

voting and thus merit further study in this context, further work on the conditions under which they can have this effect is needed. Specifically, I wonder whether voters should be brought back into the story as agents, choosing to respond to campaign appeals that bring them back to their core concerns, or if voters instead passively accept whatever agenda candidates lay out.

The role of structural factors in constraining priming choices is also left largely unexplored in the present analysis. While the elections analyzed by Hart include both strong and weak economies, it is unclear how much leverage candidates can have following a true crisis. As John McCain's pollster Bill McInturff said about campaign strategy after the Lehman Brothers' collapse in 2008, "The campaign implodes. There is no campaign anymore. There is only the economic crisis in America, and what you want to say about [it]" (Institute of Politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government. *Campaign for President: The Managers Look at 2008*, p. 204). During periods of war, during a deep recession, or after extreme violence, politicians may be less able to shift the public agenda than in politically normal times similar to those explored in this book.

I also wanted to know more about whether the effectiveness of accountability priming differs within the electorate. Other studies find that certain groups are predisposed to focus on economic issues, compared to other issue publics with alternative concerns. Do activating campaigns affect the behavior of all of these groups? If not, these distinct, motivated issue publics might limit the ability of candidates to deflect or focus accountability. Further subgroup analysis into voters who changed their behavior and emphasized the economy after being exposed to a priming message would have clarified how much control parties have over the agenda.

Finally, this book leaves unanswered one of the questions that it uses to motivate the analysis: Do differences in campaign styles explain how the economy's effect varies across countries? Is the effect of campaign strategies larger than the effect of structural variables (clarity of responsibility, globalization, etc.) that previous studies emphasize? The limiting factor is likely a lack of reliable, comparable measures of campaign messages. Hopefully this book can motivate further work to reliably measure campaign content cross-nationally in order to answer these questions.

These open questions, however, should not overshadow the importance of what Hart has accomplished in this book. It provides clear evidence that campaigns matter and that candidates can and do shape accountability processes. It also is an example of cross-national campaign analyses that should be emulated. And it raises important questions about whether incumbent candidates can shirk accountability and the importance of meaningful opposition parties to focus the electorate on

key elements of incumbent performance. Students of campaign effects or electoral accountability will learn much from *Economic Voting* and should continue to develop the themes that Hart lays out in it.

Latin America Since the Left Turn. Edited by Tullia G. Falleti and Emilio A. Parrado. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017. 384p. \$69.95 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S153759271800436X

— Federico M. Rossi, *CONICET—National University of San Martín, Argentina*

Tullia Falleti and Emilio Parrado have put together a group of stellar scholars to discuss a great variety of topics that have been central in the last decades of Latin American social dynamics. The panorama includes contributors who go beyond political science, including sociologists, anthropologists, lawyers, historians, and economists. Even though individual chapters are not interdisciplinary, the volume offers a multidisciplinary perspective focused on the social, political, cultural, economic, and legal dimensions of Latin America.

This edited volume is structured in four parts that organize the enormous variety of topics covered, a difficult task given so many foci from such diverse points of view and scholarly approaches. The topics are covered by a first section on "models of development," a second on "democracy," a third on "citizenship," and a final one on "decolonization." However, the chapters within each section cover many more issues in addition to those mentioned. For instance, in the first section, only the first chapter by Maristella Svampa actually discusses a model of development: neoextractivism. The other chapters discuss regional integration and social and fiscal policies.

There are some chapters that offer (implicit) dialogues among contributors, such as the discussion about key policies that might allow for the reduction of socioeconomic inequality in Latin America. On the one hand, Nora Lustig and Claudiney Pereira demonstrate that there was an impressive reduction of inequality under some left-wing governments (mainly in Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay), and sparse improvements in countries that continued with the neoliberal path (mainly Peru and Mexico) due to a different combination of fiscal and social policies. On the other hand, Evelyne Huber and John Stephens show that social investment on education is as important as redistributive policies from a long-term perspective (since 1960) for the whole region.

There are some chapters that cover topics linked to the book title, such as the debate concerning the interpretation of the path and type of transformation ongoing in Venezuela since the Bolivarian Revolution. George Ciccariello-Maher says that Venezuela is more than postneoliberal, moving "toward the consolidation of a dispersed form of communal power that coexists tensely

and, increasingly, in open antagonism toward the liberal-representative apparatus” (p. 115). David Smilde offers a different interpretation of the course taken by Bolivarian Venezuela. Inspired by Michael Mann’s (1986–2013) *The Sources of Social Power* perspective, Smilde applies an original neo-Weberian argument: he argues that Venezuela is going toward a full conflict (i.e., composed of a multidimensional network of conflicts) that polarizes society. Beyond their different interpretations, Ciccariello-Maher and Smilde agree that purely liberal understandings of processes such as the Bolivarian Revolution are too narrow.

Other authors draw our attention to the way in which liberalism’s interpretive presuppositions themselves produce a liberal ethos that affects many scholars when studying the democratic experimentation happening in Latin America. For instance, Oscar Vega Camacho proposes an analysis that combines decolonial thought and the idea of plurinationality in Bolivia. And on the basis of an analysis of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, and Venezuela, Thamy Pogrebinski argues that “[o]nly a proper appraisal of Latin America’s experimentation with participation and deliberation and its interfaces with representative institutions may explain why the latter have supposedly constantly failed” (p. 260). Different from this is the view of Gisela Zarembeg, Ernesto Isunza Vera, and Adrian Gurza Lavalle, who distrust these participatory experiences when analyzing Mexico.

The contributions also include chapters that do not engage in dialogue directly with others in the volume, such as Maristella Svampa’s argument that there is apparently a new consensus on economic policy based on a neoextractivist model that dominates twenty-first-century economies in Latin America. Unfortunately, the lack of debate (even implicit) with other contributions to this volume on a topic that is so controversial is a major limitation. Left unanswered is the question of the long-term economic analysis of the reprimarization of Latin American economies that had been happening long before the Left entered into power. We could think not only of long-term cases such as Chile’s rentier logic based on copper and Venezuela’s rentier state based on oil, but also of a quasi-colonial pattern that is constantly present in banana, coffee, cacao, or petroleum-based economies, such as Ecuador, Costa Rica, Colombia, Venezuela, and—to a certain extent—even Mexico. Thus, it is unclear if—in *stricto sensu*—neoextractivism is so new for Latin America, or if it is a legacy of the colonial period that has persisted until the present day neoliberal insertion of the region into the global economy.

At its best, this collection offers a sometimes difficult dialogue among chapters that provides a rewarding overview of many important issues being grappled within Latin America. For this reason, the volume’s title seems

misleading, as it is not a collection that is focused on the Left in government, and not even on transformations that happened in the region since the Left entered into power. The volume also covers right-wing/neoliberal governments (Mexico, Colombia, Peru, mainly) as well as left-wing/populist cases (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, Venezuela, mainly).

Moreover, the volume also covers topics that are completely unrelated to the twenty-first century (a period characterized by the left turn or second wave of incorporation), or even those that started in the 1980s and continued beyond the second incorporation, such as regional integration through Mercosur (Isabella Alcañiz) and intraregional migration (Marcela Cerrutti). The variety of topics that are not linked to the left turn include, among others, Roberto Gargarella’s analysis of the origins of nineteenth-century constitutionalism and early twentieth-century bills of rights in Latin America’s hyper-presidentialisms; Irina Carlotta (Lotti) Silber’s ethnography of postwar El Salvador and the historical *longue durée* of wars; and Juliet Hooker’s historiographic debate on the anti-imperialist thoughts of José Vasconcelos and the links with his idea of the Latin American multicultural mestizo identity. While quite interesting on their own, these chapters also add complexity to the central focus promised by the volume’s title.

As such, *Latin America since the Left Turn* does not fit in easily with the discussions of the “pink tide,” “left turn,” or “second wave of incorporation” that have been developing among scholars from the North and South of the Americas, as well as some UK colleagues. Nevertheless, while lacking a common focus, the volume offers an extremely wide panorama of different interpretations of Latin America. Perhaps, though a couple of chapters might not have fit perfectly, it could have been called *Perspectives on Contemporary Latin America*. This title might have prepared the reader for a guide book to some of the crucial contemporary debates in Latin America that go beyond the “Left Turn.”

With, Without, or Against the State? How European Regions Play the Brussels Game. By Michaël Tatham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. 376p. \$90.00 cloth. doi:10.1017/S1537592718004309

— John Peterson, *University of Edinburgh*

This book appears in Oxford University Press’s first-rate Transformations in Governance series, edited by Liesbet Hooghe, Gary Marks, and Walter Mattli. Michaël Tatham seeks to make an original contribution to literatures on “new territorial order,” Europeanization, and multilevel governance by exploring how substate entities—such as the German Länder, Belgian regions, or devolved British regions—interact with their respective member states as they pursue their own interests in European Union