The chapter from which the book takes its counterfactual title is conceptually interesting but does not cover much new ground for political scientists. The answer to the chapter's question hinges on a combination of incorporative and coercive mechanisms that manage marginalization, five of which he considers crucial: "selective incorporation, mimetic reform, indirect rule, consumption, and repression and surveillance" (p. 86). His account of the interaction of these mechanisms to generate and sustain quiescence in the face of increasing inequality is fairly standard. He brings the historian's sensibility for nuance and complexity to an argument about how the different mechanisms play out in practice among the poor and reinforce one another. He notes the limits of minority political incorporation, but he does not consider the extent to which the emergence of the new black and Latino politics that took shape in the 1960s and 1970s is itself a dynamic element in those processes that maintain quiescence. This aspect of the phenomenon stands out especially in light of indictments and/or convictions of high-profile minority public officials, such as former mayors Kwame Kilpatrick and Ray Nagin, and former congressmen Jesse Jackson, Jr., and William Jefferson.

The book's last substantive chapter examines the evolution of what Katz characterizes as technologies of poverty work, by which he means "research on the history, size, demography, behavior, and geographic distribution of the poverty population, as well as the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of antipoverty programs and policies" (p. 113). He indicates that since the 1980s, market-based approaches to the mitigation of poverty have become increasingly prominent, ultimately commonsensical. That is consistent with the more general proliferation of market-driven public policy over that period, and Katz examines several of the most prominent antipoverty initiatives, including Enterprise and Empowerment Zones, microfinance, and individual asset-accumulation strategies. He finds those interventions generally not up to the task of alleviating poverty in the United States. This assessment is not surprising, as those approaches stem more from faith in market forces than consideration of poverty's sources.

One quibble concerns the author's contention that the imagery of an urban underclass, mired in self-reproducing cultural pathologies, has been displaced by this market-based perspective. I suspect a more accurate view is that the underclass imagery has become so deeply embedded as a commonsense understanding of the nature and sources of poverty and inequality that it is now an unarticulated normative premise on which the market-based initiatives are constructed. The latter are touted as much for their psychological as their economic empowerment. This understanding is as true of microfinance and asset-building strategies as it is of privatization schemes such as charter schools and the HOPE VI "mixed income" housing program that "deconcentrates" poverty while advancing the objectives of publicly supported rent-intensifying development. This is a small point, but it is significant because it shows that market-based and moralistic perspectives on inequality are not incompatible. Both assume that poverty stems from poor people's deficiencies and equally impel discussion of remedial action toward correcting or compensating for those deficiencies. Rhetorically and ideologically, each interpretation can depend on the other for commonsense verisimilitude.

For political scientists in particular, *Why Don't American Cities Burn?* underscores the importance of historical perspective in the study of urban politics, racial transition, and inequality. Katz's book joins a historical scholarship that includes Beryl Satter's *Family Properties: How the Struggle over Race and Real Estate Transformed Chicago and Urban America* (2009) and Robert O. Self's *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (2005), as well as his colleague Thomas Sugrue's earlier, foundational study *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (2005), in examining the complex interplay of social forces and concrete interests—ideological, institutional, and programmatic dynamics that have shaped and constrained postwar urban and metropolitan development.

Congress vs. the Bureaucracy: Muzzling Agency Public Relations. By Mordecai Lee. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011. 336p. $39.95.
doi:10.1017/S1537592713001692

— Manuel P. Teodoro, *Texas A&M University*

The autonomy and limits of U.S. bureaucratic agencies are subjects of great and growing attention in contemporary political science. In *Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy* (2001), Daniel Carpenter argued that late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century federal bureaucrats achieved independence from their congressional masters by establishing agency reputations and cultivating coalitions of constituents. A primary means of this reputation building was public advertising. A burgeoning newspaper industry, rapidly expanding postal service, and advancements in printing allowed entrepreneurial bureaucrats to appeal directly to citizens for support over the heads of their putative congressional overseers. Those overseers were not blind, however. In *Congress vs. the Bureaucracy,* Mordecai Lee shows that throughout the twentieth century, many members of Congress were alarmed at the scope and scale of federal agencies' public relations activities, recognizing them as the de facto lobbying campaigns that they were. He documents congressional attempts to curb bureaucratic autonomy by controlling federal agencies' public communications, and then evaluates the effects of these efforts on agencies' public relations activities.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592713001692 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The book offers a series of case studies that are organized into 11 chapters that span the twentieth century, from defunding the Panama Canal Commission's press agent in 1905 to regulating video press releases by the Department of Health and Human Services in 2005. Some chapters focus on a single agency or congressional session, while others span several decades and bureaus. In each chapter, Lee recounts an agency's public communications program, a formal congressional effort to control that program, and the effect (or lack of effect) of congressional actions on agency public relations activity.

A useful example is Chapter 2's treatment of the United States Forest Service (USFS), its legendary founding chief Gifford Pinchot, and his relationship with Congress. Winning public support for the USFS was a key to his pursuit of autonomy, and he was an early master of agency publicity. Pinchot pioneered the use of public relations mechanisms that are now commonplace: customized speeches for the White House, mass mailings of agency-produced pamphlets, made-for-media events, prepackaged news articles, and press releases. Frustrated USFS opponents in Congress attacked the agency's public relations program, which they recognized as one of the pillars of the agency's autonomy. In speeches and newspapers, Pinchot's congressional enemies denounced USFS publicity as self-aggrandizing propaganda. In 1908, Congressman Franklin Mondell (R-WY) introduced legislation that would ban the USFS from writing articles that placed "an exaggerated value on its work" and from "encouraging people . . . to impugn the motives or criticize Members of Congress and Senators . . . who do not agree with some of the policies and some of the acts of the Bureau" (p. 57). Pinchot's congressional allies pointed out that disseminating information about USFS programs was an important part of the agency's mission. In the end, legislation banning USFS-authored articles and press releases passed overwhelmingly, but the USFS's congressional supporters ensured that the language of the final legislation was so vague that Pinchot could continue his publicity activities unabated. So long as the USFS was not producing propaganda but, rather, disseminating "information of value to the public" (p. 61), it remained compliant with the law. Congress had exercised its authority to curtail agency publicity, but its effort packed no real punch.

A familiar pattern emerges from Lee's studies of more than a dozen congressional attempts to limit agency publicity: 1) An agency engages in public relations activities; 2) members of Congress who are hostile to an agency decry its publicity efforts as propaganda and propose limits to agency public relations; 3) the agency's congressional allies argue that dissemination of information to the public is a legitimate activity, carving out an exception for such dissemination; 4) legislation limiting agency propaganda passes easily and with fanfare; 5) legitimate publicity (information dissemination) and illegitimate publicity (propaganda) prove impossible to distinguish from each other in practice; and so, 6) the agency's public relations activities continue more or less as before, often with some changes to formal job and program titles that skirt congressional restrictions. Lee concludes that congressional efforts to muzzle agencies are ultimately "Sisyphean" (p. 224). Although the details of the cases vary in important ways, *Congress vs. the Bureaucracy* tells essentially the same tale of the Congress–agency relationship in nearly every one. The chapters are like verses of a song that each lead to the same hook and chorus, and the reader is left humming the tune.

Lee describes his approach as "descriptive historical theory" (p. 229); it is decidedly more descriptive and historical than theoretical. The book is at its best when the actions of specific people in specific times on specific issues are recounted in detail. The heavily footnoted, painstakingly constructed case studies offer the reader a sense of the back-and-forth play of congressional politics that can disappear from more abstract treatments of the topic.

As a theoretical work the book is less satisfying. The case studies accomplish the author's narrowly defined goals: to describe congressional attempts to muzzle agency public relations and to assess their effectiveness. However, the questions most likely to engage political scientists are left aside or receive only passing attention. Why does Congress try to muzzle some agencies and not others? Why do some members of Congress take up this issue when others do not? Why do congressional attempts to control agency publicity fail so consistently? Rich narratives answer these questions in each particular case, but Lee advances no general causal argument. Greater engagement with the literature on legislative behavior and the policy process could have provided useful frameworks in which to explain the phenomena that he chronicles.

Part of the difficulty lies in Lee's tendency to ascribe motives and actions to Congress as a monolithic whole. For example, he declares that "Congress has tried to assert its statutory and financial powers to threaten bureaucratic autonomy by limiting agency public relations, [and] the bureaucracy has almost always succeeded in negating Congress's will" (p. 4). This unitary actor assumption is odd, since the book is packed with examples of diversity in preferences and attitudes among congressmen. In nearly every case, some members of Congress seek to constrain agency publicity while others attempt to bolster their favored agencies' autonomy. Congressional failures to constrain bureaucratic public relations may be due to the inherent difficulty of distinguishing propaganda from information dissemination, but it might also be a consequence of effective counteraction by agencies' congressional allies. If enough members of Congress support an agency's activities, legislation to muzzle agency publicity may be intentionally weak. Railing against bureaucratic propaganda gives members of Congress easy opportunities for position taking, a chance

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592713001692 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to attack opposition-party presidents, and a platform for the ambitious politician to raise his/her profile on the national stage—none of which requires real constraints on bureaus. In other words, it is possible that congressional efforts to muzzle agency public relations are not really about bureaucratic autonomy at all, but rather are consequences of legislators' pursuit of policy and reelection.

Congress vs. the Bureaucracy advances our understanding of the Congress–bureaucracy relationship by documenting congressional responses to publicity campaigns by autonomy-forging bureaucrats. Students of bureaucratic politics will find in its pages detailed illustrations of agency publicity as lobbying mechanism, the limited capacity of Congress to resist agency publicity, and perhaps the empirical building blocks of a broader theory of the three-way relationship among Congress, the bureaucracy, and the citizens served by both institutions.

Aging Across the United States: Matching Needs to States' Differing Opportunities and Services. By Charles Lockhart and Jean Giles-Sims. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010. 224p. $58.95 cloth, $27.95 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592713001709

— Frederick R. Lynch, *Claremont McKenna College*

Having coped with aging parents in various state and local settings, Charles Lockhart and Jean Giles-Sims learned through both personal experience and vigorous research which key economic, sociological, cultural, and policy variables should inform older Americans' decisions in choosing where to live during retirement and old age. In a well-written book that is useful to both the general public and scholars alike, Lockhart and Giles-Sims pose five basic issues that seniors must consider: 1) Where can retirees best find a life of companionship and active recreation? 2) Where can retirees best find a meaningful life and supportive communities? 3) Where can retirees best afford to live (and be safe)? (4) Where will retirees have the greatest opportunity for being healthy and finding the best medical care? And 5) where can retirees find accessible, affordable, high-quality long-term care?

The authors attempt to synthesize a massive amount of demographic data that address these questions. They understand that older Americans are a very diverse population and that the nation's 50 states often contain major internal variations (urban vs. rural areas, for example). Still, they produce several intriguing, recurring patterns of opportunities and services available by state. Much of this book is a plainly written description of a variety of factors (income inequality, cost of living, Robert Putnam's "social capital index," and several indices of political culture, health spending, and health outcomes) and how they produce differing types of "Senior State Friendliness" (SFF) as displayed on dozens of national maps. A concluding chapter is more complex, as the authors use regression analyses to try to identify key variables that explain these interstate differences.

One reader-friendly heuristic device employed by the authors is profiles of hypothetical older couples (and a few singles) who make (or do not make) geographical moves at various stages in the aging cycle. Indeed, this is an important point of the book: Seniors (and their adult children, if any) must be aware of the progressive stages of aging. States that rank well on measures of interest to "active seniors" (recreation, climate, leisure activities) may not be well matched to the more intensive medical needs (availability of medical specialists, hospitals, and long-term-care services) and community support (and proximity of family members) required in late old age. Few states, the authors find, "have it all."

As Lockhart and Giles-Sims demographically map and analyze factors related to Senior State Friendliness, definite geopolitical and sociocultural patterns emerge. They eventually conclude that "with some exceptions, different southern regions lead the recreational lifestyle dimension of SSF. Various northern regions tend to lead on the meaningful contributions and supportive communities; the health and high quality medical care; and the accessible high quality long-term care dimensions. Northwestern/north-central and south-central southeastern regions provide greater affordability" (p. 124). Indeed, it is hard not to notice that the nation's poorest, often racially divided "Deep South" states (Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama) fare worst on most indexes (except climate and affordability) and "hold a near monopoly on the bottom ranks of health and high quality medical care" (p. 124). Conversely, the more ethnically and economically homogeneous northern "heartland" states, from the Rockies (Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah) into the Great Plains (North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa), generally fare very well on Lockhart and Giles-Sims's five key senior questions—with the exception, of course, of long and cold winters, which negatively impact "recreation."

Why do some states have more SSF than others? In the concluding chapter, Lockhart and Giles-Sims calculate regression coefficients to explain variations in the five SSF issues as dependent variables using seven independent variables: state political culture, political (party) competition, state tax capacity, median income of seniors, proportion of seniors, proportion of minority seniors, and average senior property tax.

As might be expected, strong civic culture ("meaningful contributions and supportive communities") is correlated with a solid middle class (median senior income) and active, participatory politics (political culture and party competition). And the authors glumly acknowledge their replication of Robert Putnam's famously controversial correlation, that "greater ethnic diversity depresses supportive community feelings" (p. 136). They are also puzzled by a regression coefficient indicating that rising

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592713001692 Published online by Cambridge University Press