Weaver, mayor of Flint, both cities in Michigan. Although both mayors governed cities that were riddled with troubles surrounding economic development, crime, and poverty, Waterman and Weaver had a dissimilar set of experiences in office: Waterman was able to secure reelection and ultimately serve two terms in office, whereas Weaver had a less positive experience in Flint. Weaver's term took place during the height of the Flint water crisis, which she faced much criticism for, and she was ultimately not reelected. The authors also examine the mayorships of Unita Blackwell and Sheriel Perkins in the Mississippi Delta: both served as "historic firsts" (118), as they were the first women of any race to be elected in their respective towns. However, these women served in office nearly thirty years apart and therefore under a very different set of circumstances. Although Perkins was able to build a winning coalition of young voters, older voters, and Black female voters during the 2006 election, her vote count fell about 206 points short of her opponent, Harry Smith. A circuit court judge later found those votes to be illegal, and Perkins was ultimately voted into office in a special election, serving a two-and-a-half-year term.

One thread that unites many of these Black women is their being subjected to substantial criticisms throughout their mayorships. For example, Karen Weaver not only faced criticism for her response to the Flint water crisis but also for irrelevant factors such as her shoes, hairstyle choices, and earrings. Keisha Lance Bottoms of Atlanta also experienced her fair share of criticism, both during and after her campaign. Comments about her temperament were unsurprisingly called into question, given that they played all too well into the notorious "angry Black woman" trope. Sharon Pratt of Washington, DC, faced significant challenges during her mayorship as well. As the first Black female mayor to govern the nation's capital, Pratt "experienced challenges to her leadership defined by sexism, racial discrimination, and persisting patriarchal attitudes" beginning in 1991 (234).

These types of obstacles and criticisms faced by the Black female mayors examined are clearly indicative of a particular form of discrimination rooted simultaneously in *both* racism and sexism. The book's findings align well with those of other works suggesting that Black women often encounter a distinct set of challenges in the political realm. For example, Nadia E. Brown and Danielle Casarez Lemi explored in their 2021 book, *Sister Style: The Politics of Appearance for Black Women Political Elites*, how characteristics such as hair and skin color influence voters' attitudes toward Black women candidates and elected officials.

Another theme that is interwoven throughout the book is the deep importance of Black women's political representation because they have the power to uniquely represent the interests of the voters they serve. It becomes clear how important it is that the voters in the cities analyzed—Black voters, in particular—have political leaders that not only match their policy interests but who can also relate to their experiences in ways that non-Black or non-female mayors may not. These Black women mayors also have the ability to inspire the next generation of Black female leaders—an advantage that should not be taken lightly.

Overall, *Political Black Girl Magic* is an important work that can increase our understanding of both the obstacles and successes encountered by Black female mayors in U.S. cities. At the same time, this book will likely have a significant influence on the broader race, gender, and politics literatures with its novel in-depth, rigorous analysis of the experiences of Black female mayors. It is vital that scholars continue to make a conscious effort to critically examine the challenges faced by and the successes of Black women in the political space. Moreover, this book showcases the substantial efforts of Black female mayors to improve U.S. cities and the ways in which they, through both trials and tribulations, exude "Political Black Girl Magic" at its core.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Autocracy Rising: How Venezuela Transitioned to Authoritarianism. By Javier Corrales. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. 2022. 256p. $85.00 cloth, $32.00 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592723002670

— Orçun Selçuk, *Luther College*
selcor01@luther.edu

On December 6, 2015, opposition parties in Venezuela achieved an unprecedented victory in the parliamentary elections and won a two-thirds majority. Instead of initiating a process of democratic transition, however, this victory marked the beginning of a new era when President Nicolás Maduro decided to increase the degree of repression and quickly turned Venezuela into a full-scale authoritarian regime. In his new book, Javier Corrales considers the rise of the opposition to be the key factor that pushed Maduro to fully autocratize. He argues that when the balance of power in the party system started to favor the opposition, Maduro either had to liberalize or block the prospects of democratic change. Maduro chose the latter and succeeded because he inherited autocratic tools from Chávez and deployed them innovatively.

Autocracy Rising starts with an overview of the theoretical framework and the central theme of the transition from

semi- to full-scale authoritarianism amid the rise of the opposition and the use of autocratic tools by the government. In the second chapter, which is a quick recap of Venezuelan politics before Maduro, Corrales draws from his publications on the Chávez era and focuses on what he calls "asymmetric party system fragmentation" in shaping regime outcomes. He shows how Chávez benefited both from the fragmentation of the opposition parties and their strategic mistakes in the first decade of his presidency. As long as the asymmetric balance of power continued to favor the ruling coalition, Chávez was able to erode liberal democratic institutions and consolidate power.

Next, Corrales provides a detailed account of Venezuela's economic crisis that affected the entire region. Chapter 3 contains concrete indicators, tables, and charts that outline the extent of the economic crisis in Venezuela under Maduro. In his account of the economic collapse, Corrales prioritizes domestic policy choices over external factors like oil prices and sanctions, as comparative politics scholars typically do. He attributes the collapse to the heavily statist economic model that Maduro implemented with little flexibility. While Maduro and his cronies enjoyed greater access to material resources, average Venezuelans saw a decline in educational and health outcomes in the context of hyperinflation, shortages, and scarcity. This chapter is crucial for the book's theoretical framework because it explains why Maduro became significantly less popular. Corrales is accurate in saying that authoritarian regimes can tolerate a certain degree of economic downturn, but the severity of the crisis eroded Maduro's legitimacy even among the hardcore supporters of *chavismo*.

As expected, the economic crisis fueled the opposition, which was already engaging in acts of party-building and coordination. Toward the end of the Chávez era, the opposition parties realized that the best way to counter autocratization was to unite their forces, despite their ideological differences, under the Democratic Unity Roundtable. Although conventional wisdom suggests that opposition coordination would increase the chances of democratization, Corrales makes a compelling case that it actually increased the ruling coalition's threat perception and so accelerated autocratization. Increasing opposition competitiveness, hence, resulted in more repression and openly antidemocratic behavior, such as canceling a recall referendum, rigging elections, and banning opposition politicians.

For Corrales, the opposition did all the right things in the second half of the Chávez period and Maduro's first presidential term but could not prevent the fully autocratic turn. In fact, he argues that their success may have actually caused it! His account of the Venezuelan opposition thus differs from Laura Gamboa's *Resisting Backsliding* (2022), which emphasizes the use of "extra-institutional strategies" that backfired and led to the erosion of democracy. Focusing on a different period than Gamboa, Corrales's coverage of the opposition seems more positive but includes some setbacks too. For instance, Corrales mentions that the opposition under Guaidó was involved in a premature insurrection and maritime invasion, which discredited the revitalized opposition internationally. One of the book's strengths is Corrales's careful consideration of alternative perspectives on the successes and failures of the opposition, including a more critical analysis of Guaidó from Michael Penfold, his coauthor of an earlier book, *Dragon in the Tropics* (2011). Ultimately, Corrales acknowledges that the opposition could not topple Maduro and failed.

Regardless of what the opposition did and did not try, Maduro's survival in office is extraordinary by Latin American standards and is only rivaled by Cuban leaders. If Venezuela were a democracy, Maduro's disastrous economic management would have resulted in street protests, impeachment, recall, or resignation, but it was already a hybrid regime when he came to power. In chapter 5, Corrales convincingly shows how Maduro resorted to the preexisting toolbox that included often legal but autocratic practices. In addition to using autocratic legalism to reward loyalists and punish opponents, Maduro resorted to the traditional tools of authoritarianism that include but are not limited to censorship, purges, human rights violations, and suppression of protests. In chapter 7, Corrales demonstrates that Maduro went beyond what was available to him and constantly innovated to stay in power: he purchased the loyalty of the military and the judiciary by granting them more powers and access to corrupt networks.

Between the two chapters that tell a story of autocratic survival, chapter 6 applies the theoretical framework to Nicaragua, Colombia, and Ecuador. Although none of these three countries follows Venezuela's exact trajectory, Corrales accurately points out that Nicaragua's turn to full-scale authoritarianism also took place when the opposition was gaining strength. Ortega's ruthless repression was a response not to a change in the party system but to the emergence of a protest movement. The party-building aspect of the opposition was missing in Nicaragua, yet Ortega still decided to become fully authoritarian. Colombia maintained its low-quality democracy under Uribe, whereas Ecuador is closer to the Venezuelan case in terms of the sequence of backsliding. Corrales attempts to answer why Moreno in Ecuador did not respond to the rising opposition in an autocratic way; however, a more relevant question would be why Correa, the original left-wing populist, peacefully stepped down in the first place. It is true that neither Correa nor Moreno had strong control over the military or a highly institutionalized party, but it is not clear whether they would be as willing as Ortega and Maduro to institute a full-scale authoritarian regime if they had the enabling conditions. The presidents of Ecuador were less committed to the idea of a revolution, and the Cuban influence was much less present there.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592723002670 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I highly recommend *Autocracy Rising* to scholars of autocratization, opposition, and Latin American politics. Although the book is primarily a single case study, Corrales skillfully situates Venezuela's descent into authoritarianism and its economic collapse within a global context. The book has short chapters that are easy to read and digest. Its plain language makes it appealing to policy makers or general observers who may encounter topics related to the Venezuelan crisis and need a balanced overview of the relevant developments in the past decade.

Ideational Legacies and the Politics of Migration in European Minority Regions. By Christina Isabel Zuber. New York: Oxford University Press, 2022. 208p. $90.00 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S1537592723003043

— Jennie L. Schulze, *Duquesne University*
schulzej@duq.edu

Christina Isabel Zuber's empirically rich and superbly written book addresses the timely question of how we can understand policy choices regarding the integration of migrants; she explores that question in the underresearched context of predominantly minority regions of Europe. The most-similar case study design sets up an interesting puzzle about the factors that influence the development of policy in more inclusionary directions in Catalonia (2009–10) and more exclusionary directions in South Tyrol (2011): "Why are Catalan political parties united in portraying immigration as an opportunity, while in South Tyrol—as in many European democracies—immigration represents a hotly contested political issue? And why does Catalonia opt for a model of immigrant integration based on social equality, while South Tyrol chooses a more exclusionary approach?" (p. 1) To answer these questions, the book develops a theory of ideational stabilization that connects transformative events of the past—in this case, experiences with internal migration between the 1920s and 1970s—with later political choices regarding international migration in the 2000s. In doing so, it provides a much-needed corrective to the field's overemphasis on showing how ideas can explain policy change to the detriment of understanding how ideas can also affect policy stability: it does so in cases where economic and institutional factors are insufficient for explaining continuity in policy choices.

The idea that past events or historical legacies can have an impact on decision-making processes in the present is not novel. The book's main contribution is its identification of the causal mechanism that can link past experiences with contemporary politics. The model of ideational stabilization explains how ideas about migration that developed at a previous critical juncture become locked in through the creation of discursive consensus among political elites, as well as through policy and practice. Political actors attempt to sway public opinion and support for certain policies by highlighting either the material incentives of a specific course of action or its fit with societal dispositions. Although political actors have considerable agency in selectively emphasizing certain incentives and dispositions over others, that selection is limited by prevailing societal dispositions. Ideational stabilization is more likely when a policy area is more closely linked to dispositions (norms, values, and identities) than to incentives and when the identity group is large, because the costs of deviating from the consensus will be higher.

This framework draws heavily on the model of choice developed by Dennis Chong in *Rational Lives: Norms and Values in Politics and Society* (2000), as well as the policy literature on framing developed by James Druckman and others. At times, the treatment of relevant literatures is not exhaustive, and one might dispute certain claims. However, these omissions do not weaken the overall logic of the argument about how ideas become stabilized in ways that contribute to policy stability over time, despite changing economic and institutional incentives.

Empirical chapters 2–6 draw on a wealth of primary and secondary sources, including the literature on national and local policy, regional policy documents, parliamentary debates, party manifestos, and interviews with political and administrative officials in charge of creating and implementing policies, as well as with members of immigrant representative bodies. Within-case process tracing shows how ideas about immigration based on previously positive experiences with internal migration (in the case of Catalonia) and negative experiences (in the case of South Tyrol) developed over time through both political discourse and policy practice, resulting in complete stabilization and more inclusionary policies in Catalonia and incomplete stabilization and exclusionary policies in South Tyrol. The cross-case comparison demonstrates how this causal mechanism produced different political outcomes, which cannot be satisfactorily explained by economic and institutional factors.

Through a frame analysis of parliamentary debates, chapter 2 establishes how certain ideas were activated in the context of debates over legislation in Catalonia (2009–10) and South Tyrol (2011). What emerges is a picture of a broad consensus among Catalan elites that immigration is positive, supported by positive historical frames that connected opportunities with values. In South Tyrol, a competitive framing contest took place, with negative frames linked predominantly to material incentives. Integration was framed as a "one-sided duty of the immigrant" in South Tyrol (43), whereas the "Catalan model of integration" included a commitment to social cohesion and equality, along with a certain level of assimilation (p. 45).

Chapter 3 explores the degree to which policy and discourse converge through a qualitative content analysis of each integration law; this analysis uses a typology developed by Rinus Penninx and Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas to classify inclusion and exclusion across political-