Budgeting Entitlements: The Politics of Food Stamps. By Ronald F. King. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2000. 256p. $65.00.

Eric M. Patashnik, *University of California, Los Angeles*

This is one of the best works so far in integrating budgeting into the general study of the American welfare state. The events of the past twenty years attest to the importance of making connections between budgeting and social policymaking. Since the presidency of Ronald Reagan, the budget has been at the center of ideological struggles over the future of activist government. We have witnessed the "fiscalization" of public social provision. Conflicts over Social Security, Medicare, and the tax revenues available to finance future program expansions are played out in budgetary debates. If one wishes to understand the current prospects for U.S. social policymaking, it is crucial to examine the politics of the budgetary process.

By the same token, contemporary budget scholars must pay close attention to the dynamics of social policymaking. When Aaron Wildavsky wrote his classic 1964 book, *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*, most domestic spending supported the internal operations of the bureaucracy. Since the 1970s, however, a growing share of the domestic budget has been spent on transfer payments for individuals. Many transfer programs have been designed as mandatory entitlements. Under ordinary agency budgeting, the appropriations committees have the license to authorize funds as they see fit. Under entitlement budgeting, expenditures are on automatic pilot unless budget guardians manage somehow to reclaim control. In sum, the expansion of welfare entitlements has fundamentally changed the political economy of American national budgeting.

In this stimulating and thoroughly researched book, Ronald King explores the clash between entitlement protections and budgetary concerns. His analysis uses the food stamp program as its primary empirical vehicle, but it sets forth a conceptual framework that is helpful in understanding more generally how policy design influences the politics of resource allocation decisions. King's main empirical claim is that the institutional rules of the budget game fundamentally shape both the strategies of individual players and the outcomes of collective decisions, although not always in intended ways. For King, entitlement budgeting also serves as a setting for exploring the normative tension between procedural and substantive justice. Budgeting implies a discretionary choice among competing purposes, yet entitlements stand as prior claims that are insulated from ordinary fiscal control. The tension between entitlement and spending restraint seems to be irresolvable. King provocatively insists that confrontation with this basic moral dilemma is a continuing obligation of an engaged citizenry.

The book's most important contribution is methodological. King uses rational choice models both to generate hypotheses about the effect of institutional rules on actors' behavior and to provide an interpretive framework for ordering his empirical findings. This is a potentially fruitful yet still uncommon approach in policy studies. Many political scientists with substantive policy concerns shun rational choice concepts and analytic models, viewing them as a barrier to sensitive understanding of case materials. Formal theorists either avoid confrontation with the messy details of policy development or else use these details merely to establish the plausibility of some off-the-shelf model. King demonstrates that it is possible to make good use of analytic models in policy research. One can attempt to strike a balance between descriptive realism and analytic power. Some historical-institutionalists may criticize King for being too abstract. Game theorists may attack him for not being analytically rigorous enough. Given King's own purposes, I think he has the balance between empirical richness and analytic power about right.

King's models have three distinguishing characteristics. First, they are elementary; they involve no high-powered math. Second, they were deliberately formulated with a specific empirical application in mind—the evolution of the food stamp program since the 1960s. The models clearly have broader implications, but King makes no attempt to develop universal theories of politics. Third, the models do not make heroic assumptions about the effectiveness of the policy process. They allow for policy outcomes that are the product of neither consensus nor rational deliberation.

At the core of the models is the notion of a "reversion point," the budget outcome that will prevail by default if no bargaining agreement is reached. The location of the reversion point at any moment depends crucially on the specific budget rule then in effect. Over the food stamp program's history, three distinct budget rules have been employed. King skillfully exploits this institutional variance to explore how changes in the reversion point alter the logic of bargaining strategies of the players. The first rule is ordinary discretionary budgeting, which governed food stamps during the program's formative years. Spending cannot take place absent the passage of an appropriations measure, so the reversion point is zero. Next, King analyzes the entitlement rule, under which the reversion point is determined by the number of eligible persons who seek assistance and the level of their determined need. The third budget rule, which applied to food stamps during much of the Reagan-Bush era, is a spending cap that allows outlays to increase but only up to a predetermined level. The reversion point exists at the cap threshold.

According to King, changes in the reversion point do not eliminate conflict over food stamp spending; rather, they influence the way budget actors play the game. His most interesting insight is that the incentives for aggressive behavior in budget negotiations vary with the form of budget rule. Under discretionary budgeting, the incentive for moderation is relatively strong because the failure to reach agreement will cause programs to receive zero funding, an outcome so extreme that even conservatives who decry excessive government spending are likely to run from it. Under pure entitlement rules, in contrast, budgetary posturing and position taking are less politically risky because everyone recognizes that obligatory costs eventually will be met.

The many strengths of the book notwithstanding, some constructive criticisms can be offered. The analysis makes no attempt to test statistically the effect of changes in budget rules on either bargaining dynamics or policy outcomes, although trend data on the food stamp budget are presented in an appendix. King rightly emphasizes that all entitlements are not alike, but he misses an opportunity to say how his models might be modified if applied, say, to a contributory entitlement such as Social Security, for which expenditures are permanently appropriated yet constrained by a dedicated revenue base. In the concluding chapter, King suggests that the budgetary precommitment established through the entitlement mechanism can be seen as an instance of "self-binding," whereby citizens prevent themselves from reneging on promises they wish to keep. Another possible interpretation—one that seems to fit better with King's facts—is that the entitlement form (as well as the cap mechanism) embody attempts by particular factions to lock in their political agendas by binding their current and future opponents. In

government budgeting, structural design is used not only to solve the "time-inconsistency" problem but also to reduce political uncertainty.

These caveats aside, *Budgeting Entitlements* makes an important contribution. The book is particularly appropriate for advanced undergraduate and graduate courses that stress social policy, political economy, and public administration. It is essential reading for budget specialists, welfare state researchers, and policy scholars interested in drawing on rational choice concepts in their work.

Divided Arsenal: Race and the American State during World War II. By Daniel Kryder. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 301p. $29.95.

Philip A. Klinkner, *Hamilton College*

Scholars of comparative politics and international relations have long been aware of the importance of war to state development, but only recently have scholars of American politics come to the same conclusion. In particular, they have begun to examine the importance of wars and their aftermath to the development of the American state. Daniel Kryder contributes significantly to this trend by examining how the American state sought to manage the racial friction created by World War II. He takes on Gunnar Myrdal's view that this conflict, like the American Revolution, the Civil War, and World War I, would lead to significant advances for African Americans. According to Myrdal, the ideological nature of the war against fascism inspired white Americans to redouble their efforts to make the democratic and egalitarian ideals of the American creed a reality for all.

Kryder shows that state actors took a less idealist view of the war; they focused less on pursuing ideological reform agendas and more on the pragmatic tasks of maintaining an orderly and efficient military mobilization as well as assuring continued electoral success. The analysis focuses on federal manpower policies governing black factory workers, farm laborers, and army troops. In each case, Kryder provides a thorough and sophisticated description that draws heavily upon government records and archives. In particular, he offers an excellent description of the waves of unrest among black soldiers, most of whom were stationed in the South.

Kryder shows that executive branch bureaucrats were concerned less with advancing a particular racial agenda, egalitarian or otherwise, than with minimizing racial conflicts that might harm the war effort or endanger the Democratic Party's increasingly fragile coalition of conservative southern whites, urban blacks, and northern white liberals. At times, this led to policies that were somewhat racially progressive, such as the Fair Employment Practices Commission in 1941 or the reduction in segregation on military bases. At other times, these goals led in the opposite direction, such as the initiation of FBI surveillance of urban blacks. Indeed, "the Roosevelt administration implemented policies that may have appeared progressive, but other purposes—the full mobilization of industrial production and the maintenance of the party coalition—outweighed in importance the principle and goal of egalitarian social reform" (p. 4). Kryder is certainly correct in stressing the limits of the executive branch's desire to alter the racial status quo. From FDR on down, most saw winning the war as their primary and perhaps only goal. If the cause of racial equality were to be advanced, it would only be as a side effect or instrumental in the pursuit of victory.

The only weakness of the book is that Kryder seeks to extrapolate from the case studies to make a larger statement about the effect of World War II on American race relations. He concludes that the war had little lasting positive influence and, if anything, actually constrained the movement toward civil rights. Kryder seems to be using the civil rights advances of the 1960s as his benchmark for assessing the achievements of the 1940s, which clearly do not measure up. It seems that the more appropriate benchmark is the decades before the 1940s. Compared to the 1910s, 1920s, and 1930s, changes in federal policy regarding race relations were truly staggering. The federal government moved from at best ignoring racial inequality to at worst actively engaging in discriminatory practices, to working to undo some aspects of that inequality, albeit in the circumscribed ways that Kryder discusses. In some respects, the federal government's response to civil rights in the 1940s is like the dog that could dance—that he did so poorly is far less significant than the fact that he did it at all.

By focusing exclusively on federal manpower policies, Kryder overlooks other areas of government action. For example, during World War II the Department of Justice acted for the first time since Reconstruction to investigate lynchings as a violation of federal civil rights laws. Changes of equal or greater importance came in other branches of government, particularly the Supreme Court, which in 1944 undid a major component of black disenfranchisement by banning white primaries. There were also changes in racial attitudes and policies outside the federal government. State and local governments began to pass antidiscrimination legislation. Private actors began to jump on the civil rights bandwagon, as evidenced by the remarkable spread of local interracial councils in the mid-1940s and the integration of baseball immediately after the war. A fuller look at American race relations in World War II shows a somewhat more positive trend than Kryder suggests.

But these are differences of degree rather than of kind. *Divided Arsenal* is a compelling and important analysis of American racial manpower policy in World War II. It advances significantly our understanding of American race relations in this critical period and, more broadly, of the interrelationship among war, the state, and social movements.

Diversity and Distrust: Civic Education in a Multicultural Democracy. By Stephen Macedo. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. 343p. $45.00.

Renford Reese, *Cal Poly Pomona University*

Stephen Macedo's book is an episodic historical analysis of the role of civic education in the United States. It has three broad themes: "Public Schooling and American Citizenship," "Liberal Civic Education and Religious Fundamentalism," and "School Reform and Civic Education." It is motivated by the author's conviction that much of the thinking surrounding diversity and difference is misconceived. According to Macedo, "diversity is not always of value, and it should not, any more than other ideals, be accepted uncritically" (p. 3).

Macedo suggests that celebrating diversity should be secondary to a civic liberalism that advocates the legitimacy of reasonable efforts to inculcate shared political virtues but leaves deeper philosophical moral questions to private communities. He supports a public philosophy of liberalism that embraces civic ideals that are broad in their protection of freedoms but not too deep. A main purpose of this book is "to argue that we should not allow liberalism's most alluring features—broad freedoms, limited government, and the