

conclude, “the more parties move relative to preferences, the more partisanship moves” (p.166). The evidence presented to support this claim in each country is the book’s main empirical contribution, but a number of other important observations emerge along the way. For instance, we learn that partisanship in Britain is shaped by economic performance to a greater extent than elsewhere. In particular, the country’s current economic condition (as measured by GDP change) leads British voters to update their long-term evaluations of the parties. In Australia or the USA, by contrast, the effects of the economy on such party utilities are transitory and tend to disappear after just one election. Another interesting finding is the instability of partisanship in Canada. The large amount of “updating” that Kollman and Jackson detect between elections is taken to indicate the weakness (or general absence) in this country of what they describe as “normal partisanship,” which refers to the deep attachments emanating from social cleavages of class, religion and ethnicity. These bonds seem to be particularly strong in the United States but comparatively weak in Canada.

Overall, this is an excellent book on an important topic. Partisanship is a core concept in studies of public opinion, party systems and democratic change, and scholars with interests in these fields will find value in this book. Country experts may also find its analyses useful when they want to present arguments in a comparative light. While contributing to these scholarships, the book also points to some

Irwin F. Gellman, *Campaign of the Century: Kennedy, Nixon, and the Election of 1960*, Yale, New Haven, 2022, 473.

Reviewed by: Kenneth Janda, *Political Science, Northwestern University, Roseville, MI, USA*
DOI: 10.1177/13540688221113649

US Presidents John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon were both elected to the House of Representatives in 1946, served in 1947 as freshmen on the same House committee and became friends. In 1953, after Nixon became Vice-President and Kennedy was elected Senator, they occupied offices facing each other in the Old Senate Office Building. *Campaign of the Century: Kennedy, Nixon, and the Election of 1960* tells how opposing presidential campaigns rupture friendships.

Geller’s book blames biased media coverage for Kennedy and against Nixon during the 1960 presidential election campaign: “70% of newspapers (in editorials) endorsed Nixon,” but “the vast majority of reporters (who wrote daily

potentially fruitful lines of inquiry for future research. For example, as Kollman and Jackson note (p.218), their findings suggest that the number of parties is negatively correlated with the stability of partisanship, which prompts questions about why this pattern is observed and what this tells us about both voters’ decision-making and parties’ positioning across systems. While the book compares four countries with different party systems, the range of variation that they represent might be regarded as being fairly limited. It is true that these cases differ in their extent of fragmentation, but they are also frequently considered within the broad class of “two-party systems.” As such, it would be interesting to investigate whether the patterns detected by Kollman and Jackson can also be found in the context of a more varied range of systems, including some with relatively high levels of polarisation and fragmentation (e.g. Italy) and others where governments are generally formed by cross-party coalitions (e.g. Germany).

ORCID iD

Zim Nwokora  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2171-9319>

Author biography

Dr Zim Nwokora is a comparative political scientist whose research focuses on constitutions, political party systems and political finance.

stories) favoured Kennedy.” (p.247) Gellman names prominent television and print reporters known to be for Kennedy. Those disclosures are not new. Gellman cites a 1976 book “charging that the Kennedys shrewdly manipulated the media to help Jack win” (p.228). While Gellman does not discover media bias during the campaign, he does uncover its extent.

Throughout the book, Gellman alludes to “Kennedy’s two most damaging secrets” - his sexual exploits and his poor health (p.229). Campaign reporters knew both, and either might have caused his defeat if publicly revealed. Gellman owes the cover-up not to media bias but to journalistic norms of the time and to false medical information from the Kennedy camp.

Gellman says that Theodore White’s Pulitzer Prize-winning *The Making of the President 1960* seriously distorts public understanding of the election and the candidates. Although other scholars also saw bias in *Making of the President*, Gellman’s Preface contends that White’s “overall narrative of the race, of a heroic Senator defeating an unscrupulous partisan, has gone largely unchallenged” (p.ix). Gellman’s discloses that White had acknowledged in

his memoirs that he had conceived of it “as a novel”, with Kennedy as the hero and Nixon as the villain. (p. 311)

As to the central political concern in 1960, who really won the close election? Did Kennedy win it fairly, or did the Democrats manufacture popular votes in Texas and Illinois to produce a majority of electoral votes for Kennedy and the presidency? Gellman concludes that although Nixon thought that “Kennedy had won the election through fraud” challenging the election results might have caused a constitutional crisis. (p. 318)

In reporting Kennedy’s decision to call Martin Luther King Jr’s wife after his jailing, versus Nixon’s decision not to call, White had reinforced the idea that the Kennedy-Johnson ticket supported civil rights more than Nixon-Lodge. However, Gellman says that Nixon, like Eisenhower, still viewed the Republicans as the party of Lincoln (p.91). Gellman claims that “Nixon also paid close attention to civil rights because the administration had performed far better in this area than the Democrats” (p.233). Eisenhower de-segregated public venues in Washington D.C. appointed blacks to government posts, spearheaded civil rights bills in 1957 and 1960, sent troops to Little Rock to enforce school de-segregation, and began to de-segregate the armed forces, which Truman ordered but did not enforce (p. 233).

Jackie Robinson, the most famous black man in America at the time, wrote a syndicated column appearing in black newspapers. Gellman describes Robinson’s disdain for Kennedy’s and Johnson’s record of voting against civil rights legislation in the Senate and his strong support of Nixon and his running mate Henry Cabot Lodge. “Robinson toured one hundred cities for the Nixon campaign, covering 60 thousand miles” (p. 235).

Gellman views Kennedy’s call to Mrs King while her husband was in jail as a tactical move that deviated from his own “Southern strategy” - choosing Texan Lyndon Johnson for Vice-President. The Nixon-Lodge ticket in 1960 was more vocal in support of civil rights than the Kennedy-Johnson team. Ironically, Nixon’s own Southern strategy later in his 1968 campaign abandoned attempts to win black votes as the party of Lincoln.

Reading Gellman’s book caused me to re-appraise Nixon concerning civil rights and to revise my judgment of his character - especially concerning his reaction to the 1960 election, which Gellman correctly describes as “the closest presidential election since 1888” concerning the popular vote (p. 254). Kennedy won 49.7% versus Nixon’s 49.5% - a margin under 0.2%. Although Kennedy led in the electoral college vote by 303 to 219 and passed the needed majority of 269, the election was very close in both Illinois (with 27

electoral votes) and Texas (with 24). Gellman writes, if Kennedy “lost Illinois and Texas, he would slip to 249” while Nixon “would reach 270 and be the winner” (p. 275).

“But Did He Win?” Gellman asks about Kennedy in his next to last chapter. Concerning Illinois, he answers: “Every major biography of Daley, without exception, asserts that the mayor used fraudulent practices to secure Kennedy’s victory” (p.277). Concerning Texas, he writes: “Few questioned that fraud happened, but could the number of stolen votes have exceeded” Kennedy’s 46,000 vote margin? (p. 283). Gellman seems to think that Nixon really won.

Who really and truly won in 1960? The simple truth is that there is no “true” winner in a very close election involving millions of ballots after completing reasonable recounts. That bears repeating: *There is no “true” winner in a very close election involving millions of ballots.* Disputed ballots and questionable election procedures determine who is declared to be the winner. Democratic elections assume the peaceful transfer of power on disclosing the results. Political chaos ensues if losers fail to accept verified results.

Gellman’s book altered my thinking about the man I knew as “Tricky Dick”. Gellman supplies ample evidence supporting Nixon’s resignation to the election outcome, declining to encourage reporter Earl Mazo’s writing about election fraud in Illinois and Texas (pp.283–286). Gellman’s Preface is especially informative. He reports on Nixon’s role as Vice-President in certifying the count of the states’ electoral votes. After the official vote count was complete, Nixon said that his defeat and his opponent’s victory provided an “eloquent example of the stability of our constitutional system and of the proud tradition of the American people of developing, respecting and honoring institutions of self-government” (p. xi).

Giving plus marks to Nixon for his policies, character, and behaviour in 1960 does not erase his negative marks for performance as President in 1972. However, it does warrant re-appraising his role in the 1960 election and recognizing that many journalists and some scholars did not treat him fairly in covering the campaign of the century.

Kenneth Janda is Payson, S. Wild Professor Emeritus of Political Science at Northwestern University. His most recent books are *A Tale of Two Parties: Living Amongst Democrats and Republicans Since 1952* (Routledge, 2021) and *The Republican Evolution: From Governing Party to Antigovernment Party, 1860-2020*. (New York: Columbia University Press). He now lives in the Twin Cities, Minnesota.