

Farrington then focuses on the complex calculus faced particularly by middle- and upper-class African Americans during the 1960 election. He provides an extensive treatment of the watershed election of 1964, focusing in Chapter 5 on the rise of the conservative right and the Goldwater candidacy and in Chapter 6 on the increasing attachment of racial conservatives—particularly southern racial conservatives—to the Republican Party in the aftermath of Goldwater’s historic loss. African American Republicans always faced a difficult political situation because of the number of racially conservative Southerners and the consistent attempts by both parties to attract this constituency. Only in the aftermath of John F. Kennedy’s assassination and then the largest popular-vote presidential victory in modern American history by Lyndon Johnson does the calculus change.

The late 1960s and early 1970s bring some hope to blacks within the GOP. *Black Republicans* characterizes Richard Nixon as one of the stronger supporters of Civil Rights within the Republican Party (but beyond the Rockefeller wing of the party), and there were significant hopes for movement on Civil Rights and economic issues with his election. For example, patronage, set-asides for African American businesses, and federal support for historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) were of significance to black Republicans throughout this time period. By the onset of the Reagan administration, these hopes are dashed. Likewise, any advantage the Republican Party had in the realm of support for African American Civil Rights had also ended (and clearly ended) by the Reagan administration.

The book ends with an increasingly dispiriting characterization of the potential for either Civil Rights or economic policy advances—for poor, working-class, middle-class, or upper-class blacks—through support for the Republican Party. Farrington concludes that the blacks who remained in the organizational party were “far more conservative than their predecessors” (p. 230). And even these conservative “black Republicans . . . faced an uphill battle for full acceptance inside the party” (p. 231).

Farrington’s exhaustive coverage of black leaders’ involvement with the Republican Party during this time period is extraordinary. A singular strength of this research is its insightful coverage of the *federal* character of partisan attachment. Rather than focusing solely on the organizational party dynamics at the national level, the author illustrates how black leaders in the party made significant political and policy inroads at the state and, even more obviously, at the local level.

The careful examination of the multigenerational class conflict on social welfare policy within the black community is another strength of the book. But the analysis of the intersection of economic issues and Civil Rights issues within the African American community could be more effective. Why, for example, did black Republicans during the Nixon years shift their emphasis from Civil

Rights to economic issues? Why did they take stances that “were more unambiguously conservative, touting individual opportunity as the key to black advancement” (p. 195)? Given this shift, is the conservatism of black Republicans during and after the Reagan administration such a surprise? What is most interesting here is that Farrington’s analysis indicates that these issues were viewed *independently*, and it suggests that black Republicans at this time did not see a connection between the continued expansion of Civil Rights and broader efforts to achieve social justice. In hindsight, that is somewhat difficult to understand, and a more comprehensive treatment of the interplay between these issue sets is warranted.

Likewise, the description and analysis of the “two-party” strategy could be more compelling. On its face, the two-party strategy makes political sense: willingly align with whichever party most clearly supports your policy goals. In any particular electoral context, ticket splitting—particularly in the time period of the analysis—would be an effective political tool. In Farrington’s discussion, however, the “federal” nature of the strategy is under-emphasized. (In fact, neither “federalism” nor “two-party strategy” appear in the appendix.)

Also, Farrington’s analysis of the two-party strategy ignores the impact of the 1965 Voting Rights Act on it. As African Americans mobilized to vote following the passage of the VRA, they overwhelmingly moved into the Democratic Party. This mobilization was a key factor in the shift of southern conservative whites into the Republican Party. This demographic shift ended whatever claims the Republican Party had to being the party of Civil Rights, and with it, the rationale—from a Civil Rights perspective—of the two-party strategy. That aspect of this historical narrative should figure more prominently in Farrington’s analysis.

Finally, it is sometimes difficult to keep track of key quantitative data in a book without charts, graphs, or maps. For example, it is suggested that poor and working-class African Americans greatly outnumbered middle- and upper-class blacks during this time period. A simple graph illustrating this point would have been very helpful. Likewise, illustrating the prevalence of ticket splitting among blacks during this period would have helped readers fully understand the two-party strategy. Overall, however, this is a valuable new contribution to our understanding of African American political behavior, partisan dynamics, and twentieth-century American politics more generally.

The Imprint of Congress. By David R. Mayhew. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017. 176p. \$35.00 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S1537592718003675

— John D. Griffin, *University of Colorado Boulder*

Having spent an illustrious career studying the U.S. Congress, it perhaps comes as little surprise that *The*

Imprint of Congress reflects David Mayhew's deep affection for the institution. There is a reverence for the work that has taken place in the Capitol building in this monograph this is at once refreshing and endearing. There is also a creative and important argument put forth, one that engages big questions, perhaps the biggest questions, of how institutions support democratic stability and effectiveness in the face of the challenges that history presents.

"What has been Congress's imprint on American society and life?" is the central question motivating this investigation (p. 1). The term "imprint" is a carefully selected one; for Mayhew, the term is meant to convey something longer lasting and more deeply embedded than simply the impact or effect of regular legislative activity. Instead, the opportunity for Congress to make an imprint, for Mayhew, arises in the face of historical, transnational "impulses" that can challenge America's regime stability and legitimacy. By "impulse," he means that "a patch of activity flashes up, occurs, and arrives at a common end-state in a variety of countries, including the United States, during a common time span" (p. 13). Mayhew identifies 13 such major challenges in the nation's history: launching the new nation; continental expansion; modernizing liberalism; building an industrial economy; taming corporate excess; international expansion; responding to the Great Depression; building a welfare state; post—World War II prosperity; the Civil Rights revolution; economic liberalization; addressing climate change; and alleviating public debt. He asks: How well did America perform compared to other countries facing these same impulses or challenges, and what role did Congress play in crafting and executing (i.e., imprinting) America's strategy to manage them?

After a systematic examination of each episode, Mayhew concludes that the performance of the United States, compared to its international peers, was better, or "out front," on four of 13 impulses (launch of the new nation, building an industrial economy, rising to world power, and post—World War II prosperity), typical of other countries in eight cases, and a laggard in one case (response to climate change). In terms of whether Congress or the president was crucial, or the "chief lever" of policy change, Mayhew identifies just one case where this role belonged to Congress (taming corporations and the wealthy), six cases where the responsibility was shared between Congress and the Executive Branch, and six cases where the president led the charge (pp. 96–97). And yet, despite presidential prominence in several domains, the imprint of Congress on the country's fortunes originates from its unique ability to legitimize policy outcomes.

There are several notable contributions in this book. The role Congress has played in addressing the major challenges and opportunities facing this country is a topic seldom addressed. Scott Adler and John Wilkerson's

Congress and the Politics of Problem Solving (2012) and Laurel Harbridge's work on bipartisanship come to mind as notable exceptions. Work in this vein is admirable for its ambition and willingness to engage a big question, even if it sometimes, as in *Imprint*, entails some loss of rigor for want of sufficient observations, or, as Mayhew acknowledges, it makes for a "loose speculative analysis" (p. 4).

Another contribution of this work is that what we think of as a relatively insular American politics is often symptomatic of broader international trends. Recognizing these patterns is important because in crafting policy solutions, we may need to account for external, reinforcing factors. As well, we can learn from other countries' experiences confronting these challenges. From a research perspective, acknowledging the international context allows for the type of cross-country comparisons at the heart of *Imprint*, which would otherwise be limited to over-time, domestic comparisons.

Finally, the book also contributes to our understanding of political leadership. The congressional strategies Mayhew examines are not merely an outgrowth of the attitudes of American citizens. Elected officials have often taken the initiative in facing national and international challenges, even if this entailed some electoral risk. As he puts it, "representative assemblies do indeed violate the views of the median voter. . . . [T]hey do it all the time. We expect assemblies to do that. That is one reason for having assemblies" (p. 102).

Anticipating a likely challenge to his enterprise, Mayhew is careful to distance himself from the view that all the historical impulses he examines are morally admirable (pp. 13–14). Indeed, he characterizes one of the 13 impulses, continental expansion, as "quite appalling" (p. 14). He divorces the question of whether the United States performed better than other countries and whether Congress led U.S. performance from the question of whether "in casting our eyes back today we are delighted or appalled at what went on" (p. 14). And yet, what we make of evidence that America's performance was "typical" and that Congress's role was "dominant" has a lot to do with the normative standing of the objective. If we adjudge continental expansion to be appalling in its effects, then Congress's role in America's successful expansion, and more broadly Congress's imprint on American society, takes on a new cast.

Mayhew's story is also one in which Congress is a relatively unitary actor. This may oversimplify, in some of his cases, where the institution has been fractured along partisan or ideological lines. Indeed, Mayhew points out that a key role for Congress is to confront a polarized and heterogeneous public and to craft singular, coherent policies. Of course, just as Americans have often been divided, Congress has been divided as well. Future research could probe for analogous evidence of party or ideological imprinting on American politics.

What readers primarily will take away from Mayhew's account, however, is that Congress has demonstrated leadership to help the country manage history's

challenges. That, and his affection for the institution that has been the subject of his scholarly life, stand out clearly in this book.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Party Systems in Latin America: Institutionalization, Decay, and Collapse. Edited by Scott Mainwaring. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018. 522p. \$120.00 cloth, \$39.99 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592718003602

— Raúl L. Madrid, *University of Texas at Austin*

Almost 25 years ago, Scott Mainwaring and Timothy R. Scully published an edited volume, *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America* (1995), that developed the concept of party system institutionalization and helped set the agenda for a wave of research on political parties in Latin America and beyond. Mainwaring's latest edited volume, *Party Systems in Latin America: Institutionalization, Decay, and Collapse*, takes up where the previous work left off, surveying developments in Latin American party systems over the last few decades.

The new volume is much more than an update—it covers a great deal of new ground and makes a significant conceptual and empirical contribution to the literature on political parties. In the Introduction and the first two chapters, Mainwaring reconceptualizes party system institutionalization and uses the new concept to measure changes in it in the entire region since 1990. (Chapter 1 was coauthored with Fernando Bizzarro and Ana Petrova.) In Chapter 3, Mainwaring explores party system institutionalization's consequences for democracy, and in Chapter 4, he and Bizzarro examine the factors that are correlated with party system institutionalization in the region. Chapters 5–11 consist of detailed case studies of party system stability and change in seven Latin American countries (Chile, Brazil, Mexico, Colombia, Argentina, Venezuela, and Peru), all of which were written by a distinguished group of U.S. and Latin American scholars. Chapters 12–15 consist of comparative analyses. Noam Lupu analyzes how the undermining of party brands contributed to partisan erosion and party breakdown in Argentina, Bolivia, and Chile in Chapter 12. Jason Seawright uses machine learning to examine party systems' roots in society in Chapter 13, and Gustavo A. Flores-Macías explores the impact of party system institutionalization on economic policymaking and performance in Chapter 14. Finally, in Chapter 15, Allen Hicken and Rachel Beatty Riedl compare party systems in Latin America to those in Africa and Southeast Asia.

The most important contribution of the volume is the reconceptualization of party system institutionalization, which will, no doubt, be incorporated by future scholarship on this topic. In their 1995 volume, Mainwaring

and Scully conceived party system institutionalization as having four dimensions: 1) the stability of interparty competition; 2) the strength of the parties' roots in society; 3) the popular legitimacy of parties and elections; and 4) the solidity of party organizations. In this volume, however, Mainwaring and his collaborators (p. 17) dispense with the latter three dimensions on the grounds that they facilitate party system institutionalization but do not define it. The stability of interparty competition, they argue convincingly, represents the core of party system institutionalization. In highly institutionalized party systems, the main parties are stable, as are their vote shares, and their linkages to voters (p. 21). This reconceptualization focuses and simplifies the concept, and makes it easier to measure.

Another important contribution is with respect to measurement. In Chapter 3, Mainwaring identifies 13 indicators that can be used to measure party system institutionalization, and employs them to assess changes in party system institutionalization in all Latin American countries except Cuba. These indicators measure not only the stability in aggregate patterns of interparty competition but also the durability of the main contenders and the ideological stability of parties in the legislature. He uses these indicators to measure party system institutionalization in both presidential and legislative elections and with respect to different time periods. The measures yield similar trends and patterns of variance in most cases, and many of the results will come as no surprise to scholars of Latin American parties and elections. Although many scholars will not find it necessary to use all 13 indicators that Mainwaring has employed here, the indicators provide a useful range of measures that scholars can choose from to suit their own purposes. Moreover, Mainwaring has provided a great service by making this valuable data set available in an online appendix.

The third contribution is empirical. The volume significantly advances our understanding of the evolution of party systems in the region. Chapters 5–12 provide persuasive explanations for the consolidation, stasis, or decline of party system institutionalization in eight Latin American countries. They carefully show why and how party systems evolved during this period, and they discuss some of the consequences of these changes.

Nevertheless, *Party Systems in Latin America* is more of a conceptual and empirical contribution than a theoretical one. Many of the theoretical arguments in the volume have been made previously by the authors in other venues. For example, Chapters 3, 12 and 14 are all well done and largely convincing, but they draw extensively on