as likely to die of a stroke under the age of 65 than other racial groups. In the end, Douglas's chapter suggests why there needs to be further work on how politics affects health, particularly the health of Black women.

"Hiding in Plain Slight" is Keesha M. Middlemass's study of Black women ex-felons. Lacking a clear rationale, a number of policies and laws that Middleman discusses make it difficult for ex-felons to reenter society. Her interviews with female clients of a nonprofit organization in Newark, New Jersey, find that they are well aware of these state-sanctioned barriers to rebuilding their lives, yet these women do not want to return to prison. Were these barriers made visible to government officials, lawmakers, and the public, the irrationality of a legal system that effectively marginalizes them would be exposed, and barriers to ex-felon reentry might be removed.

In "The Politics of Bread Making in Honduras's Garifuna Community," K. Melchor Quick Hall contends that this tribe is, in fact, Black. The author shows how family relations, winning recognition as an indigenous tribe, and the act of making cassava bread by Garifuna women are forms of resistance to neoliberal land reform in Honduras. Maziki Thame examines the leadership role of Jamaica's first woman prime minister, Portia Simpson-Miller. Simpson-Miller subverted negative stereotypes about Jamaican women to appeal to the poor but still was unable to overturn Jamaica's paternalistic power structure.

The campaign to fight obesity of Michelle Obama, the first Black First Lady, created a safe narrative and did not challenge deeply entrenched negative understandings of Black life. Grace E. Howard writes that the narrative that Obama chose was "the one with bootstraps," in which health and obesity were presented as the outcome of personal choices made by ethnic communities and the poor, children as well as adults. Because obesity in the Black community was largely presented as the product of bad parenting, the public health campaign did not address the role in fostering obesity of the lack of access to fresh food, medical care, and exercise space.

Tonya M. Williams's chapter surveys the engagement of health and reproductive rights nonprofits in Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas in the legislative debate leading to the passage of the 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA). To secure its passage, a deal was cut among lawmakers that blocked federal funds for abortion coverage. One-half of the surveyed nonprofit groups mobilized and engaged in demonstrations and petition drives during the legislative debate over the ACA, and one-half encouraged their constituents to contact their representatives. In in-depth interviews, the heads of these nonprofit groups expressed concern that the ACA might not benefit Black women equally because of their lack of knowledge about personal health care and limited experience with the health care system. Thus, as Williams shows, there was concern that the ACA could be another major government program like Social Security that in its original enactment denied coverage to many Blacks. In addition, even though the ACA was designed to expand Medicare benefits to the poor in all 50 states, a number of conservative states chose not to implement that provision.

The editors of this volume contend, pessimistically, that, without a radical shift in the direction of inquiry in political science and the social sciences, Black women as political actors will remain invisible. Others would dispute the claim that, despite the growing visibility of Black women in US politics—for example, a Black woman served as First Lady from 2009 to 2016 and Kamala Harris ran for the Democratic Party presidential nomination in 2020—future research will continue to ignore the role of Black women in US politics and society. Other signs of change today could include Black women feminists moving from the margins to lead universities and departments, direct graduate programs and admissions, and edit major journals, as well as core courses taught at major universities on Black women in politics—some of which has already happened.

However, the editors leave one with the impression that, without real structural changes in the content of existing disciplines, pessimism about centering the experience of Black women in political science research, as well as in the social sciences more broadly, is generally warranted.

Primary Elections in the United States. By Shigeo Hirano and James M. Snyder Jr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. 358p. $99.99 cloth, $34.99 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592720000481

— Barbara Norrander, *University of Arizona*
norrande@email.arizona.edu

Primary elections evoke differing views about their role in American politics. Reformers in the early twentieth century advocated for primaries to eliminate the corruption they saw in nominating conventions. Early critics argued that primary voters would be less able to recognize the strengths of various candidates and that primaries would prevent parties from nominating balanced tickets. Contemporary critics argue that low turnout results in a primary electorate composed of more extreme voters who nominate more extreme candidates, which contributes to today's polarized politics. The large social science research on primary elections also provides contradictory evidence about the nature of these elections. Shigeo Hirano and James Snyder's excellent book provides a few central themes that clarify the influence of primary elections from the beginning of the twentieth century to the early years of the twenty-first century.

Foremost, Hirano and Snyder argue that not all primaries are alike. A dominant theme throughout their book

is that the dynamics and outcomes of primary elections vary by the competitive nature of the two parties in a geographic area, whether it is a state, congressional district, or county. The advantaged party, which has the support of a larger proportion of general election voters, will have primary elections with meaningful competition and result in the nomination of highly qualified candidates. Primaries in smaller, disadvantaged parties will have fewer candidates and few qualified nominees. The main reason for this pattern, the authors argue, is the strategic behavior of qualified candidates. High-quality candidates compete in primaries where the nomination is meaningful and promises a strong potential of winning the general election.

Voters also play a role in how primary elections result in the nomination of qualified candidates, according to Hirano and Snyder. Without a partisan cue and frequently with few meaningful issue differences between candidates from the same party, primary voters focus on candidates and their qualities. Primary voters learn about the qualifying experiences of candidates from newspaper endorsements and candidates' own advertisements. When parties do have significant issue divisions, primary voters respond in kind by supporting primary candidates closer to their own issue preferences. Hirano and Snyder argue that not all primary voters have to focus on the qualifications or issue positions of candidates to produce meaningful primary results. A more astute portion of the primary electorate can swing the results to a meaningful outcome, whether it reflects the quality of the candidates or crucial issue divisions within the party.

The first half of the book examines the historical record for primary elections from their adoption in the early decades of the twentieth century through the 1950s. In the early twentieth century, one-party areas were quite common, not just in the South but also across the northern and western states. Hirano and Snyder demonstrate that primary elections were first adopted in areas of one-party dominance. Primaries introduced electoral competition in these one-party areas, at least for the advantaged party in open-seat contests. Advantaged parties had more primaries with at least two candidates, a larger number of candidates overall, and more competitive outcomes with narrower electoral victories. Primaries in the disadvantaged party lacked these competitive traits, whereas those in areas of more evenly matched parties had a level of competitive primaries somewhere in between that of advantaged and disadvantaged parties.

Hirano and Snyder also tackle questions of how primary elections affect the actions of candidates once they are elected to government office. In chapter 4, the authors ask how primary elections affect the loyalty of members to their party leaders in Congress. Their test case was the split in the Republican Party at the turn of the twentieth century, when congressional party leaders often came from eastern states where party policies protected manufacturing interests with high tariffs, and more populist and agrarian interests were represented by Republicans in states west of the Mississippi. Comparing Republican Party loyalty on roll-call votes from 1890 to 1928, a period that spans the introduction of primary elections, Hirano and Snyder find that eastern Republicans remained loyal to party leaders, but western Republicans deviated from their congressional leaders on issues where their constituents disagreed with the leaders' positions.

The second half of the book focuses on primary elections after 1950. The period of the 1950s to the 1980s differed from the earlier era by having more competitive constituencies, candidate-centered campaigns, and a strong incumbency factor. By the 1990s, these trends reversed as the era of polarized politics began. Yet some of the basic patterns from the early twentieth century continued. Competition still remained highest in the advantaged party's primaries. The most-qualified candidates still continued to run in the advantaged party's primaries and were the most likely to win. And although turnout in primaries was lower than in the earlier era, turnout levels still responded to the competitiveness of the primaries, with higher turnout in open-seat, advantaged party primaries. The authors even find evidence that primary elections are used by voters to punish misbehaving incumbents. Although less than 1% of House incumbents lose a primary election, incumbents caught up in scandals lose 14% of the time.

Chapter 11 of the book tackles the question of primaries in the current era of polarized politics. Hirano and Snyder dispute the idea that primaries cause polarization, simply because they were introduced decades before the recent increase in party polarization. As for primaries contributing to today's polarized politics, Hirano and Snyder demonstrate that low primary turnout is not a factor, because primary turnout levels are unrelated to the chances of nominating a more extreme candidate. Once again, the competitive nature of the parties matters. More extreme candidates are nominated by both the advantaged and disadvantaged parties, perhaps because voters act sincerely on their issue preferences in cases where the outcome of the general election is governed more by party identification than candidate qualities. However, Hirano and Snyder suspect that strategic primary voters are responsible for the victory of more moderate candidates in areas where both parties have a chance of winning the general election.

On the one hand, Hirano and Snyder's book reminds us that not all primaries are alike and that future scholarly research should focus on identifying differences in primaries and how these differences matter. An especially important contribution of Hirano and Snyder is their focus on the competitive status of a party as key to the nature and outcome of primaries. High-quality candidates strategically enter open primary races within the dominant party. Meanwhile, primary voters appear to behave strategically

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720000481 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by choosing more moderate candidates in areas of two-party competition. Thus, Hirano and Snyder rightfully highlight the importance of electoral competition to both the decisions of candidates and primary voters, something that future scholars should do as well. These authors also demonstrate the importance of considering differences across historical eras and variations in issue and demographic groups within a party's supporters.

On the other hand, Hirano and Snyder effectively demonstrate that contemporary concerns over differences between open and closed primaries and the role of primaries in partisan polarization may be overstated. With their analyses of primary elections from their inception at the turn of the twentieth century to the polarized politics of the early decades of the twenty-first century, Hirano and Snyder's book should be of interest to scholars of party politics, electoral politics, and American political development.

Campaigns That Matter: The Importance of Campaign Visits in Presidential Nominating Contests. By Jay Wendland. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2017. $95.00 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S1537592720000730

— Wayne P. Steger, *DePaul University*
wsteger@depaul.edu

Campaigns That Matter offers a unique look at campaign visits in the presidential nomination campaigns from 2008 to 2016. Jay Wendland places his study at the nexus of the literatures on campaign effects and presidential nominating campaigns. He analyzes campaign visits as a factor in presidential candidate strategy, the mobilization of certain groups within the party coalitions, and the nominating electorate preferences for candidates. The systematic analysis of campaign visits offers a unique contribution to the presidential nomination literature. Demonstrating the campaign effects of candidate visits is a tougher task, particularly when focusing on one kind of campaign activity amid many in a complex multicandidate campaign. The contribution is more limited in this respect.

A number of studies have looked at candidate visits as an explanatory factor for the Iowa Caucus, most notably those of Hugh Winebrenner, Rachel Caufield, and Chris Hull. These studies, however, focused on Iowa rather than the broader set of nominating elections. Wendland also looks at voter turnout and nominating voter preferences for candidates, which these and other studies did not do. He finds that candidate visits appear to be an effective strategy for lower-tier candidates who need their smaller number of supporters to turn out to vote. Front-runners, by contrast, seem to rely on media and organized field operations to mobilize supporters. Still, the effects vary considerably by candidate and by election year. Wendland finds that Romney benefited the most from state-level visits in 2012, and Trump and Clinton both benefited in 2016. The mixed results suggest that the effects of candidate visits may be highly contextual, depending on both the race and the candidate.

The literature on campaign effects generally focuses on events like televised debates, candidate gaffes or scandals, campaign spending, campaign ads or ad buys, and news media coverage—all things that can be measured temporally as intervention effects in the analysis of the ebbs and flows of public opinion. Several studies have analyzed presidential candidate visits to states, though these studies generally are qualitative (though see Chris Hull's *Grassroots Rules*, 2008, as an exception). No one has looked at the effects of candidate visits across states as a factor in voter turnout and candidate preferences, so Wendland's study contributes to our understanding of campaign effects and of presidential nominations. Wendland smartly looks at national nominating campaigns in which the powerful confounding force of partisan identification is removed from the behavioral equation and for which the sequential process provides some empirical leverage for analyzing campaign effects.

Candidate activities have a greater potential to affect presidential nomination campaigns in which the prospective voting population cannot rely on party identification to guide candidate preferences and voting decisions. In this context, Wendland lays out the various ways in which candidate appearances can potentially affect a citizen's political behavior. Candidates certainly behave as if their time and efforts matter, and Wendland documents differences among candidates in this respect. During the invisible primary, nationally known candidates devote relatively more of their appearances to fundraising and visit states across the country, while lesser-known candidates focus their time in the early states on an effort to get noticed. Candidate visits track the primary schedule once voting begins. Wendland finds some evidence that candidates focus their appearances on key party constituencies whose support they need to win. Targeted campaigning seems to pay off with higher voter turnout of targeted party constituencies.

Wendland finds some evidence that campaign visits can sometimes help lesser-known candidates mobilize supporters from particular constituencies of the party coalitions. In effect, lesser-known candidates use their time to boost turnout among what is a proportionately smaller group of candidate supporters. Wendland finds mixed results when it comes to public opinion. Campaigning hard by out-visiting states relative to rival candidates seems to have helped some candidates in some years, although the effects vary across elections. Wendland's analyses include other kinds of campaign effects as well. Visits and ad buys seem to have helped Huckabee, Romney, and Clinton in 2008; Romney in 2012; and Trump in