

The Academy of Political Science

475 Riverside Drive · Suite 1274 · New York, New York 10115-1274
(212) 870-2500 · FAX: (212) 870-2202 · aps@psqonline.org · <http://www.psqonline.org>

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY

Volume 126 · Number 4 · Winter 2011-2012

No part of this article may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except:

- one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or
- with prior written permission of The Academy of Political Science.

Political Science Quarterly is published by The Academy of Political Science. Contact the Academy for further permission regarding the use of this work.

Political Science Quarterly
Copyright © 2011 by The Academy of Political Science. All rights reserved.

But when the club goes corporate, it must hire workers “not committed to seeing the business prosper.” The “natural” solution (p. 144) is for the stakeholders to direct the workers. (Would the Quakers do it this way?) Cooks Island requires plans “to force each member of the group to internalize the costs and benefits of his or her actions” (p. 159). From this analysis arises the “Planning Theory of Law” under which “*Legal systems are institutions of social planning*” whose purpose is “*to compensate for the deficiencies of alternative forms of planning in the circumstances of legality*” (p. 171, emphasis original). James Madison, Shapiro concludes, was wrong: government would be necessary even if men were angels.

The political scientist may be forgiven some skepticism about Shapiro’s premises. Since “the anthropological literature suggests that intergroup violence...was quite extensive,” (p. 409, n. 3), the reader might wonder what happened after one group prevailed. If conquest does not result in law, how not? To explain law through consensus rather than conflict biases the enterprise and weakens the claims Shapiro makes for his book.

JUDITH BAER
Texas A&M University

Why Iowa? How the Caucuses and Sequential Elections Improve the Presidential Nominating Process by David P. Redlawsk, Caroline J. Tolbert, and Todd Donovan. Chicago, IL, The University of Chicago Press, 2011. 336 pp. Cloth, \$85.00; paper, \$27.50.

The 2012 presidential race is well under way, and with it comes a groundbreaking study of the Iowa caucuses and the U.S. nomination system. *Why Iowa* is fascinating, rich in new gems unearthed in its data that will substantially advance the U.S. presidential nomination literature.

The book has three main parts: an explanation of Iowa’s rules and their impact on the contest; an analysis of the caucuses in the context of the nomination system’s sequential voting system; and an exploration of reform proposals’ public support and normative worth.

The work brings a number of innovations to the table. For instance, David Redlawsk, Caroline Tolbert, and Todd Donovan do an admirable job of exploring the expectations game in a way that the literature has neglected. That exploration begins with a fabulous compilation of media characterizations of what a 23–26 percent outcome in the caucuses means for differently situated candidates, ranging from a “comfortable second,” to a “strong second,” to a “flat tire,” to an “overwhelming defeat” (p. 144).

The authors measure media expectations using changes in coverage after the contest, which they liken to analysts’ expectations and changes in stock prices after an earnings announcement (p. 144). Even without capturing positive and negative effect in the coverage, this factor has a statistically

significant impact on nomination outcomes, controlling for percentage of the vote in Iowa and whether a candidate won the New Hampshire Primary (p. 260, Table A.7.4). Given that past models in the literature rarely find a direct effect from Iowa's vote percentage, this means that factoring in media expectations better specifies a model of nomination performance with respect to Iowa's role.

In plain English, Redlawsk and his colleagues appear to have demonstrated statistically not just that Iowa plays a role in determining nomination outcomes, but how it plays that role: a candidate's raw performance in the Hawkeye State matters relative to how that performance factors in to media expectations (as well as candidate performance in the Granite State thereafter, granted). The work also turned up the amusing finding that the Obama campaign targeted Republican caucus-goers, making more door-knocking calls on them than their own GOP campaigns did (pp. 83–84, T-4.1). And Redlawsk and his colleagues uncover an eyebrow-raising result along the same lines: 2008 Democratic caucus-goers were actually *older* than their GOP counterparts in the state, in spite of the hype about Obama driving younger voters to the polls (p. 91).

Another curveball: Iowa Republicans in 2008 were actually slightly but significantly more active online than Democrats virtually across the board (pp. 109–111, F-5.8). The authors' explanation makes good sense: GOP respondents were higher income and more-educated and therefore more likely to be online generally.

A final finding that militates against conventional wisdom—a phrase of which Redlawsk and his colleagues may be a bit too fond—was that 2008 Iowa caucus attendees were actually fairly representative of the state's registered voters, which is a good wake-up call for both nomination scholars and the public at large (pp. 136–138).

Finally, *Why Iowa* makes a powerful argument for, well, why Iowa: because, in 2008, we saw a candidate like Obama learning from the caucus how to campaign face to face—and defeat a powerful front-runner.

For nomination scholars and generalists alike, *Why Iowa* is worth its weight in gold, even at today's prices.

CHRISTOPHER C. HULL
Georgetown University

Reading Obama: Dreams, Hope, and the American Political Tradition
by James T. Kloppenberg. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 2010. 296 pp. \$24.95.

Two years into his presidency, Barack Obama's critics on the left have accused him of selling out, while his critics on the right have written him off as an unrepentant liberal. *Reading Obama* is an attempt, by historian James Kloppenberg, to proffer an exculpatory account that could potentially reconcile