



Ballots of Tumult: A Portrait of Volatility in American Voting.

Review Author[s]:
David W. Romero

The Journal of Politics, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Aug., 1992), 890-893.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-3816%28199208%2954%3A3%3C890%3ABOTAPO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-2>

The Journal of Politics is currently published by Southern Political Science Association.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/spsa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

an effective conservative manager of prosperity (though it deserves mention that his achievement bypassed the one in every four Americans who remained poor during the 1950s). This is an excellent book that merits attention not only from students of the Eisenhower era but also from anyone interested in the modern presidency and in American political economy.

Iwan W. Morgan, *City of London Polytechnic*

Ballots of Tumult: A Portrait of Volatility in American Voting. By Courtney Brown. (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1991. Pp. 248. \$34.50.)

Courtney Brown in *Ballots of Tumult* challenges the perception of the American electoral system as characterized by stability. The system's dynamic is provided by the social-political environment in which voters find themselves. The voters' environment encourages either "institutionalization" or "deinstitutionalization" of voting behavior. Professor Brown defines institutionalization as the establishment of longitudinally consistent patterns of electoral behavior (19).

With a new data set (extensive demographic data from approximately 3,000 countries), exhaustively compiled from various ICPSR sources, Brown investigates four American electoral behavior phenomena: the 1928–1936 realignment, third parties, congressional voting, and the extension of the vote to women. The first three provide the most interesting results. While the extension of the franchise to women is clearly a significant event in American electoral history, within Brown's framework of analysis its explanation is comparatively bland.

Brown's framework of analysis, an "ecosystem" with all its complicated interdependencies, may be unfamiliar to political scientists. So too are the methodological tools Brown employs: systems of differential equations, phase diagrams, graph algebra, and nonmutative estimation (NME). NME is discussed in an appendix, and readers who wish to explore these advanced topics are provided a well-documented literature trail. While the methods may be foreign and highly sophisticated, Brown's explication is elegant, and readers with limited mathematical training are not left in the dust of the comet's tail.

A good example is his challenge of the equilibrium bias in cross-sectional analysis, which he terms the "equilibrium fallacy" (41–43). This discussion considers cross-sectional analysis' difficulties when dynamic processes are ignored. His simple algebraic demonstration reveals the serious estimation bias that can result in cross-sectional analysis, unless, fortuitously, the system already happens to be in equilibrium.

To analyze the 1928–1936 realignment period, Professor Brown offers an

interdependent system of three nonlinear differential equations that capture the oscillations between the Democratic and Republican parties as well as between both parties and nonvoters. In addition, Brown's model differentiates between national and "conditioned" fluctuations. Conditioned fluctuations are changed within certain social subgroups (e.g., urban, worker, and farm).

Brown pursues a familiar theme in realignment research: mobilization versus conversion. He models two sorts of conversion: conversion due to the strength of the national appeal which is independent of the local partisan environment (uniform), and conversion due to social interactions (social). The social interaction aspect assumes few conversions in areas dominated by either of the parties. Conversion is therefore hypothesized to be greatest where sizeable Democratic and Republican populations coexist.

Mobilization, likewise, has its uniform and social components. The uniform component is simply a function of the number of nonvoters in a locality. The social component's theoretical base is the hypothesis that new voters will be mobilized as a function of the number of nonvoters and the level of partisan strength in the locality.

In general, Brown finds room for both conversion and mobilization. He demonstrates that 1928–1932 was dominated by conversions to the Democratic party. In contrast, Democratic gains from 1932–1936 were due primarily to mobilization. Examination of the conditioned variables reveals that farm workers made up a substantial part of Democratic converts from 1928–1932. In contrast, urban voters did not begin to mobilize in favor of the Democratic party until after the 1932 election. Finally, the uniform components of the model explain most of the system's behavior over this period.

Professor Brown's treatment of third parties relies upon five phenomena: James B. Weaver's People's party (1892), Teddy Roosevelt's Progressive party (1912), Robert La Follette's Progressive party (1924), George Wallace's American Independent party (1968), and John Anderson's Independent candidacy (1980). He addresses whether third parties serve as catalysts for realignment, springing up during low levels of voter institutionalization and dissatisfaction with major party performance, and whether their support comes from the existing parties or new voters.

Brown's findings suggest that third-party politics are characterized by weak partisan institutionalization and shifting partisan ties, within the context of a stable overall political system. For example, in 1912, most of the former Republicans who split and voted for Roosevelt returned to the Republican party in 1916. The same general pattern is true for La Follette, primarily a farm-based candidate. There were partisan differences, however. Republican La Follette supporters returned in 1928. Possibly as a reaction to the Al Smith candidacy, Democratic farm support did not return in 1928.

The theoretical implication of Brown's third-party analyses is support for

the hypothesis that they are more likely in times ripe for realignment. The La Follette case provides the clearest insight. Brown reminds us that the early phase of the realignment (1928–1932) saw dramatic shifts in farm support to the Democratic party. He speculates that by 1924 farmers were disenchanted with the Republican party and that La Follette provided them an escape. Farmers were looking for help in 1928 but neither party provided it. The Democrats in 1932 offered farmers their hope, leading to vast Democratic conversions in this election. In other words, the 1932 Republican farm revolt was waiting to happen.

The puzzle that attracts Brown to the extension of the franchise to women is that in spite of the steep increase in the size of the electorate, if anything, system stability was solidified. Basically, the answer is that there was no critical national cause for Democrats to take advantage of in 1920. As a result, the dominant political power, the Republican party, actively recruited women and was successful in its mobilization efforts.

Congressional mobilization (1950–1984) is modeled as a function of three processes: the base level of mobilization, the presidential contest, and finally, the influence of the national economy. Brown begins his analysis by neatly separating the base level of congressional mobilization for the parties from presidential contest effects. In regard to base mobilization, Brown turns up an interesting result. The decline in congressional mobilization evident in recent elections seems to have a partisan asymmetry. It appears to be a consequence of a decline in base-level Republican, but not Democratic, mobilization.

Brown takes a fresh look at a recurrent theme: the “surge and decline” in congressional turnout. Institutionalization in this context means habitual voting in both on- and off-year elections. The more “institutionalized” the voter, the less susceptible he or she is to the hoopla of presidential contests.

Brown’s treatment allows him to sort out the influence of a number of social conditions (southern-nonsouthern, pre- and post-1964, southern pre- and post-1964, pre- and post-1964 for African-Americans and whites, pre- and post-1964 for southern African-Americans and whites, pre- and post-1964 for nonsouthern African-Americans and whites) on congressional mobilization. Some interesting insights result.

In particular, Brown offers dismal prospects for an increase in Republican congressional mobilization in the near future. Because southern white voters are highly institutionalized Democratic supporters, he hypothesizes that Republican fortunes will most likely have to wait for generational replacement to take its course. Also, regarding Republican wooing of African-American voters to increase their competitiveness in the South, Brown offers this speculation: “These results suggest a brief campaign for African-American support is likely to have little long-lasting effect. On the other hand, if the Republican party actively seeks African-American support, there may be a

consequent drop in their white support; such a loss may be very hard to recover" (184).

In sum, Professor Brown has authored a book that is "must" reading for students of American electoral politics. His sophisticated analyses challenge political scientists to perceive the American electoral system as teeming with activity, and demonstrates that, with the right set of circumstances, dramatic change is certainly possible.

David W. Romero, *University of California, Riverside*

Issue Evolution: Race and the Transformation of American Politics. By Edward G. Carmines and James A. Stimson. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989. Pp. xvii, 217. \$27.50.)

Carmines and Stimson offer a fascinating and sophisticated analysis of the development, or evolution, of what seems to be becoming, day by day, the defining political issue of our time—race. In the course of arguing that racial policies and attitudes toward race have become the critical dimension underlying and distinguishing the coalitions of the two American parties, the authors make two additional points, not original with them, but well worth the dramatic emphasis that they provide. The first of these points stresses the critical role of political leadership in electoral change—the electorate does not act spontaneously but rather responds to the actions and rhetoric of those who purport to speak in the parties' names. The second point reminds us of the role of happenstance in processes of dynamic change. We may not be able to predict in advance the shape that change will take, even though hindsight may make clear the explanatory role of certain events.

Since the 1950s an historic transformation of the political parties has taken place. The party of Lincoln has become the party of racial conservatism while the party of segregation has become the champion of racial equality. How did this transformation come about? An obvious landmark was the election of 1964 with the positions of the presidential candidates on racial issues clearly staked out, followed by the War on Poverty policies enacted by the Democrats. Just as crucial, Carmines and Stimson argue, was the Senate election of 1958, in which the landslide victory of the Democrats—won on economic, not racial issues—happened to replace 10 Republican racial liberals with 10 Democratic racial liberals. Thus, an election having nothing to do with race had the effect of creating visible party leaderships distinctly different from each other and from their respective pasts. As racial issues became more salient in the 1960s, the public would take note.

As interesting and persuasive as any part of this work is the analysis of the role of party actives—the middle levels of leadership—in the process of issue evolution. During the 1960s, Carmines and Stimson argue, the party