

structural fit between cognitive schemas and prevailing issue frames. Extending the work of Mary Jackman, Winter argues that race and gender schemas develop different structures that emerge out of the distinctive ways that social relations along each dimension have been organized, portrayed, and institutionalized. Racial schemas are structured by the separation and competition of ingroups and outgroups, the attribution of opposing characteristics, hostile emotions, and political differences over whether individual or structural factors explain divergent outcomes. By contrast, gender schemas are structured around individual differences and functional spheres of activity, hierarchical but interdependent relations, paternalistic emotions, and political differences over whether existing relations are natural and appropriate.

Winter's central thesis is that "group implication occurs when a subtly crafted issue frame shapes an issue to match the structure of a cognitively accessible race or gender schema. The issue is then mapped analogically to the race or gender schema, and feelings about race or about gender are transferred back to the issue, influencing evaluation of the issue" (p. 31). Thus, group implication is, for Winter, "a form of reasoning by analogy [where people] understand political issues by analogy with their cognitive understanding of race or gender" (p. 19). Rather than reflecting overt racism or sexism, such processes tend to "operate implicitly, outside our conscious awareness" by shaping the underlying ways we understand and evaluate political issues (p. 21).

In a series of well-crafted experiments, Winter tests the potential for issue frames to activate race and gender schemas on seemingly unrelated policy questions, such as grandparental visitation rights, Social Security privatization, and government's role in ensuring jobs and wages. Consistent with his model, he finds that frames with different structures alter the foundations of policy preferences in expected ways; such cues have stronger effects when they are implicit, rather than explicit; and frames structured to evoke one set of predispositions (race or gender) do not simultaneously evoke the other.

Turning to national survey data on public attitudes toward welfare and Social Security, Winter makes a major contribution to the study of social politics by pushing beyond the common observation that anti-black stereotypes influence public responses to "welfare." The deeper dynamic, he finds, is that the structure of the programmatic opposition between welfare and Social Security maps neatly onto the structural opposition of outgroups possessing symbolically black characteristics (laziness, irresponsibility) and ingroups possessing symbolically white characteristics (hard work and just reward). Thus, just as whites' feelings toward blacks shape support for welfare spending, whites' feelings toward other whites shape support for Social Security spending. Winter concludes that the racialization of social provision "is more subtle, more

pervasive, and more implicit than the example of welfare alone might suggest" (p. 145).

These findings are extended in fruitful ways by Winter's analysis of how changes in framing activated gender schemas as a basis for public responses to healthcare reforms proposed in the early 1990s. As the issue became framed around questions of government interference in personal, private realms and as Hilary Rodham Clinton became central to public debates, Winter finds that public preferences regarding health care reform became more closely tied to citizens' predispositions regarding gender equality. The change in rhetoric from 1992 to 1994 was accompanied by a shift toward a more gendered basis of responding to the health care issue.

In addition to being a major contribution to scholarship on political communication and public opinion, *Dangerous Frames* deserves to be widely read by students of race, gender, and intersectionality. By focusing on the different structures of race and gender schemas, Winter adds depth to the conventional claim that intersections of race and gender involve far more than the sum of the separate dimensions. At the same time, Winter suggests that because of the uneasy fit between these divergent structures, truly intersectional policy frames and cognitions may occur less often than some suggest.

*Dangerous Frames* and *Because of Race* are welcome additions to the study of race and gender that deserve to be widely read. Their authors write with clarity and style, making these books valuable for undergraduate teaching as well as scholarly debate. Both books raise unsettling questions and, in Pollock's case, proposals for reform that merit serious discussion. Together, they invite us to revisit our basic conceptions of how, why, when, and where race and gender matter in American political life.

**The Democratic Virtues of the Christian Right.** By Jon A. Shields. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009. 216p. \$29.95. doi:10.1017/S1537592709990533

— Ziad Munson, *Lehigh University*

Jon A. Shields's starting point in this provocatively titled volume is the remarkable achievement represented by the rise of the Christian Right. Conservative evangelicals were among the most alienated and politically withdrawn citizens in the country in the early 1970s. Moreover, the theological development of premillennialism constituted a strong cultural barrier to their mobilization. From this inauspicious starting point, the leaders of the Christian Right have created a bedrock constituency for the Republican Party—more engaged, better organized, and with greater political education than any other group in America. And all of this happened much more recently than many realize. Shields uses National Election Study (NES) data to show that the key juncture in the rise of the Christian Right was not the Moral Majority and the Reagan

“revolution” of 1980 but, instead, the rise of the Christian Coalition almost a decade later. Only in the 1990s did the Christian Right rise to true political prominence.

Yet Shields scarcely questions how this remarkable transformation took place. He is interested instead in exploring what it all means for a democratic polity. The central argument of the book is that the Christian Right contributes to the vitality of American democracy in four major ways. First, its leaders repeatedly educate members of the movement in the need to use logic and rational argument, rather than religious dogma, in advocacy for the movement’s goals. Second, the vast majority of these activists are civil and respectful in their engagement both with the general public and those with whom they disagree. Third, the Christian Right regularly and strenuously seeks to engage in public debate over the issues it finds most important, a willingness not matched by their opponents on the Left. And fourth, the Christian Right has succeeded in bringing a large segment of American citizens—evangelical Christians—into the political fold for the first time in almost a century.

Shields suggests that these activists engage in politics in these ways primarily, if not exclusively, because it is in their interest to do so. As their movement lies outside the cultural mainstream, leaders and activists are strongly motivated to put forth secular arguments for their positions. Resorting to theology, by contrast, hurts their case and has a tendency to marginalize their concerns. Because their movement is widely portrayed as militant and unyielding by an unsympathetic press, they have a strong interest in engagement that is observably calm, rational, and without rancor or violence. The Christian Right, which seeks to change the status quo and have its message heard, has much to gain (and little to lose) by public debate with its adversaries on the Left. With Christian fundamentalists representing a potentially important voting bloc, it makes sense that political entrepreneurs have sought to organize them.

Shields makes his case by using NES data and rich qualitative data drawn from interviews with Christian Right leaders, texts from their publications and speeches, and ethnographic observation of their meetings, rallies, and protests. He argues powerfully that the way in which activists actually engage in the political process—rather than simply how they respond to survey questions about tolerance or compromise—is the key to evaluating their democratic contributions. In highlighting the importance of grassroots engagement to participatory democracy, Shields joins a well-established chorus of other scholars who have come to similar conclusions (Dana Fisher’s *Activism, Inc.* [2006] and Theda Skocpol’s *Diminished Democracy* [2003] come immediately to mind). The new data on how this grassroots mobilization works on the conservative end of the political spectrum is all the more useful for being both qualitative and quantitative.

Going further, Shields also wants to provide a normative evaluation of the quality of the Christian Right’s contribution. The depth of moral and political philosophy in the book, however, is much thinner than the data presented. For example, the author argues that the Christian Right’s contributions to democracy should be judged on the process it uses to achieve its policy preferences, rather than on the content of these preferences themselves. Yet this clear division between process (means) and policy goals (ends) is overly simplistic. Surely, we would not conclude that a movement that seeks to jail all citizens with HIV, but that pursues that goal through secular argument, civil debate, and the mobilization of a previously silent constituency, constitutes a virtue to the democratic polity, would we? More realistically, can we as easily separate moral evaluation of means and ends when we move away from the abortion issue and toward the Christian Right’s other hallmark issues, such as opposition to gay marriage or support for prayer and creationism in the public schools?

The focus on a moral valuation of the Christian Right’s contributions leads the book away from some potentially useful analysis regarding moral suasion in social movements. In particular, Shields repeatedly makes the point that social movement leaders are faced with a fundamental tension between the need to mobilize their base (with strident rhetoric, the demonization of the enemy, and consciously Christian/biblical appeals) and the need to affect public policy (with moderated rhetoric, civil engagement, and secular appeals). This is an interesting point, and one that the impressive array of data he has collected on the Christian Right might help us better understand. But while he notes this tension, he does little to unpack it, model its dynamics, or analyze its sources or its effects. A more thorough engagement with the literature on social movements, in both political science and sociology, might be of benefit. The work on framing processes, for example, has much to say about exactly these kinds of tensions and how they are resolved.

Although Shields’s central argument is that the Christian Right makes important contributions to the democratic process (and, in comparative terms, greater contributions than their opponents on the Left), he is not blind to some of the more authoritarian threads of the movement. He addresses the radicalized elements throughout his analysis, often finding that they are small and marginalized, even within the movement. Perhaps more importantly, he notes that Christian Right activists as a group bring decidedly little moral skepticism to their political participation, a fact that significantly dilutes their contribution to deliberative democracy.

The normative focus of his argument notwithstanding, Shields brings to light a wealth of new data on the Christian Right in a way that helps us better think about the historical rise of the movement, as well as its similarities to

and differences from the far better scrutinized social movements of the Left. His organization of this data around the norms of deliberative and participatory democracy helps us deepen our understanding of one of the most active areas of civic engagement in the United States over the last several decades. These contributions make *The Democratic Virtues of the Christian Right* of use to students, scholars, and journalists alike.

### **Girls on the Stand: How Courts Fail Pregnant**

**Minors.** By Helena Silverstein. New York: New York University Press. 2007. 256p. \$40.00 cloth, \$22.00 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592709990545

— Noelle H. Norton, *University of San Diego*

In her book, Helena Silverstein warns “abortion compromisers” that parental consent laws and judicial bypass procedures are implemented in ways that compromisers will find unacceptable. Noting that *Roe v. Wade* (1973) has lost its “rock star status” (p. 155) and that *Planned Parenthood of South Eastern Pennsylvania v. Casey* (1992) is “the new sheriff in town” (p. 154), Silverstein carefully exposes the ignorance, inefficiency, incompetence, and outright defiance of the courts charged with implementing judicial bypass procedures for teens who want to limit parental involvement in their decision to have an abortion. Quoting from Olivier Wendell Holmes, Jr., and frequently citing legal scholar Stuart Scheingold’s *The Politics of Rights* (1974) throughout the volume, she reminds the reader that the law often reflects or reinforces current morality and the prevailing political power, rather than upholding rights.

It is rare to find a book that works as hard to convince the reader that law and public policy are flawed yet still is such a well-balanced and scholarly piece of research. By both reviewing legal precedent and conducting field research, Silverstein presents a strong argument about the ineffectiveness of judicial bypass rules at the same time that she concludes that current bypass practices might be upheld under constitutional inspection. In the final section of the book, she concedes that a “plausible case could be made that minors are only incidentally and not unduly burdened by the magnitude of delay associated with the administrative inefficiencies and judicial recusals” (p. 154). Nevertheless, the result of this balanced but passionate examination of the judicial bypass ends up providing an extraordinary glimpse into the difficulties that young women face when traversing the legal system. Scholars interested in law and society, judicial behavior, public policy, abortion politics, and even methodology will find *Girls on the Stand* to be a rare treat.

Silverstein uses two methodological approaches to explore the judicial bypass for pregnant minors who do not want to obtain parental consent for an abortion: legal analysis and survey research. In Part I, she thoroughly reviews the

legal precedent and statutory rules that have established current bypass procedures in 34 states (p. 4). This section also includes an evenhanded assessment of reasons for and against parental involvement and the judicial bypass. In Parts II and III, the author moves beyond review of legal precedent by reporting the results of a survey and field interviews conducted with a cadre of research assistants who systematically contacted county courts simulating that they were pregnant minors. Silverstein collects survey data in three states with parental consent laws and bypass options—Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Alabama—in order to evaluate how court gatekeepers, court advocates, and judges handle inquiries into a judicial bypass. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 in Part II show, on the whole, that those charged with implementing a judicial bypass are often ill-informed or completely ignorant of bypass options in their state; Chapters 6 and 7 in Part III show that some court actions can be identified as “misconduct” or “malicious” as judges regularly recuse themselves, require minors to receive Christian pro-life counseling, and appoint guardians to represent the unborn. Silverstein uses the results of her combined legal and survey research to conclude that “minors can be made to bear the weight of the state’s moral perspective” (p. 154) and that this reality “dismantles the idealization that surrounds and upholds parental involvement laws” (p. 160). Ultimately, she makes her case loud and clear, disabusing abortion compromisers of the myths surrounding the fairness of parental consent laws.

Although the book is well written, clearly organized, and fascinating to read, some scholars might argue that the empirical data and the research design have some flaws. The author does not present concrete data on the percentage of minors who request and are granted a bypass by state, nor does she present an estimate of those who might be deterred by court gatekeepers or advocates. Further, she only surveys court systems in three states without identifying, in numerical form, the number of court systems surveyed or the raw number of times her research assistants were misinformed, maliciously misled, or given suggestions to seek counseling.

It is exactly this kind of criticism, however, that makes evaluation of complex public policy almost impossible. Authors hesitate to conduct analyses that cannot be completely verified with extensive empirical support. It is especially difficult to measure rates and percentages when exploring abortion politics simply because the topic is so controversial and the subjects under analysis, whether court employees or pregnant minors in this case, are unlikely to fully disclose the motivations behind their actions or inactions. In fact, young women who decide not to take any action cannot be measured at all.

From the first chapter, and throughout the entire book, Silverstein adequately addresses the methodological difficulty she faces when exploring the implementation of abortion policy. For example, she acknowledges in her last