengthier discussion of the differing effects of time under democracy on the one hand, and party formation on the other, regarding the competitiveness of recycled dictators under democracy. In addition, recent empirical research shows the impact of constitutional reform under dictatorship and political institutions, such as proportional representation, on the uncertainty of autocrats under transition (see Michael Albertus and Victor Menaldo, “Dealing with Dictators: Negotiated Democratization and the Fate of Outgoing Autocrats,” *International Studies Quarterly* 58, 3, 2014). Though Kyle does reference institutions throughout the book, his framework does not explicitly specify the relationship between the institutional environment and the uncertainty that outgoing regimes face as they transition toward democracy.

I look forward to future work that seeks to unpack postauthoritarian politics with an eye to the political developments that precede the previous regime, whether democratic or some other form of authoritarian rule. In this regard, Kyle puts forth a welcome contribution that paves the way for additional avenues of inquiry, not just in Latin America but also across the developing world. By focusing more on how antecedent conditions combine with particular types of democratic transitions, democratization scholars can continue to develop more nuanced understandings of postauthoritarian politics.

David N. Lopez  
University of Washington

---

Richard Nadeau, Éric Bélanger, Michael S. Lewis-Beck, Mathieu Turgeon, and François Gélinau, *Latin American Elections: Choice and Change*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017. Tables, figures, 248 pp.; hardcover \$70, ebook.

Systematic scholarship on mass political behavior in Latin America is no longer a marginal enterprise, but ’twas not always thus. When I began graduate school in 1994, the study of public opinion and voting behavior in the region seemed poised for takeoff because of democratization and the emergence of a new generation of quantitatively trained Latin Americanists. However, scholarship in Latin American

politics took an institutional turn, as political scientists focused on parties, legislatures, electoral systems, and other kinds of rules and organizations.

Fortunately, this turned out to be a temporary delay. In the last decade, Latin American survey data (that adhere to academic standards) have proliferated, thanks in part to the biannual efforts of the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP), which began in 2004. Moreover, in the last five years alone, numerous monographs and edited volumes on the topic have been published. The groundbreaking and award-winning *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism* (Susan Stokes et al. 2013) was soon followed by a bevy of books on clientelism and vote buying in the region (e.g., Rebecca Weitz-Shapiro, *Curbing Clientelism in Argentina*, 2014) and the ambitious and wide-ranging edited volume *The Latin American Voter* (Carlin et al. 2015). In short, Latin American voting behavior is finally a hot topic in political science.

*Latin American Elections* wades into this booming territory with an important contribution that seeks to bring theoretical order to the newfound diversity of findings in the field. The authors import from U.S. voting studies the Michigan model and its “funnel of causality” theoretical framework. Developed in the 1950s, the funnel of causality groups the causes of vote choice into a set of categories that are ordered from long-term, slow-moving forces (such as race, gender, and class) to short-term ones that are idiosyncratic to each election (such as performance and candidate evaluations). The authors organize the book around these causal categories, with chapters on demographics, socioeconomic affiliations, partisanship and ideology, and positional and valence issues.

To test a variety of hypotheses in each category, the authors estimate regression models of vote choice using LAPOP data from 2008, 2010, and 2012. LAPOP typically does not poll during election campaigns, so the authors use as their dependent variable a measure of vote intention (in a hypothetical election to occur in the next few days) for the incumbent party or candidate. The authors pool respondents from 18 countries across all three years into statistical models that include various measures of the funnel of causality categories. Across the categories, the authors argue that demographic and socioeconomic factors have the weakest (but still nonzero) effects on vote intention, partisanship has the strongest effects, and ideology and issues yield effects that fall somewhere in between. The authors also report results from sets of single-country models and show how the weights of different factors vary cross-nationally.

The statistical significance of various Michigan model factors leads the authors to make their summary conclusion: “the behavior of voters in the region rests on the same foundations identified elsewhere in the world” (124). The weights of the different factors may vary across world region and countries, but the authors justify this conclusion on the grounds that the collective factors of the Michigan model account for a good deal of the individual-level variance in voting behavior. At the same time, one of the values of their approach is that the authors are able to determine that the impacts of some factors, especially partisanship and ideology, are not as strong in Latin America as they are in the United States and Western Europe. The authors do

consider one factor that has received much scholarly attention in Latin America but that is not part of the Michigan model—vote buying—and conclude that vote buying is not all that prevalent.

The authors are to be commended for making *Latin American Elections* a short and readable volume (144 pages of text). Not surprisingly, a book of this brevity glosses over some things that would have made the argument more compelling and convincing. On the theoretical side, the argumentation is not always grounded in the Latin American context and literature. The authors instinctively begin each theoretical section by talking about the effect of the variable at hand (e.g., class, ideology) on voting behavior in the United States or Western Europe. They then transition to a discussion of how this variable may matter in Latin America, but this is typically brief and somewhat bereft of relevant information about the realities and contexts in Latin America.

For example, in one such paragraph, the authors write, “There is no clear reason to expect that this [positive] relationship between income and right-leaning vote choice ought to be different in the emerging economies of Latin America” (48). In actuality, this statement overlooks the large literature on the relative absence of class voting in Latin America. As another example, the authors derive some hypotheses under the assumption that left-of-center (right-of-center) parties in Latin America espouse the same kinds of policies and stable ideologies as do left-of-center (right-of-center) parties in the United States and Western Europe. However, when it comes to redistribution and welfare states, a recurring finding in Latin American political economy is that right-leaning parties have been, in recent years, almost as likely as left-leaning ones to implement progressive social policies. All told, the theoretical arguments and hypotheses sometimes fail to fully exit the shadow of the established democracy contexts from which they are derived.

On the empirical side, some readers may not entirely agree with the authors’ interpretations of their statistical results. The authors read their coefficients as sound estimates of causal effects and provide rather little discussion of the potential for reverse causation or confounding. For example, they conclude that “partisanship is the key determinant of voting behavior in Latin America” because their measures of partisanship correlate more strongly with vote intention than do their other independent variables (120). However, they do not explore whether partisanship is the exogenous unmoved mover (in their words, an “anchor variable”) that is implied by this statement. Indeed, the correlation between respondents’ expressed sympathy for a party and their hypothetical choice for the “party or candidate of the incumbent president” borders on the tautological, especially since survey interviews typically occurred outside the context of a campaign with actual candidates.

Similarly, the authors decline to wrestle with the motivated reasoning logic that would make respondents’ evaluations of corruption, democracy, and public safety under the incumbent endogenous to hypothetical vote intention for the incumbent. Finally (and admittedly nitpicky), the authors do not adjust for the violation of statistical independence that is introduced by pooling respondents for all countries and years. Because of this, their reported standard errors may be too small.

These issues notwithstanding, the value of *Latin American Elections* lies in the application of a unified but also flexible framework to a set of explanations and a literature that is now swimming in hypotheses and findings. The funnel of causality could provide a means of cross-national comparison—something that has been overlooked, given the concept's single-country origins—by allowing researchers to explain the country-level variation in weights that voters apply to different factors. It also forces subsequent scholars of voting behavior to be more explicit and careful about where causal factors fall in a complex chain of events. (Given the availability of panel data from the region, this could be a fruitful area of subsequent research.) As they put it, the authors have taken Michigan south, providing a model of theoretical unity to the study of voting behavior in Latin America.

Andy Baker  
University of Colorado, Boulder

---

Alexander Wilde, ed., *Religious Responses to Violence: Human Rights in Latin America Past and Present*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2016. Table, figures, abbreviations, bibliography, index, 520 pp.; hardcover \$125, paperback \$49.

One of the challenges of contemporary Latin American scholarship is to understand the disjunctures and continuities between an authoritarian past when democracy was an unmitigated good to be contrasted with the violence of authoritarian states, and a present in which democracy is showing its frayed edges. Many democratic governments in the region fail to provide security to their citizens; other democratic governments have become authoritarian, facilitated in part by the frustration of citizens over this lack of security. In the current context, violence has become pluralized, and a burgeoning literature has come forth with remarkable studies of violence by scholars such as Desmond Arias, Daniel Goldstein, and Javier Auyero. Yet it is still not easy to come to a clear portrait of how we got from there to here, or what the way forward is. Alexander Wilde's edited volume provides an essential contribution to our developing understanding, looking at religious responses to violence in the region.

The first half of the book provides a significant revision of scholarship on the role of religion in addressing violence from the 1960s to the 1980s in its focus on human rights. While we know the importance of the Second Vatican Council in the reorientation of the church's pastoral attention to a preferential option for the poor, it has long been apparent that many of the church's most important contributions came not directly from liberation theology and pastoral action from below, but from broader, more institutionalized challenges to authoritarian states. In this book, Wilde and a number of other contributors reveal the importance the concept of human rights had in this process.

As developed in the 1960s, liberation theology focused on structural causes of injustice and did not reject violent struggle. It provided an important motivating ideology for many radical priests and even some guerrilla movements, but it was