

Book Reviews

Richard L. Engstrom, Editor

Nolan McCarty, Keith T. Poole, and Howard Rosenthal. *Polarized America: The Dance of Ideology and Unequal Riches.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006. 240 pp. (\$35.00 cloth.)

The subject of political polarization in the United States has drawn considerable attention in the last several years. The hotly-contested 2000 and 2004 presidential elections, along with highly partisan (and contentious) battles in the U.S. Congress, have prompted many political commentators to bemoan the renewal of partisan conflict and gridlock in Washington. Numerous observers have described the battle between red and blue states, suggesting that America is sharply divided over politics and policy. Yet beyond the hand-wringing about how polarized politics and government are in the U.S., there remains an important question: what caused the shift toward greater party polarization in the first place?

Nolan McCarty, Keith Poole, and Howard Rosenthal (hereafter, MPR) have written a remarkable book about the growth in partisan polarization during the past four decades. MPR tout a provocative thesis: that the ebbs and flows of partisan polarization in the United States during the 20th century are linked directly to patterns of income inequality over the same time period. Political parties are formed and maintained because they represent aggregations of competing interests, and the growth of income inequality (along with the presumed primacy of all things economic) has resulted in a sorting of the electorate into partisan groupings built along economic lines. When income inequality is high, so the argument goes, low- and high-income citizens have less in common, and their interests are more likely to be in direct competition with one another. The result is the two mass parties are more likely to be comprised of citizens from different economic strata during periods of high income inequality. Political elites (such as members of Congress) retreat to their separate partisan corners, where they are encouraged to move away from the ideological middle. The result is the partisan polarization in Congress that has been documented by numerous scholars.

MPR set the stage for their argument by focusing on the “common trajectory” for partisan polarization and income inequality. They show how the flat trend in party polarization in House roll-call ideology in the period from the late 1940s into the mid 1970s was replaced by a steady upward trend into the late 1990s, and this pattern coincides with a hauntingly similar

trend in income inequality over the same time period. Using a different measure of income inequality permits MPR to explore the common trajectory for partisan polarization and income inequality over most of the 20th century, and here again the trends are similarly U-shaped for both time series. High levels of polarization and income inequality at the beginning of the 20th Century were replaced by a strong downward trend in both time series, followed by a flat trend in both series around the middle of the century, and a steady upward trend in both series in the last three decades of the century. The coincidence of these trends is insufficient on their own to support anything approaching a causal argument, but these trends are certainly suggestive and justify the systematic analyses presented in the remainder of the book.

The meat of MPR's argument is found in Chapters 2 and 3, in which the authors explore the linkage between partisan polarization in the U.S. Congress (Chapter 2) and the mass electorate (Chapter 3), on one hand, and income inequality, on the other. After documenting in a variety of ways the trends in partisan polarization in roll-call voting over time, MPR set out to connect roll-call ideology with mean district income, and their findings suggest that the relationship between income and roll-call behavior has strengthened over time in a manner that is consistent with the similar trends in income inequality and partisan polarization. Simply, roll-call conservatism is more a function of district income in the 1990s (when income inequality was relatively high) than in the 1970s (when inequality was more modest in magnitude). The trend in this relationship stands up well to alternative explanations, including the Southern realignment, partisan reforms in Congress, redistricting, and the role of party primaries for nominating congressional candidates. Regarding partisan polarization in the mass electorate, MPR again explore the relationship between partisanship and income from 1952 to 2000. While there has been a relationship between these two variables for some time, MPR's findings suggest that the relationship has gotten stronger over time, albeit in a nonlinear fashion.

Taken as a whole, the authors demonstrate convincingly that the effect of income on mass and elite ideology has increased substantially, with Democrats and Republicans (both in Congress and in the mass electorate) increasingly differentiated by income. In the remaining chapters MPR explore the effects of immigration and campaign finance on the inequality-polarization linkage, as well as the policy and political implications of increased polarization.

It is difficult to find fault in this superb book. My only question relates to what was, for me, a surprising omission—i.e., the exclusion of explicit measures of income inequality in the authors models of partisan polarization. As I read the authors' theoretical discussion and initial evidence, I was

convinced that they would model partisan polarization as a function of income, income inequality, and an interaction between the two, suggesting that the effect of income on party polarization is heightened during periods of high income inequality. Instead, MPR explore how the effect of income on polarization changes over different time periods, some characterized by high income inequality, others not. What this means is that the estimation of the effect of income inequality is somewhat indirect and less precise than it might otherwise be.

Nonetheless, in the end MPR have put together a strong and convincing argument about how partisan polarization and income inequality are related. Their coverage of the evidence is extensive, and in the hands of such gifted researchers the evidence is presented in creative and compelling ways. The theoretical arguments presented by MPR are quite elegant, and I am confident that this book will become the gold standard in the burgeoning literature on the implications of income inequality in the American political system. Perhaps the greatest effect of this book will be in the future research generated from the ideas that the authors present. This book is a must-read for any scholar interested in contemporary American politics, particularly those interested in the implications of the distribution of wealth in American society.

James C. Garand
Louisiana State University

Anthony J. Nownes. *Total Lobbying: What Lobbyists Want (and How They Try to Get It)*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. viii, 269 pp. (\$70.00 cloth; \$25.99 paper.)

The take-home point from the latest book on interest groups by Anthony Nownes is that a fair amount of lobbying occurs that has been ignored by most scholars. In addition to the familiar “public policy” lobbying (efforts aimed at legislation, proposed regulations or court decisions, for example), lobbyists also can be found trying to influence land use politics (government decisions about land use and development) and procurement decisions (goods and services purchased by government). Land use lobbying is especially common among local governments, while procurement lobbying occurs at all levels of government. Thus, lobbying is more pervasive than one might deduce from a typical study focused on the national government.

Total Lobbying attempts to explain what lobbyists do, largely in their own words. The first two chapters lay out the tripartite definition of lobbying

described above and provide an overview of the interest group lobbying literature. The next two chapters cover public policy lobbying. Chapter 5 covers land use lobbying and chapter 6 covers procurement lobbying. A concluding chapter offers a summary of key points.

The body of the book focuses on the lobbyists—who they are, how they do their job, and the methods they use to influence government decisions. The book compares lobbying in the three fields. For example, contract lobbying is more common in land use and, especially, procurement politics. In addition, business interests appear to be represented by a greater proportion of land use and procurement lobbyists than public policy lobbyists. It would help here if Nownes could provide some context on the relative amount of each type of lobbying found in the United States.

The evidence for the book comes from interviews with thirty-four lobbyists working at different levels of government around the country. Direct quotations from the interviews are frequently used as illustrations. While the sample of lobbyists is not meant to be representative, using their own words to give readers a sense of what lobbyists do greatly enriches the narrative. In addition, Nownes often refers to the interviews in a summary fashion to denote patterns that emerge (the book is peppered with phrases such as “the data suggest . . .”). In these moments, it would help if the evidence was presented in more detail. For example, exactly how many of the interviews confirmed a particular point? How many did not fit a particular pattern?

One suggestion for the next edition is to bring some current events into the discussion of lobbying. This would make the book more accessible for readers and acknowledge the poor public reputation of lobbyists. For example, there is little mention of Jack Abramoff or the lobbying scandal that imprisoned Rep. Randy “Duke” Cunningham. Even though some of the interviews probably occurred before the Supreme Court’s decision in the *Kelo* case, it is curious that the chapter on land use lobbying has little mention of the disputes over eminent domain in the United States. Similarly, the chapter on procurement lobbying does not mention the controversy over security and construction contracts associated with the war in Iraq.

The book is pitched at an undergraduate audience. It is obviously written by someone with experience teaching courses on interest groups, as the narrative relies on informal language and is largely free of academic jargon. Nownes takes care to define important concepts and presents many sections in a linear fashion (for example, reviewing the interest group literature on common lobbying techniques in list fashion with a brief summary at the end). Nownes also tries to grapple with bottom-line questions that tend to interest students: Who wins? How influential are lobbyists? What lobbying methods are most effective? As Nownes acknowledges, the evidence in the

book is not sufficient to provide clear answers to these questions, but he does offer some tentative answers, particularly in the final chapter. Some scholars will wish that Nownes did more to link his material to theoretical debates about the role of interest groups in American democracy. For example, the “pluralism” versus “elitism” debate is referenced on one page in chapter 2. The final chapter offers some interesting ideas about the role of interest groups and the direction of interest group research, but with little effort to integrate those ideas with other research in the field.

Nevertheless, there are two main goals of *Total Lobbying*. One is to demonstrate that there are some areas of lobbying that are ripe for academic study. The second is to provide a nuts-and-bolts guide to what lobbyists do and how they view their role in the political system. The book succeeds on both counts.

David C. Kimball
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Daniel McCool, Susan M. Olson, and Jennifer L. Robinson. *Native Vote: American Indians, the Voting Rights Act, and the Right to Vote*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. xiii, 232 pp. (\$80.00 cloth; \$24.99 paper.)

Few laws of the 20th century had a greater impact on the American political landscape than the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA), with its goal of enforcing the Fifteenth Amendment’s prohibition against denying suffrage on the basis of race or color. Securing the voting rights of African Americans was the motivation behind the VRA and has been the primary focus of research on its impact. However, the VRA extends to other minority groups. Significant attention has been directed by scholars to the voting rights of Latinos but the rights of Native Americans have largely been overlooked. Daniel McCool, Susan Olson, and Jennifer Robinson remedy this with their review of voting rights litigation on behalf of Indians and analysis of the VRA’s effects. “It is human nature to try to maintain one’s power,” observe the authors; “it is also human nature to contest the status quo when one is excluded from it” (p. 19). This is the story of challenges to the status quo on behalf of Native Americans.

The presentation covers two broad topics: acquisition of voting rights by Native Americans and abridgements of those rights that have been challenged under the VRA. The opening chapter covers the first topic, providing an overview of Native Americans’ struggle to be recognized as citizens and obtain the right to vote. That citizenship should be a question seems odd

until we recall the history of relationships between the U.S. government and Indian tribes. Various court rulings, decisions by public officials, and legislative enactments placed Native Americans in the situation of being what McCool, Olson, and Robinson describe as “people in an occupied land under the control of a foreign power” (p. 2). Not until passage of the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 was a person enrolled as a tribal member and living in a federally recognized reservation considered a U.S. citizen. Yet, as the authors note, the right to vote did not automatically follow the acknowledgment of citizenship. Those familiar with efforts to deny African Americans’ the right to vote or to restrict its exercise will notice parallels between those practices and efforts to deny voting rights to Indians. The grandfather clauses, white primaries, poll taxes, and literacy tests used in the South are replaced in the West by prohibitions against Indian voting in state constitutions, requirements that tribal ties be severed, taxation requirements, and literacy tests. The results were identical in the two regions, however, as minority voters systematically were excluded from the polls.

The majority of the book is devoted to legal challenges to state and local laws that restrict Indian voting rights. McCool, Olson, and Robinson identify 74 Indian voting rights cases spread across fifteen states, primarily the Intermountain West and Great Plains. A third of these cases challenged at-large electoral systems; approximately one-fifth concerned redistricting disputes and one-fifth contested discriminatory electoral procedures. These issues are reviewed in a recital of cases in Chapter Three and illustrated in three subsequent chapters by a set of cases.

The impact of VRA litigation on Native American rights, placed in the context of research regarding other minorities, is the subject of Chapter Seven. Whereas presentations in earlier chapters relied on court documents for source material, here the authors present analyses using election statistics and data from interviews with elected officials in jurisdictions affected by VRA litigation. Those familiar with research on the VRA’s effects on other minorities will not find the conclusions startling. On the whole, providing language assistance, as directed by the VRA, has increased registration and turnout among Native Americans (as it has among Latinos), and replacing at-large electoral systems with single-member districts has increased the number of Indians elected to office (it has for African Americans and Latinos). Also not surprising are the differences in perceptions of Indian and white elected officials of the impact on policy in jurisdictions whose electoral systems were changed as a result of VRA litigation. Native American elected officials believed their communities had received more services, that Indians had greater access to government, and that Indians viewed government more favorably as a result of increase representation. White elected officials, on the other hand, did not see the status quo as being altered

significantly but acknowledged the importance of having Native Americans' point of view being presented during deliberations.

The book is not flawless, but the flaws are few. Most notable is failing to provide summary information in tabular form so the reader can get a better sense of the major conclusions drawn from the analyses. For example, Table 3.2 shows the number of cases involving Native American voting rights raising particular issues (challenges to at-large systems, discriminatory administration of voting laws, etc.). It would be helpful if the authors had presented the number of cases in which the Native American plaintiffs prevailed by category. This would help the reader understand the full extent to which the VRA has advanced Indian voting rights in the face of a discriminatory status quo. Similarly, the authors present the results of their survey of elected officials only in the text, making it difficult to see fully what impact on policy elected officials believe the representation of Native Americans on county commissions and school boards has had. On the whole, however, these flaws are not significant.

Native Vote could be used in a variety of courses. The entire book is appropriate for courses on minority rights in general or on voting rights in particular. Chapters One, Three, and Seven provide material on the application of the VRA to Native Americans pertinent to courses on elections and voting. Although each of the case studies illustrates civil procedure in action, the presentation of *U.S. v. Blaine County*, which challenged an at-large election system, is especially good as it provides detailed discussions of the expert testimony supporting each side and the judge's ruling applying the standard tests for determining minority vote dilution.

McCool, Olson, and Robinson remind us that the struggle for equal rights in American society continues and involves citizens of many races. Both experts in minority rights and those with only a rudimentary knowledge of this subject will find *Native Vote* intriguing and informative.

James D. King
University of Wyoming

Steve Bickerstaff. *Lines in the Sand: Congressional Redistricting in Texas and the Downfall of Tom DeLay.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007. ix, 472 pp. (\$34.95 cloth.)

Those of us who are not Americans have long enjoyed watching the politics of the United States from afar. Even if one is pro-American (and most Australians are that way inclined), one enjoys the sheer chaos that seems so often to be the American way. In my case, I remember, during the

civil rights struggles of the fifties and sixties, watching with amusement the operation of the filibuster system for the Senate. I would think (and those with whom I had conversations would agree) that the Americans must have a mad political system to tolerate behavior like that. Although the filibuster still exists, it no longer brings shame upon the American Senate. Or rather it does not bring shame in the eyes of outsiders who are rarely aware that the filibuster system still exists. That shame has been replaced by the shenanigans over redistricting, incomprehensible to outsiders. To the extent that one can think of any incident, however, that case was the spectacle of legislators from Texas escaping to another state where their location was a secret. That received worldwide bad publicity. How could intelligent American politicians think of the need to behave like that?

This book deals at great length with the very incident to which I have just referred. The incident occurred in 2003 but its causes go back a long way into the past. It is an exceedingly good book and is very readable. Looking for things with which to find fault all I can come up with are a few details which I may as well specify early in this review.

But first I have just one regret, which is not a criticism. My regret is that the book was completed immediately before the mid-term elections of November 2006. That meant I have needed to do some research of my own to fit those results into the argument of the book.

I am hoping there will be a second edition so here goes. On page 18 there is a Table 2.1 titled "Republican gains in U.S. congressional seats, 1971-2003." When the second edition comes out I suggest that should be "Party distribution of U.S. congressional seats." On the following page it says "Lyndon Johnson carried his home state in 1964 and 1968, but Richard Nixon won in 1972." Actually it was Hubert Humphrey who carried Texas in 1968. On page 388, referring to the up-coming 2006 election, it says that "Democrats may find it difficult to hold on to the eleven seats that they won in 2002." He means 2004.

Anyway this really is a most interesting book and a lot of detail and hard work has gone into it. I agree with the author's judgments that the whole thing was a disgrace to the American system for drawing the maps of congressional seats: it was also a disgrace to the Republican Party in Texas and to Tom DeLay in particular. Bickerstaff makes this remark: "The final 2003 redistricting plan was a partisan gerrymandering masterpiece. Only three of the ten Anglo Democratic incumbents survived as Democrats after the 2004 election."

Who fell by the wayside? Ralph Hall defected to the Republicans. Democrats who lost their seats were Max Sandlin, Jim Turner, Nick Lampson, Charles Stenholm, Chris Bell and Martin Frost. However, the author notes on page 99: "Defeated in his try for reelection in 2004, Lampson won

the Democratic nomination in District 22 to run against Congressman DeLay in 2006.” We now know that Nick Lampson is the member for District 22. He had first won the ninth district in 1996.

We Australians used to suffer from both malapportionment and gerrymandering, but both have now thankfully disappeared. All the maps are now geographically logical, drawn by independent commissions and not subject to veto by politicians. For that reason I give to my students the case of Lloyd Doggett as an example of what the American system is like. Elected first in 1994 he represented a district which looked quite logical on the map. We would have described him as being elected as “the member for Austin” as recently as 2002. However, now that the mid-decade Republican gerrymander has replaced the old logical map of his tenth district, Doggett is the member for the awful-looking 25th District which stretches south in a narrow band from part of Austin to the Rio Grande River on the Mexican border.

The American system of allowing state legislatures to draw congressional district lines is the big problem because it enables the states to gerrymander so openly. Frankly I do not know what can be done about it. All I know is that both Canada and Australia are federations with parliamentary systems and neither the Canadian House of Commons nor the Australian House of Representatives suffers from the problem of the U.S House of Representatives.

We in Australia go in for fairness arguments a great deal. Yet we do it in the context of a two-party, single-member-district system. Although there are cases of proportional representation—almost all in upper houses—fairness really means as between the two big parties. Whichever big party wins a majority of the aggregate “two-party preferred vote,” as we call it, is thought to be entitled to win a majority of seats.

Upon reading this book there was one stage when I thought perhaps my sympathies lay with Tom DeLay and the Republicans. That was when I read him on page 86 as saying that “more than 56, almost 57 percent of the Texans in this state at the 2002 election voted for a Republican running for Congress, yet we only have about 45 percent of the seats. Why? Because of the way the lines are drawn, no other reason than the way the lines are drawn.”

If the Republicans had merely undone the previous Democratic gerrymander, I might have been more sympathetic. However, that is not so and all I can say is that I am delighted Nick Lampson won DeLay’s 22nd District for the Democrats. I am also pleased (as noted in the book) that the Supreme Court in June 2006 varied six districts because DeLay’s map had violated Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. That variation enabled Democrat Ciro Rodriguez to defeat Republican incumbent Henry Bonilla in the 23rd

District at the December 2006 special runoff election which was actually the last contest in the November 2006 mid-term election.

Consequently the Texas distribution now is nineteen Republicans and thirteen Democrats, which actually is a fair distribution. However, I am aware that Lampson's position in the 22nd District is difficult. Bush carried that district by two-to-one in 2004 so it is ripe for a Republican re-gain. Yet I believe the advantage of incumbency is big enough that I predict Lampson will hold on. Consequently Chet Edwards in the 17th and Nick Lampson in the 22nd will be there as a defiant reminder of how gerrymanders sometime fail. For DeLay it is a case of the biter bitten or, if you prefer a different phrase, he has been hoist with his own petard.

I referred above to my need to do some research of my own to fit the 2006 results into the argument of the book and I also wrote that the Texas distribution of seats now is fair. So I have sought to construct a two-party aggregate for Texas as a whole in House of Representatives voting in November-December 2006. Regrettably there are no two-party Democratic-Republican votes for the 9th, 11th, 16th, 20th and 28th Districts. However, there are 2004 votes so I can use them in these five cases and 2006 returns for the other 27 districts. Consequently I have the Republicans at 2,432,366 votes (54%) and the Democrats at 2,069,877 votes (46%).

Bear in mind also that there were U.S. Senate and gubernatorial elections in November 2006. For the Senate, Kay Bailey Hutchison (Republican) received 2,661,789 votes while her Democratic challenger received 1,555,202 votes. In the governor's contest the votes were 1,716,792 for Rick Perry (Republican) and 1,310,337 for his Democratic challenger. (The much lower two-party vote in the gubernatorial contest is due to the much higher vote for Independent candidates.) So Texas is clearly a Republican state these days. It is difficult to object when there are now nineteen Republicans and thirteen Democrats in the House of Representatives at the federal level.

What is striking is that in 2002, the high point for George Walker Bush and the Republicans nationally, the distribution of Texas seats was seventeen Democrats and fifteen Republicans. The Australian naked eye would conclude there must have been a swing in votes to the Republicans in Texas from 2002 to 2006. Actually there was a three per cent swing to the Democrats over that four-year period. The trouble is, as Sir Tom Stoppard would say, "It's not the voting that's democracy, it's the counting."

Malcolm Mackerras
Australian Defence Force Academy
University of New South Wales

John C. Fortier and Norman J. Ornstein, eds. *Second-Term Blues: How George W. Bush Has Governed*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute/Brookings Institution Press, 2007. x, 146 pp. (\$24.95 cloth.)

In *Second-Term Blues: How George W. Bush Has Governed*, John C. Fortier, a research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, observes that the media tend to pay far more attention to the daily campaign activities of presidential candidates than they do to arguably more important matters concerning the candidates' capacities for governing. This is surprising, argues Fortier, because our recent presidents have, for the most part, been "strangers to Washington." Indeed, "only one president in the past thirty years, George H.W. Bush, had ever held an official job in Washington before being sworn in as president" (p. vii-viii).

Second-Term Blues, a joint project of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and Brookings Institution, represents an effort to focus greater attention on issues of governing, particularly as they relate to the second term of George W. Bush. Co-edited by Fortier and Norman J. Ornstein, resident scholar at AEI, the book is a collaborative effort consisting of six chapters written by noted political scientists (Fred I. Greenstein of Princeton University and Charles O. Jones of the University of Wisconsin) and prominent journalists (Dan Balz of *The Washington Post* and Carla Anne Robbins and David E. Sanger, both of *The New York Times*).

Second-Term Blues begins with an introductory chapter by Fortier and Ornstein in which they identify general problems faced by all presidents entering their second term and discuss how the second Bush administration exemplifies those problems. The second chapter, by Balz, continues this discussion, focusing on Bush's "ambitious second term agenda" (p. 17) and the difficulties he has faced in attaining his objectives. Chapter Three, by Greenstein, examines Bush's leadership performance, analyzing the various personal and environmental factors which have shaped that performance. Chapters Four and Five focus specifically on foreign policy issues. In Chapter Four, Sanger describes how Bush's first-term foreign policy choices have had important second-term implications while in Chapter Five, Robbins assesses Bush's "grand vision" to re-make the post-cold war world and the profound political consequences of his efforts. The final chapter of the book, by Jones, focuses on Bush's governing style, arguing that Bush has adopted an "executive" style of leadership (which is "proactive, hierarchical, contained, programmatic, resolute, and broadly accountable") rather than a "legislative" style (which is "representative, reactive, responsive, collaborative, open and sharing, compromising, and narrowly accountable to constituencies") (p. 114).

This book, for the most part, is not an academic work intended for scholars focusing on the American presidency. Persons seeking such a work should look elsewhere. For example, the foreign policy chapters are largely descriptive and little effort is made to tie the material into the academic foreign policy literature. Similarly, Greenstein's chapter on Bush's leadership, while providing an outstanding historical description of Bush's roots and growth as a leader, makes little effort to connect with the broader literature on leadership generated by students of public administration and management. Perhaps most interesting to the political scientist are Fortier and Ornstein's insightful analysis in Chapter One of the problems faced by presidents in their second terms, and Jones' thoughtful effort in Chapter Six to categorize Bush's "executive" leadership style. Indeed, each of these two brief chapters could be profitably expanded into longer manuscripts.

On the other hand, when viewed as a work aimed at alerting the media and the broader public to the issues of governing, *Second-Term Blues* succeeds admirably. Each of the chapters provides important historical background information pertaining to the George W. Bush presidency and each offers important and accessible insights into the performance of this president. One important theme which runs through the volume is the paradoxical nature of the Bush presidency. A president with little foreign policy experience has become one whose legacy is largely shaped by foreign policy. A president who was lauded post-9/11 for his decisiveness and unwillingness to compromise with enemies has been criticized for demonstrating those same qualities in his handling of the Iraq war.

Second-Term Blues also provides the reader with important insights concerning presidential power. Specifically, the book clearly demonstrates how presidential power can be constrained or enhanced by the complex interplay between a president's character and leadership style, on the one hand, and the political environment, on the other. The overall tone of the chapters is somewhat critical of Bush, suggesting that Bush has created many of his own problems by adopting a rather arrogant and unbending approach to leadership, leading to failure both domestically (e.g., loss of seats in Congress) and internationally (e.g., War in Iraq). At the very least, suggest the authors, Bush's approach to public policy has significantly lowered his approval among the general public, reducing his "clout" in Congress. Nevertheless, as Jones points out, we should also remember Bush's significant first-term policy achievements (e.g., education reform, campaign finance reform, a prescription drug benefit) (p. 111).

Like any edited volume, *Second-Term Blues* exhibits problems of unevenness. For example, some of the chapters (e.g. Chapters One and Two) overlap in certain respects. And it would have been useful to add a chapter focusing specifically on Bush's domestic achievements and disappoint-

ments. But, overall, this is a fine book which does precisely what it intends to do—focus attention on important issues of governance. To the extent that the book enhances public and media attention to these issues in the 2008 presidential election, it will have accomplished an important public service. At the very least, *Second-Term Blues* provides us with an important benchmark, assessing the Bush presidency at the mid-point of his second term. It is not (and cannot be) the final word on George W. Bush. But it should be useful reading for anyone interested in understanding his complex and controversial presidency.

James M. Penning
Calvin College

Gerald M. Pomper. *On Ordinary Heroes and American Democracy*. Paradigm Publishers, 2007. 304 pp. (\$21.15 paper.)

Since 9/11, heroism has become such a staple of the electronic and print media that what constitutes being a hero has become trivialized, hackneyed, and substantively irrelevant. Consequently, who is a hero and what is heroic no longer really matters because “heroes” are routinely manufactured for partisan politics without regard for contextual circumstances. Nevertheless, Gerald M. Pomper in *Ordinary Heroes and American Democracy* dares to ask the question “who are the heroes of our time?” In answering it, he establishes a context from which to better understand and appreciate that heroism is not always a single act of physical or moral courage that places one’s life or career at risk. Pomper argues quite the contrary; heroes neither must possess superhuman abilities nor do they have to act alone. In the telling of these eight stories, a new context for heroism is presented along with a reassuring perspective that provides new respect for American institutions and the people who worked within them during national crises. Echoing the arguments of Madison and Hamilton over two centuries earlier, Pomper acknowledges and reemphasizes that it is still institutions that restrain elected officials personal ambitions to the good of the common weal. It is the ordinary people within these institutions who possess the necessary commitment to humanitarian values that Pomper concedes are a pre-requisite to his definition of heroism. It is this profound commitment to fundamental morality and the higher values of the institution’s work, such as honesty, legality, and the protection and well-being of those entrusted to their care that can make ordinary people heroic.

Utilizing a format similar to JFK’s *Profiles in Courage* (stories of Senators who voted their conscience in defiance of public opinion), Pomper

relates the stories of eight ordinary (the reader may question whether or not these individuals are really “ordinary”) and diverse Americans who emerge as heroes. Beginning with a discussion of how heroism is defined in American culture and including examples of the heroic archetypes (champions of adversity, trailblazers, nurturers, rescuers, martyrs, guardians at the gates, activists, protestors, and reformers), he then proceeds to the eight individual stories that link individual action with institutional responsibility. Starting with Congressman Peter Rodino and his role in the Nixon impeachment process, he proceeds to Senator Arthur Watkins and the McCarthy hearings, President Harry S. Truman and his role in the creation of the Marshall Plan, and Federal District Judge William Wayne Justice of Texas, whose decision established the right of children of illegal aliens to receive a free public education. Then to scientist Francis Oldham Kelsey for her work at the FDA to prevent the drug thalidomide from being introduced into the United States, Whig and later Republican party political boss Thurlow Weed of New York for his political adroitness during the Presidential elections of 1860 and 1864 that effectively contributed to the preservation of the Union, and the muckraking journalist Ida M. Tarbell for her series of articles that eventually would lead to the break up of the Standard Oil monopoly and the restructuring of American capitalism, and finally to the story of civil rights activist John Lewis (later Congressman John Lewis). Lewis is included to illustrate the role of the “social movement” as a fundamental institution in American politics.

What is different in Pomper’s book is that he adds the influence of core American democratic institutions such as the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Courts, the presidency, social movements, and the press to illustrate how American democratic political institutions can empower ordinary people to accomplish heroic things in resolving national problems. The reader can contemplate whether or not Pomper is also sending a message that is also critical of existing institutional membership and its complicity in failing to address current foreign and domestic policy issues such as the war on terror and immigration.

In setting heroism within an institutional context, Pomper is also able to insert his political criticism regarding his two key observations in contemporary American political leadership. First is its focus on the perpetual campaign mode that passes for contemporary politics and the manipulation of public opinion in support of partisan politics. Second is the breakdown of constitutional checks and balances during times of national crisis. Although not part of Pomper’s book, the contemporary debate regarding the Office of the Vice-Presidency as an executive or legislative institution and its response to constitutional oversight processes illustrates Pomper’s thesis very dramatically. Specifically, he focuses on the expansion of executive power in the “war on terror.” The institutionalization of expanded executive power is

troubling for Pomper as he views it as a threat to the designed and intentional institutional checks and balances set forth in the Constitution. Consequently, is the office of the Vice-President part of the executive branch and if so, can the lack of oversight be interpreted as another extension of executive power without any institutional checks and balances? Pomper would argue that no institution can operate constitutionally without checks and balances.

The ordinary heroes Pomper writes of demonstrate their heroism within the context of recognized institutional restraints. In doing so, Pomper attributes to his ordinary heroes modesty, courage, persistence, and a commitment to values. He does not hold them up to be models of virtue, and Pomper concedes that each individual made tactical mistakes. However, despite acknowledging that each exhibited their frailties in many areas, Pomper attributes a fifth characteristic, that of “political heroism” to each of them. Political heroism is different from personal righteousness because it deals with the life of the community and this is the connection to American democracy that Pomper addresses in the last chapter. According to Pomper, political institutions have also become “political actors” in the context set forth by Madison to control individual political ambition because institutions can control resources, procedures, and interpretation of political life. In sum, Pomper reminds us that the Constitution still works.

WW Riggs
Texas A&M International University

David A Bositis, ed. *Voting Rights and Minority Representation: Redistricting, 1992-2002*. Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies and University Press of America, Inc., 2006. xi, 134 pp. (\$24.00 paper.)

Majority-minority districts were again part of the redistricting flurry following the 2000 Census, particularly reenergizing disputes concerning their partisan implications. The consequences of these districts are contested. Omnipresent in *Voting Rights and Minority Representation*, edited by David Bositis, are the principles supporting the deliberate drawing of district boundaries in order to ensure minority representation. The contributors are unanimous in finding that black voters are integral to the election of black representatives. While recognizing the shortcomings of the single-member district system, none offer a viable alternative. They take an endogenous approach, seeking to answer the question of how can black representation best be achieved given the current electoral arrangements.

Works on minority representation of a diverse electorate generally fall into one of two categories: those that see descriptive representation as empirically unimportant and those that find an intrinsic value in having black representatives in state legislatures as well as Congress. Few have attempted to prove the independent, yet multifaceted, significance of descriptive representation, especially its impact on the black community. Descriptive representation defined by racial association alone has been a problematic concept to defend for those who advocate the drawing of majority-minority districts.

Identification of the black voter's "candidate of choice," phraseology taken from the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Thornburg v. Gingles* (1986), has proven to be contentious. These papers illustrate the tension between wanting to ensure that black voters are able to elect black representatives and wanting to ensure Democratic success, which is believed to be more beneficial to the black community in the long run. Upon reading Anita S. Earls' Introduction to this volume, one cannot help but become excited at the prospect that the work contained therein will add to our current understanding of descriptive representation which is defined simply in superficial terms. Sadly these papers, evocative as they are, do not.

Even those cynical of the value of descriptive representation surely have a difficult time reconciling their desire for a color-blind electoral process with the reality that electing black representatives to Congress and state legislatures is remarkably difficult in districts that are largely white. The papers provide powerfully convincing evidence that racially polarized voting continues to characterize electoral behavior. Given the evidence of polarized voting, it is not surprising that the opportunity to elect a "candidate of choice" for African Americans commonly means, in this work as in others, the ability to elect someone who shares the same racial characteristics. It is the current electoral system that exacerbates the difficulty in expanding our thinking of descriptive representation because it creates an environment where political survival takes precedence over a voter's ability to truly have a voice in who is to represent him.

Electing the minority group's "candidate of choice," Laughlin McDonald, in "Redistricting and Voting Rights Issues, 1992-2002," justifies the need for majority-minority districts. For him, the redistricting guidelines found in the *Gingles* decision are not at all lacking in clarity, a criticism oft leveled at the U.S. Supreme Court's decision. He argues that the bizarre shapes of districts are only taken into consideration when it concerns districts in which minorities may have the numerical advantage and points out that white districts can be found that are just as, if not more so, oddly proportioned. That is, the preoccupation with racial fairness of opponents to majority-minority districts has obscured the existence of all other geographic

boundaries that are not perfectly proportioned. “A jurisdiction is subject to a Voting Rights Act challenge if it fails to create majority-minority districts to remedy vote dilution but it is subject to a Fourteenth Amendment challenge if it does” (p. 24). McDonald presents a novel defense for the retention of majority-minority districts by pointing out that majority-white districts are often symmetrically unattractive as well.

Black legislators’ participation in the redistricting process, as indicated by the contributors, does not necessarily guarantee the drawing of majority-minority districts. David A. Bositis, in “Political Parties, Redistricting, and Minority Representation: The Southern States, 1992-2002,” furthermore questions the numerical strength of these new, alleged majority-minority districts. He finds that the Congressional Black Caucus’s concessions to the Democratic Party and subsequent court rulings have whittled down the proportion of black voters in these districts, thereby diminishing the likelihood for black representation.

A not uncommon assertion, Bositis states, is that “Since most African Americans do not view the Republican Party as a viable alternative in elections, they must seek representation in a one-party system” (36). Solely agonizing over the increase in southern Republicans overlooks the damage caused by the Democratic Party’s tendency to subvert black interests. This is especially problematic for the black community if black representatives are expected to capitulate for the good of the party. His results substantiate findings of the correlation between black voting populations and black representation, but also illustrate the power of incumbency.

Instead of focusing simply on racial population distributions, Lisa Handley, in “Drawing Effective Minority Districts: A Conceptual Model,” takes past voting behavior of the constituents into account. White support for black candidates and the percentage of the black population participating in any given election varies by district. Handley speculates, but unfortunately does not elaborate upon, the possibility that incumbency, as well as the specific electoral system in place, may explain much of the variance found in the marginal percentages needed for a black candidate to win election.

Leo F. Estrada, in “Redistricting 2000: A Lost Opportunity for Latinos,” examines the Latino population’s inability to secure descriptive representation after the 2000 Census, and holds politicians responsible. Estrada seemingly disregards the unique cohesiveness of the black community in comparison to other racial and language minorities protected by the Voting Rights Act. From reading this chapter, one might assume that Estrada views the Latino population as a monolithic whole, overlooking “their” diversity, among them, for example, being of Cuban, Mexican, or Puerto Rican descent. Electing a “candidate of choice” for the Latino population is difficult because there is, arguably, more than one Latino population. This

may explain why party leaders have been slow to recruit effective representatives. Unfortunately, a lack of methodological design and corresponding evidence is what differentiates this study from the others in the volume.

The influence of political leadership on racial representation is clearly demonstrated by Bob Holmes, a Georgia state representative, in “Reapportionment/Redistricting Politics in Georgia in the 1990s and 2001-2002: Reflections of a Participant Observer.” The interests of the black community seem secondary to the competition for power over the redistricting process. Holmes’s personal observation of the post-2000 redistricting environment makes his contribution particularly informative. Noting the Democratic Party’s more or less united front, including the compromises made by the Congressional Black Caucus, Holmes illustrates the deleterious effect of the two-party system on black interests. As black legislators become emboldened with their success, a result of being less insecure about electoral defeat, they have also been inclined to forfeit black voter interest. The most commonly cited justification is that the Democratic Party’s overall dominance must be preserved so as to best protect black interests in the long run.

Republican triumph as a result of the creation of majority-minority districts is, to David Lublin, a truism. He points out, in “Racial Redistricting and Southern Republican Congressional Gains in the 1990s,” that racial redistricting is not always responsible for these gains, but nonetheless proceeds in his statistical analysis as if other considerations, such as the growing identification of white Southerners as Republicans, are secondary. The critical question might not be, however, as Lublin states, whether or not Democrats will gain any more seats in further redistricting rounds. Rather, the question might be, given the party switch by whites, whether or not black representatives can hold on to their existing seats.

An important question that is unfortunately not addressed in this book is how the current electoral system can be improved upon. *Voting Rights and Minority Representation* provides an invaluable description of the status of majority-minority districts and consequently minority representation in the United States. Yet the goal of the contributors is not just to describe the recent political environment, but to influence public policy in such a way as to be beneficial to racial minorities. It seems that if the electoral system is causing such controversy, it should be replaced by one that is more democratic. The book supplements and improves upon the mounting evidence that suggests it is time for the type of institutional change that truly encourages equality in political representation and participation for all citizens. At the very least, it would be helpful to develop a more thorough understanding of the motivation for minority representation in the first place, the needs and desires of the intended beneficiaries themselves. Perhaps then it will be even more evident that in order to ensure effective representation for American

minority populations, new electoral arrangements should be the focus of study and the locus of minority advocacy organizations.

Corina S. Schulze
University of New Orleans

Rose, Melody. *Safe, Legal, and Unavailable? Abortion Politics in the United States.* Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press, 2007. xviii, 235 pp. (\$29 paper.)

Few issues have so pervasively colored American politics over the past three decades as that of abortion. The complex, nuanced opinions of the United States Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade* (1973) predictably invited new policy initiatives and further litigation, but in addition we have seen virtually every conventional political process in the nation and no small number of nontraditional forms reflect this issue. Elections at every level of the system have exhibited its reach, American foreign policy has reflected abortion policy preferences of Congress and incumbent administrations, administrative agencies have been caught in its net, and regulatory actions by state and local governments have been no less a part of the national abortion policy quilt than has policy making at the national level.

Such a formidable and expansive topic would seem to invite lengthy examinations of the politics at the heart of this issue and of policy content itself, and there is no dearth of such efforts. Rose, however, offers in relatively brief form an overview of this social regulatory policy case. Her stated purpose is to report accurately the current status of abortion policy in the United States and to provide a starting point for those who wish to become more knowledgeable and understanding of it. She also suggests that her work represents a useful case study of social regulatory policy for those who are primarily interested in the policy process.

Rose's conclusions are hardly novel, but they are clearly developed and stated. First, in a functional sense, abortion is now less available to those who might avail themselves of such a service than was true in the mid-1970s. Although frontal assaults on the basic policy have not succeeded (one must in these uncertain times add the caveat "yet"), opponents of permissive abortion policies have been very successful in restricting its availability. The author is led on several occasions to point out that while some women may enjoy a right to abortion services because they are in a position to seek them out, many of their counterparts merely have a privilege, for they do not have the resources to go where the services are available.

Second, abortion policy has been transformed from one which reflects

the rights of women, in consultation with competent medical professionals to determine matters involving their health and well-being, into a policy framework which features nascent fetal citizenship. One of the more significant long-term outcomes of this policy conflict may be the development of a new legal standard for the beginning of human life. More immediately, however, this aspect of abortion policy pits two compelling interests against each other—those of a pregnant woman who might be accorded some responsibility and prerogatives for her physical and emotional condition and those of a prospective person in the form of a fetus.

Third, Rose observes that Americans are currently addressing abortion policy as a moral issue; it becomes a medical issue only as it reaches the plateau of crisis.

The prospects for a change in course which Rose identifies are similarly conventional, and her development of them would leave the hopeful unconvinced of their promise. They are the mobilization of medicos—doctors—as they seek to reassert their professional prerogative for treating women who are pregnant, the mobilization of women themselves as they reassert their right to make judgments about their bodies and circumstances, and the “religious left” as it attempts to counterbalance the religious interpretations and judgments of religionists who find abortion to contravene scriptural teachings. The logic for each is apparent, but there may be more promise in a more general perspective, one that Rose acknowledges, which is that there tends to be a pendulum effect in controversial policy arenas, which may result from a variety of phenomena.

This book consists of an introduction, five substantive chapters, and a sixth chapter of conclusions. This reviewer found two chapters to be especially effective. One is a summary chapter of the Court’s responses to major abortion cases it has heard. Here, Rose explains the emergence of privacy rights as a basis for *Roe* and the evolution of fetal rights of citizenship in response. The cases are selected and the analysis of reported cases is brief, but the thread of judicial policy development is clear throughout. The second chapter of note is that dealing with states’ policy responses to *Roe*, which largely involve the erection of practical and statutory barriers to abortion access and the development of fetal rights. Tables indicating the fifty states’ selected abortion policy provisions permit some interstate analysis as to the dynamics of abortion policy politics.

One might wish for a more extensive analysis of abortion politics in some aspects of this work. Indeed, the subtitle might well substitute the word “policy” for “politics.” Why, for example, are some states more restrictive than others regarding abortion policy? Having detailed public opinion on abortion, to what extent does public opinion in each of the various states dovetail with those same states’ abortion policies?

Also, there is a faint underlying perspective to the book that social regulatory policy, notably abortion policy, should somehow be free of politics. This becomes overt in Chapter Five, which depicts the Democratic Party's inconsistency in the modern era as it addresses abortion, characterizing it as being pre-eminently concerned in responding to the issue so as to maximize its electoral benefits. To expect a political institution that uses elections as a principal tool for achieving its goals to do otherwise seems naïve.

There are undoubtedly some who will find elements of this work objectionable for one reason or another. Yet the author has clearly attempted to address this volatile issue in clear, baggage-free terms, and she has succeeded in providing a brief introductory text for a course in which abortion policy is the principal focus or a major topic. Each chapter concludes with a set of suggested discussion questions, selected additional readings, and chapter end notes. Three appendices to the text focus on summaries of major cases at law involving abortion, platform provisions of the major political parties with regard to abortion, and web resources. The only omission of note is a comprehensive bibliography.

Updates on two matters discussed in the text may be helpful. Late in 2006 the FDA approved over-the-counter distribution of the "Plan B" pharmaceutical for women 18 and older. And in November, 2006, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in *Gonzales v. Planned Parenthood et al.* and *Gonzales v. Carhart, Leroy et al.*, in which the question before the Court was whether the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003 is invalid because Congress omitted a "health of the mother" exception. As the time this review was written the Court has not ruled in these cases.

James F. Sheffield, Jr.
University of Oklahoma

Pietro S. Nivola and David W. Brady, eds. *Red and Blue Nation? Characteristics and Causes of America's Polarized Politics*. Volume One. Washington, DC, and Stanford, CA: Brookings Institution Press and Hoover Institution, 2006. xi, 317, pp. (\$19.99 paper.)

A distinguished group of academicians, journalists and pollsters successfully combine the methodological rigor of political science research with the readability of first-rate journalism in the first volume of *Red and Blue Nation?* Nuance and analytical rigor characterize this work.

The work of the nineteen authors is largely consensual and complementary, although a spirited methodological dispute is engaged in between

Alan I. Abramowitz and co-authors Morris P. Fiorina and Matthew S. Levendusky. All of the authors agree that at least “sorting” has taken place within the U.S. political party system over the last forty years. For example, in 1969 in contrast to recent years, it was not unusual to find a significant number of Democratic U.S. senators whose roll call voting as measured by indices developed by ideological interest groups such as Americans for Democratic Action and the American Conservative Union would place them to the right of a number of Republican U.S. senators. Where a number of the authors part company and regale their fortunate readers with rich intellectual strife is the extent to which such sorting occurs.

Editors Pietro S. Nivola and David W. Brady delineate the problem of polarization in the first chapter. They find that although the extent to which it exists has been overstated, it does pose a substantial threat to solving domestic problems, such as maintaining the solvency of Medicare, and to the formulation and execution of sound foreign policy. The heartening increase in voter turnout in recent elections is more than outweighed by the loss of trust in government as an institution.

Fiorina and Levendusky maintain in their chapter that while polarization may very well characterize members of the political class such as public officeholders and public intellectuals, what has taken place among the mass public is better referred to as sorting. Fiorina and Levendusky examined the extent to which respondents took the positions of their national political parties over the years of 1972 through 2004, and found no clear patterns. When it came to attitudes toward government providing health insurance there was virtually no change. When it came to government helping minorities, white Republicans were more likely to line up in recent years with their national party’s position of not doing so, but white Democrats were no more liberal in 2004 on this issue than in 1972. In a pattern which is effectively used throughout the volume, comments and rejoinders are provided.

Alan I. Abramowitz and Gary C. Jacobson comment critically on Fiorina and Levendusky’s conclusions. Abramowitz notes that an examination of National Elections Studies data reveals that, except for nonvoters, partisan polarization had increased on ideological identification, defense spending, government aid to blacks and abortion. Much less overlap was found in 2004 than in 1972 among active citizens, voters and campaign activists. Democrats in 2004 were much more likely to be consistent liberals than was the case in 1972, and Republicans were much more likely to be consistent conservatives. In their rejoinder and Abramowitz’s comment on it, a dispute rages as to whether Abramowitz’s recoding of the seven categories of the liberal-conservative scale into five categories exaggerates the amount of ideological polarization which has taken place.

Fiorina and Levendusky also tackle observations such as the following, “As late as March 2005, long after unchallenged official reports had concluded otherwise, 79 percent of Republicans still believed that Saddam Hussein’s Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction just before the U.S. invasion, while only 37 percent of Democrats held this view” (Jacobson, p. 92). The authors note that similar partisan cleavages existed during the 1980s when partisans were asked about the growth of the deficit during the Reagan administration. One speculation of Fiorina and Levendusky that will be testable at least beginning in 2009 is the extent to which President George W. Bush is idiosyncratically polarizing, possibly because of his Texas mannerisms. Disagreements in the remainder of the book are less pronounced.

While Brady and Hahrie C. Han note that Al Gore was far more sanguine about his failure to achieve the presidency after garnering a majority of the popular vote in 2000 than fellow Tennessean Andrew Jackson was after a similar outcome involving another New England born son of a former president in 1824, clearly the New Deal era was not very polarizing and its electoral outcomes largely exemplified retrospective voting. James E. Campbell in his comment on their work cites research which demonstrates that congressional polarization in roll call voting is about the same as that during intensely partisan late nineteenth century.

Other major topics covered in *Red and Blue Nation?* include the effect of religion on voting behavior, and how changes in the use and structure of mass media influence political behavior. The book contributes to the growth in the study of religion and its relationship to politics which has taken place in recent years, and lays out a rich research agenda for students of media and politics.

E.J. Dionne, Jr., and his commentator Alan Wolfe largely concur that religion is important, but not everything. While frequency of participation in religious services is increasingly predictive of partisan vote choice and denominational differences less important, there are substantial numbers of individuals who rarely if ever enter a house of worship who vote Republican and a significant number of individuals who do so weekly or more frequently who vote Democratic. Dionne’s discussion of the importance of intra-denominational differences such as those between traditionalist and Vatican II Roman Catholics, with the former emphasizing “life” issues and the latter social justice issues, is fascinating.

Much food for thought and future research is provided in “How the Mass Media Divide Us,” by Diana C. Mutz and the comments on it by Thomas Rosentel and Gregg Easterbrook. Clearly the media environment has changed with the repeal of the Fairness Doctrine in the mid-1980s and the proliferation of communication outlets. The ramifications of individuals having greater ability to choose news outlets amenable to their political

opinions, and of being able to avoid political information altogether and thereby avoid incidental learning by having a plethora of cable channels available via remote control, remain to be carefully studied.

Certainly the arguments of Thomas E. Mann in “Polarizing the House of Representatives: How Much Does Gerrymandering Matter?” (not much) and related comments by Gary C. Jacobson and Thomas B. Edsall (although Edsall does make a case that gerrymandering can matter at the margins) proved prescient in light of the aftermath of the 2006 congressional elections which ushered in a return to divided government.

This reviewer looks forward to the second volume of *Red and Blue Nation?* It will be interesting to see how it incorporates the results and after-effects of the 2006 elections.

Henry B. Sirgo
McNeese State University

Jason L. Pierce. *Inside the Mason Court Revolution: The High Court of Australia Transformed.* Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, 2006. x, 334 pp. (\$50 cloth.)

Judicial review is a growth area in comparative politics. Courts around the world are looking into the arena of judicial activism to see if there is a mode of activism that suits local circumstances. As Jason Pierce shows in *Inside the Mason Court Revolution*, Australia is no exception. The industry devoted to “democratization” has no agreed position on how best to treat the politics of the judiciary. One understandable approach is to leave it to the lawyers who can often take the political heat out of the judicial review of law and policy by treating it as a technical issue of “getting the law right.” While this legalist approach makes good sense in many cases of contentious litigation, it does not take us far into identifying the appropriate roles of the courts in democratic politics and government.

Enter this book, which is an ambitious attempt to draw from recent Australian experience larger international lessons relating to the political roles of superior courts in democratic systems of government. We know in a general sense that democracy values the separation of powers, so we can welcome democratic constitutions, like that of the Commonwealth of Australia dating from 1901, with formally separated powers. But we also know that formal constitutional provisions are a little like empty vessels which can contain, or be forced to contain, a wide variety (and levels) of contents. While a democratic constitution can protect the existence of a judicial branch, many interesting questions arise about how the office holders in

judicial branches approach the proper exercise of their distinctive judicial powers.

Of course, similar questions arise in relation to executive and legislative office-holders and their exercise of their own distinctive powers. But in both of these cases we are dealing with “the political branches” where the political use and abuse of their respective powers can be assessed in the context of explicitly political debates over appropriate democratic powers. Against what sorts of political standards do we assess claims of the use and abuse of judicial powers? The relevance of Pierce’s fascinating book is that it provides a fresh answer to this quite fundamental question. Pierce’s answer is not generated through the high road of political theory (and many comparativists will agree that we can be thankful for that), but the low but reliable road of empirical investigation: particularly, through extensive interviews with the judges themselves, complete with their remarkably astute and forceful debate over what constitutes political use and abuse of judicial powers.

The book’s title refers to the fate of the Australian High Court under Chief Justice Mason (1987-1995), which provides the remarkable case of a democratic court transformed from its traditional reactive legalism into a vigorous pro-activism, all caused by internal rather than external “drivers.” Whereas the introduction of bills or charters of rights have provided the cause (or is it simply the condition?) for judicial activism in many other democratic systems, such as Great Britain, Canada and New Zealand, the Australian case illustrates just how far judicial institutions can be reshaped under their own leadership, given the right chief justice. Pierce’s book is very much about the judicial revolution effected by Chief Justice Mason, who is the pivotal person in the storm center that Pierce’s interviewees describe. This is a book about controversial policy leadership as much as disputed judicial philosophies, in large part because of the remarkably sustained attention that the powerful legal community interviewed by Pierce grant to this singular chief justice.

Pierce’s eight chapters move far beyond the interview material. The book is a model of rigorous institutional analysis of a constitutional branch of democratic government. The fact that the case study is Australian is less important than that the case deals with democratic debates over appropriate roles for superior courts. The Australian case material suits Pierce’s purpose well, which is to mine a rich vein of democratic experience to highlight confusions and uncertainties held by legal and political elites over the appropriate modes of managing judicial power. Readers not familiar with Australia are provided with two fine chapters setting the Mason Court in historical context, and a later chapter nicely documenting the recent turn of the tide under the conservative Howard government to a return to judicial

restraint, which elected governments like to think is the Australian default position. Pierce quietly points to evidence that the Mason Court was not altogether out of step with Australian judicial conventions, and that democratic judges worldwide seem to have seized on the opportunities that traditional methods of judicial scrutiny provide for creative policymaking when the official policymakers are not looking.

Pierce notes that Australian political scientists have largely left the politics of the judiciary to their legal colleagues. The two exceptions he notes, Brian Galligan and Haig Patapan, are both graduates of the University of Toronto and were taught by Canadian Peter Russell and either taught or influenced by one-time Toronto faculty member, U.S. scholar Walter Berns. Pierce does what neither Galligan or Patapan have done, which is combine an impressive array of statistical information on court workload with the depth perception of extensive interviews with those on the “inside” of this legal and political revolution, as the book title puts it. The result could have been a towering mass of dry data interleaved with spicy gossip. I am impressed with Pierce’s ability to tell a simple but powerful story from this assembly of quite disparate evidence.

Sometimes the clarity comes at a price. Pierce works with convenient binary sets that will not appeal to all readers: for instance, that this Australian story shows how the “orthodox judicial role” can be challenged by “a new politicized judicial role,” and that the former mode is primarily about “certainty” whereas the latter is primarily about “fairness.” But when he gets down to details, Pierce provides rich complexity on the many dimensions of the two role types under investigation. Information in the Appendix confirms the broad subject base used for interviews and the research logic behind this fresh study of Australia’s legal elite. Only a youthful outsider would have the courage even to try to elicit elite Australian opinion about such elusive subjects as judicial power and powerful but impersonal judges. Pierce deserves many non-Australian readers.

John Uhr
Australian National University

Mark Haugaard and Howard H. Lentner, eds. *Hegemony and Power: Consensus and Coercion in Contemporary Politics*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006. 262 pp. (\$75.00 cloth; \$25.95 paper.)

Writers such as Noam Chomsky have recently used hegemony and empire interchangeably to note some form of dominance in relations among polities. The exploration of the origins of the concept of hegemony in Greek

thought corrects the confusion by showing how hegemony differs from empire in that it relies on consent rather than coercion for the preservation of the power of the hegemon. In fact, hegemony was taken to be a legitimate form of political dominance precisely because it serves common interests, while the corrupt alternative of empire serves only the interests of the dominating party. The larger thesis of this necessary book is that the concept of hegemony offers an expanded understanding of power in that it accounts for the generation and maintenance of dominant and subordinate positions in political relationships without reference to the forms of power—both “hard” and “soft”—that function by the explicit application of incentives and disincentives by one actor upon another.

However, the authors in this volume follow Gramsci in breaking the connection between consent and the service of collective interests. For them, as for Gramsci, it is taken for granted that a hegemon—such as the bourgeoisie—may rule subordinate groups—such as the proletariat—by consent rather than coercion while objectively failing to serve the interests of the consenting subordinates. Benedetto Fonatan’s development of Gramsci’s thought makes it clear that he offered hegemony as an explanation for the failure of the proletariat to engage in a program of radical political transformation on behalf of its own interests given that the application of traditional forms of coercion—violence and material deprivation—were evidently inadequate to keep the proletariat repressed and docile. Hegemony—the moral, intellectual, and cultural leadership of a political actor over others—explains the subordinate groups’ consent and active participation in a system of political relationships that disadvantages them and fails to serve their best interests.

To account for this phenomenon, Gramsci extends the concept of ideology to include the educational activities of the modern state and the general ways in which language structures reality. Thus, a subordinate group may support their own domination because they believe it to be natural and/or legitimate. This linguistic turn makes Gramsci’s concept of hegemony particularly amenable to those in this compilation who draw on insights from Wittgenstein, Derrida, Foucault and other poststructuralist philosophers.

However, as Philip G. Cerny makes clear, the concept hegemony in the literature on international relations, building on Mancur Olson’s work, describes the hegemon as that actor that finds itself willing and able to assume the cost of providing public goods in a system in which no other actors are so willing and able. This, it would seem, is an adequate explanation for the general consent to a system that generates relational disparities in power and autonomy because, while it may advantage the hegemon to a greater extent than it does the subordinates, it also creates enough absolute advantage for all members that they are all better off in a hegemonic system

than they would outside of it. Cerny goes on to argue that hegemony is more effective and durable if it involves the adoption and internalization of values that legitimate the distribution of power. The values that Cerny is concerned do this legitimating work. However, they are not related to the values of the public goods supplied by the hegemon, but instead focus on special characteristics of the hegemon itself, e.g., the perceived desirability of the American way of life, that would justify its position.

Why this shift in focus from characteristics of the hegemonic system to characteristics of the hegemon and the reaffirmation of the importance of a Gramscian conception of hegemony? Cerny does not explain this, so let me hazard a suggestion. The position the hegemon enjoys—its ability and willingness to supply public goods—is generated by conditions that are only to a limited extent within the control of actors. This contingent position cannot be said to be deserved; fortune may generate power, but it cannot legitimate power.

Lentner also notes that the Gramscian conception of hegemony has played a minor role in international relations scholarship precisely because considerations of relational and systematic power have loomed so large. The relationship between hegemony and other forms of power needs to be developed because, as Howard H. Lentner, Mark Haugaard, Cerny, and Henri Goverde all point out, hegemony as the more effective form of power for achieving and preserving leadership and efforts to bolster material power often come at the expense of an erosion of hegemony.

In a similar vein, in Tomohisa Hattori's examination of foreign aid programs, he notes the close correspondence of donor-recipient and creditor-debtor relations, and argues that grant aid is a symbolic means of naturalizing and legitimizing material power relations. The expressions of gratitude in the reception of foreign aid from creditor states implies the debtor states' acknowledgment that their subordinate position is not a product of the willful or voluntary activity of the creditor states. Furthermore, foreign aid is situated in an institutional setting that allows for moral public scrutiny of donors in terms that legitimize these practices and presents them as morally fit for their position of leadership.

A certain ambivalence is present in many of these essays because these insights regarding positions within a hegemonic system raise the question of the position of the intellectual who develops them. Modern Western civil society is a product of the liberal bourgeois society. The cultural and socio-political values associated with this form of social organization delegitimize force and violence and elevate consent and persuasion in the political sphere. Hegemony is, by these standards, preferable to dictatorship and empire. The dilemma of the contemporary Western critic of hegemony derives from the legacy of the meta-narrative of transition from the barbarism of coercion to

the civilization of consent that makes hegemony morally preferable. While the adoption of this narrative entails consent (however tacit) to and legitimation of hegemony as a form of domination, Haugaard warns against the forms of opposition that lead to a decivilizing process whereby violence becomes part of everyday life. An attempt to transcend hegemony ought to be viewed with suspicion, as such a move could only serve as an act of exclusion that seeks to give itself a privileged position by denying its own exclusionary nature.

The fundamental question for the neo-Gramscian intellectual is the determination of the subject position with whose interests he or she identifies. The role of public opinion in support of state and socioeconomic power renders the idea of a “neutral” position meaningless; every intellectual position is situated in an array of allied and conflicting positions and becomes part of what Gramsci called “a war of position.” Benedetto Fontana implicates every position in this war by describing how the manufacture of political actor’s “critical understanding of self” and its “personality” as “a social and political subject capable of acting in history” is part of the hegemonic process. Elina Penttinen puts a fine point on this with the case of Western feminists who attempt to help and protect Third World women. It is only by the representation of some other women as suffering victims and themselves as protectors that the Western feminist establishes herself or himself as a subject. The logic of protection entails the subordination and silencing of those who are categorized as vulnerable.

With this critical reflection on the use of the concept of hegemony in mind, several authors offer thoughts on the possibility of political action by subordinate groups. Haugaard argues that an effective counter-hegemonic strategy may be found in attempts to persuasively present the interests of subordinate groups as universal, and thus attract the support of other groups. This ability to universalize from the particular and tie divergent interests together into a unified interpretive horizon is the form political action takes under hegemony, where the political process is centered around the formation of public opinion.

Saul Newman and Kevin Ryan close this series of essays with a consideration of the partial displacement and partial fixity of political identities as the most fruitful source of radical politics. They invoke the idea of contingency as the occasion for the structural instability that precipitates social movement. Critical thought and radical action is possible because consciousness of contingency makes the social agent able to use multiple levels of discourse against each other, thereby problematizing those meanings that have become reified in the current hegemonic discourse. Ryan labels the individual able to articulate multiple subject positions and switch between interpretive horizons as capable of “self-transgression,” which in turn

problematizes a specific region of hegemony. Thus, while every discourse necessarily excludes other meanings and reinforces particular relations of domination, Ryan criticizes the poststructuralist project that ends with the dream of the subject-as-void and total elimination of power, and instead affirms the socially situated subject and that emancipation must be found in the ongoing rearticulating of power relations. However, the poststructuralist claim that there is no privileged position, e.g., that of the proletariat, from which to definitively criticize the ideologies and consciousness of others as “false” seems to finally take the radical edge off the concept of hegemony. There is no root to unearth, no foundation to stand upon. For political purposes there are only discourses with the potential to unite people through shared interpretative meanings, and far from being radical, the aim of such politics is the achievement of a hegemonic “common sense” of one sort or another.

Hans von Rautenfeld
University of South Carolina

Wilbur C. Rich. *African American Perspectives on Political Science*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007. xii, 444 pp. (\$89.50 cloth; \$32.95 paper.)

This book is a collection of writings exploring the role of race in the formal study of politics as represented in the political science profession in the United States. The essays were prepared for this anthology and written by men and women on faculties at colleges and universities selected in a multi-layered process (p.2). The book has eighteen essays, several co-written, and twenty-two authors. Wilbur Rich is the editor of the book and author of an introduction and two of the essays. The combined work is approximately 450 pages.

The editor presents the essays as “chapters,” organized in five parts: “Race and Political Science” (3 chapters), “Globalization and Transnational Politics” (2), “Civic Engagement and Voting” (4), “Political Institutions” (3), and “The Subfields” (6). The coverage is broad: attention is given to race and public policy in the U. S., race in the construction of relations among nations, concepts from modern and post-modern contexts and attention to relations involving class, gender and other minorities. The authors draw on canonical texts in the European tradition and (mostly) the American political science that evolved in the 20th century. Readers of different interests can expect to find writings ranging from that centered on the modest hypothesis fit to be tested and assessed according to quantitative measures

on primary data, as well as occasions where inquiry is pitched at other levels with some focused on textual reconstructions, a “clash of civilizations” as in Huntington, and Fanon, the exportation of racist stereotypes in Western colonial policies, or the administration of U. S. federal agencies.

As with any anthology, certain limitations are to be expected including unevenness among the writings as to focus and handling of material, variations in writing skills and style or continuity. The editor himself is aware of this and offers an upfront warning to the reader—that with these political scientists “their writing styles are different as are their intellectual agendas” (p. 3).

One challenge facing the editor is the best arrangement of the essays to help the reader navigate the material. The result here is uneven and the first part seems to ignore one implication of its task. Insofar as the focus is the formal study of politics in the U.S., it is really about organs of the American Political Science Association (and regional and minority affiliates) and as such the logical basis for organizing a collection would be the standard subfields. But here a subfield is set off in a separate place while engaging cross-cutting categories that interrogate subfield boundaries (globalization, civic engagement, and political institutions) are distinct parts even as some invoke and comment on subfield matters.

More worrisome, however, are occasions where the essays don’t fit the expectation conveyed by the category, as with those included under “Civic Engagement and Voting.” Some others logically could be grouped together including those reporting research on titles in journals or the self studies by the APSA (Wilson and Frasure, Walton and Smith, and Orr and Johnson) and perhaps the three essays focused on the larger world community (V. Johnson’s “Globalization and the Study of Development,” Hoston’s “Comparative Politics and Asia,” and E. Henderson’s “International Relations”).

Anthologies can be of strategic utility when a reader seeks to refresh in kindred fields. Several of these essays will work well for this, including the cross national pieces mentioned above, Rich’s “Presidential Leadership,” the constitutional piece by Tate, Lyles, and Barker, and Graham on critical race theory.

The conceptual appeal of this anthology is a bit more complicated. The editor’s own assertion is forthright: “The central theme is that race matters in politics, not only nationally but internationally” (p. 1). But these writings confirm more the second part of his warning concerning disparate agendas. The writings are focused on race but the authors sometimes see the issue as a certain absence of coverage of the race subject by political scientists or a matter of exclusion from the discipline or “isolation” within. Sometimes the exclusion is seen as resulting in a political science that misinterprets the place of race in politics; some say this problem is a function of a rush into

science, while others say science is the virtue of the discipline. It is thus fitting that the “perspectives” in the title of this book is the plural reflecting those disparate “agendas” and a measure of caution, at least, for those expecting seeds of a new paradigm.

The message of the anthology, however, is elusive. For one thing the emphasis on “exclusion” and “lack of attention” to race, while instructive about some real and negative white racial attitudes and practices, plays to a defect too common in U. S. race study, where discussion about discrimination consumes attention that might be given to underlying content.

Indeed the familiarity one feels on hearing data illustrating racial exclusion/omission may divert our attention from engaging materials where mainstream political science has been into race (including, of course, major articles in the first edition of the *American Political Science Review*, three years before the founding of the NAACP). The authors here offer reliable argument showing limited attention to race (and bowing appropriately to a couple of exceptions, mainly Key and Gosnell), but there is ample evidence that, on the contrary, race relations have been a very active object for white mainstream political science and the challenge presented requires analysis of a different kind focused on critique of a legacy of engagement.

Legacy also matters in a second way. Black political scientists have not been as abundant or prominent as those in history, sociology, English and creative literature. And not as visible. But there is a legacy there (Charles Hamilton touches briefly on it in his Forward and Martin Kilson’s essay on John Davis is fitting, even as it moves away from his academic toil). Ralph Bunche is mentioned here—but there was an active and dynamic sector of black political scientists doing academic work at mid-century (the topic of politics was also covered by a range of scholars in other disciplines and significant attention to civic life had to do with evaluating social movements that was the terrain of struggle in the centuries of exclusion).

Finally, these writing give little attention to the dynamics in the black politics leading to the current period. The changes of the past three decades do not get the attention they deserve and that is ironic. In the generation since Bunche joined the Selma voting rights march, we have seen a veritable sea change in race and politics—resulting in many ways from the legislation that came out of that march (the federal Voting Rights Act). Items for study, research and commentary are many: the struggle within the Civil Rights Protest movement to shift from “protest to politics;” the voting rights litigation movement that did eventually build; the defiant politics of “massive resistance” having choked school desegregation, in one moment, nearly blocked black voting rights in another, and, after the VRA, battled black office holders to a standstill. There is the bedeviling party realignment especially in the bi-racial Old South; and the prospect now of re-ghettoizing

the new voters either through the single member districts (which is discussed briefly in this book) or in the mystics of presidential campaigns (which is not). In this volume we get only a fleeting glimpse of these dynamics. This is troubling in a book reconfirming race in domestic politics to be important to the international community, as the editor says. He is correct. But to study American First in these days results less from the old urge to exhibit a model for replication than from the responsibility on the shoulders of its citizens (including scholars) to discipline its activity in the global community. As those citizens are disfranchised or marginalized, the world may suffer under a leadership that fits so close the racial program lamented by the authors in this anthology.

Alex Willingham
Williams College

