

had carefully cultivated. In the next wave of legislative consideration, subsequent organizational expansion in key electoral territory, particularly the East and Midwest, meant that the movement had greater electoral leverage than ever before. Amenta maintains that only the attack on Pearl Harbor thwarted the adoption of a universal old-age pension. Armistice and the ascendance of the conservative coalition in Congress kept the movement from winning further victories. Nevertheless, the movement continued to have an indirect affect upon old-age policy. By the late 1940s, the organization's prior achievements in enlarging old-age benefits under OAA produced fiscal arrangements that indirectly fostered political support for a shift toward Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI). These changes, in the absence of effective organized demands, led to the birth of the modern Social Security program.

With Piven and Amenta both offering accounts of the New Deal surge in social policy, a juxtaposition of their approaches is instructive. While in some ways complementary, their analyses diverge on key points. First, the Townsend movement hardly appears to be disruptive in the fashion to which Piven often alludes, that is, engaging in rallies, strikes, rioting, or other unorthodox political behaviors. Rather, this movement appears to be a quintessential pressure group operating fully within the norms of electoral politics. True, as the movement grew and became capable of threatening electoral disruptions, it acquired greater leverage over old-age policy, but these disruptions were of a quite conventional variety. Second, Piven seems to argue that in the absence of mobilization to disrupt electoral politics, the Social Security Act would not have been enacted. Amenta disagrees and suggests that old-age policy was already on the administration's agenda before Townsendite organization, and that some measure was likely to be enacted irrespective of the movement. Furthermore, instead of assertive mobilization automatically boosting generosity, Amenta's analysis indicates that the movement's tactical blunders actually allowed congressional conservatives to reduce OAA benefit levels below the administration's original recommendation. Finally, while Amenta's analysis indicates that greater Democratic control in Congress furnishes movements seeking enlarged social policy benefits with better prospects for success, Piven treats these circumstances as analytically insufficient. Her argument nevertheless points to the hypothesis that disruptions have the effects she identifies only during moments in which center-left coalitions are dominant, a situation which may well be exogenous to social movement agitation.

Despite significant disagreements, both narratives converge in the proposition that movements matter under the right circumstances, and they clarify what those circumstances are. While there are sure to be challenges to the specifics of her analysis, Piven's argument should stimu-

late a lively debate and provoke further research on the specification of movement impact during the fleeting moments of egalitarian public policymaking. The propositions that she offers in this regard are bold and suggestive. For his part, Amenta's sharp theoretical analysis of Townsend mobilization and his rigorous excavation of the historical evidence sets a high standard for future research and makes an exceptionally significant contribution to the literature on movement impact. For those interested in how social movements shape politics and policy, especially in an egalitarian direction, both studies warrant attention and careful consideration.

### **Prejudice in Politics: Group Position, Public Opinion, and the Wisconsin Treaty Rights Dispute.**

By Lawrence D. Bobo and Mia Tuan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006. 288p. \$40.00.

DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071769

— Harwood K. McClerking, *Ohio State University*

In his seminal 1958 article ("Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position"), sociologist Herbert Blumer argued that we should understand race relations and racial prejudice especially as a "sense of group position." Blumer's basic intuition is that individuals are organized by racial categories as groups and that group members are concerned about the relative position of their group in the racial hierarchy: Members of higher-status groups in particular react with many of the visible signs of race prejudice when their group's status is challenged. Lawrence D. Bobo and Mia Tuan offer possibly the most comprehensive exposition and explanation of that argument in their new book, *Prejudice in Politics*. First, Bobo and Tuan let us know exactly what group position theory is and how to make sense of it in comparison to other ideas about the nature of prejudice in politics. Along with group position, they examine the relevance of other theoretical explanations of prejudice, such as self-interest, clashing values, and symbolic racism. Then they use a unique survey to operationalize, compare, and contrast these competing ideas about prejudice in politics. In the end, they offer us the compelling idea that the "real" answer to understanding prejudice in politics lies not in eliminating alternative hypotheses but in a group position-oriented synthesis of these presumably competing ideas.

At first glance, this book may seem to be about a relatively small issue. As noted in the subtitle, the book examines the context surrounding a treaty dispute in Wisconsin between a tribal group of Native Americans, the Chippewa, and various governmental entities. The actual dispute (lasting officially from 1974 to the mid-1990s) was about whether the Chippewa have the right to fish, hunt, and gather off their reservation in Wisconsin, as had been guaranteed by treaties signed in 1837, 1842, and 1854. But Bobo and Tuan use this particular case to understand a

much larger set of issues of broad relevancy to students of American politics. Their central question is clear: “How and why does racial prejudice enter into politics in the modern United States?” (p. 1). Having taken on such a large issue, they examine it in an interesting and enlightening way. They employ original survey data (for both open-ended and standard question formats) and offer an innovative analysis of the content of media sources and other miscellaneous sources such as flyers and posters.

The book has three clear goals: to understand the sociology and psychology of ethno-racial relations, to pay attention to the treaty rights controversy, and to examine these issues through a survey instrument. After laying out Blumer’s group position theory in the Prologue and Chapter 1, in Chapter 2 the authors discuss the context under which the treaty rights dispute occurred. Their broad overview of Native American history helps us comprehend the very particular situation of the Chippewa. The overview provided in this chapter, for example, makes it easy to understand how the traditional stereotypes of Native Americans end up impacting white perceptions of the Chippewa people and Chippewa political maneuvers.

In Chapters 3, 4, and 5, the authors turn most directly to their empirical tests. Here they examine the relevance of such explanations as self-interest, the clash of ideological values (what they label the “injustice frame”), symbolic racism, and group position. They do this using survey data from the 1990 statewide Chippewa Indian Treaty Rights Survey (CITRS). Just over 91% of respondents were white Wisconsinites, and almost 45% were residents of the 19 counties most directly affected by the treaty dispute. After assessing the salience of the dispute, the contours of relevant group stereotypes, and the relative strength of the self-interest motive in Chapter 3, the authors turn to a full analysis of all of the competing theoretical concerns in Chapter 4. Here they examine the effects of ideology (as the “injustice frame”), symbolic racism, and group position. It is obvious from the authors’ analysis that these three constructs move parallel to one another. After further demonstrating this parallel movement by comparing construct predictors (Table 4.7, pp. 162–63), the authors argue for a theoretically driven synthesis. Their argument centers on these empirical demonstrations and their assertion that group position fully accounts for what we observe in the tables in Chapter 4.

From there the authors move in Chapter 5 to demonstrate how group position aids our understanding of public opinion toward the political aspects of the dispute, such as attitudes toward the antitreaty protestors, actual involvement in the dispute, and feelings toward a political compromise (comanagement of the resources at stake by the state and the Chippewa people). In the last chapter, they step back from their data to again evoke the larger frames and task at hand, noting how their work aids our understanding of race/ethnicity, prejudice, and politics.

There is not much wrong with this book that the authors do not themselves foreshadow. Although I applaud it for focusing on the particulars of the case, letting us know the history of this prolonged debate and interactions, in the final analysis it is about just one state, and it is not clear that its findings can be generalized to the American context at large. Perhaps the most problematic aspect of *Prejudice*, however, concerns its focus on white Americans. Bobo and Tuan’s story is about group position and competition. Of course we can only have a full sense of the battle between two groups when we know how they perceived each other, as well as how the groups maneuvered with each other politically, socially, and economically. Unfortunately, *Prejudice* does not provide a full picture of either. As noted, we get an exquisitely detailed view of the proceedings, but a view of one side of the debate only. We simply do not hear from the Native Americans in this story. They are treated in the main as a reference point, not a political group with active protagonists or a sense of agency. To the authors’ credit, these are critiques of which they are painfully self-aware. They note that they could not conduct a comparable content analysis since the mainstream papers rarely had a discussion of the Chippewa side of things (other than a few scattered comments from tribal leaders), and they acknowledge that the focus on whites is the biggest weakness of their project (p. 21).

Despite these critiques, this is an important book that will serve as a great source for scholars seeking to understand racial politics. It is comprehensive in its overview of the theoretical underpinnings of such politics, especially for those wishing to know more about the logic of group position theory. It is also laudable for its move outside the white/black paradigm to a relatively unique, but ultimately quite familiar, case.

**Multiethnic Moments: The Politics of Urban Education Reform.** By Susan E. Clarke, Rodney E. Hero, Mara S. Sidney, Luis R. Fraga, and Bari A. Erlichson. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006. 264p. \$69.50 cloth, \$23.95 paper. DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071770

— Kenneth J. Meier, *Texas A&M and Cardiff University*

This book, which had its origins in the Civic Capacity and Urban Education Project funded by the National Science Foundation and directed by Clarence Stone, examines the politics of race and education in four major U.S. cities—San Francisco, Los Angeles, Denver, and Boston. Each of these cities is multiracial, with substantial populations of Latinos and Asian Americans as well as African Americans and Anglos. The authors’ objective is to determine how new ethnic interest groups fit into the politics of education reform, a politics that historically had focused on educational equity in the context of black–white politics.

Susan Clarke and her colleagues loosely use the concepts of urban regimes and two-tiered pluralism to discuss