

reason, McGuinn's scholarship comes at a critical time, particularly because the No Child Left Behind Act is about to be considered by Congress for reauthorization.

McGuinn's scholarship is impressive; few researchers would have the patience to sift through the mountains of reports, reports about reports, and policy studies that both illuminate and obscure the how and why of NCLB. The author's work is particularly important because it ties political science theory together with how it came to be that Democrats and Republicans decided that local control was the problem, not the solution, to the shocking facts of educational inequality. It is an eerie fact that our educational system reproduces our school system with such accuracy; it seems almost an automatic process. But, of course, there is no invisible hand in the social world. Our social system is highly stratified, and a network of institutions reinforces this stratification, often through the very institutions that claim to provide mobility. School systems, generally speaking, are not interventions in social reproduction; they facilitate and legitimate intergenerational inequality.

No Child Left Behind is meant to disrupt this process by forcing schools to be transparent and to make their failures public knowledge. McGuinn documents how this intervention grew from the margins of the policy arena to dead center. He examines in detail how Republican and Democratic "regimes" eventually despaired of piecemeal reform and went to the heart of the matter—federal dollars could be used to leverage transparency and accountability and to force school districts to "close the achievement gap."

All of these developments are described by McGuinn with admiral evenhandedness. He is particularly astute in weaving together the story of how conservatives came to believe that the federal government was the philosophical focus of regulatory school policy at the local level and even the school-by-school level. His book is good medicine for all of us because at a time when school improvement is so politicized, it is salutary to step back and to put the policy wars into perspective.

Today, Americans are still concerned about education, although the "war on terror" has overshadowed educational reform in the last several years. Much of McGuinn's work is centering the educational policy debate on the political environment that shapes public perception. He writes, "In particular, the political environment since the 1980s has encouraged national politicians to emphasize ideas and symbols in their rhetoric and to make more frequent public appeals for political support; this is especially true for presidents and presidential candidates" (pp. 203–4). We live in an age of the permanent presidential campaign, and we can expect that educational improvement, for many years to come, will be one of the policy chapters written by politicians as they promote the gospel of social wealth.

If I were to differ at all with McGuinn, it would be my concern that he somewhat underemphasizes the educational agenda of what constitutes the political Right in

American politics. NCLB is loaded with rhetoric about educational equality, but it also can serve to deregulate public education by demonstrating its incompetence and, thus, fulfill the ambition of the deregulators by a means other than vouchers. We have seen that deregulation is far from a magic bullet and that the federal government is not a neutral arbiter when it comes to rewarding its friends and punishing its enemies through the process of awarding grants, contracts, and consultancies.

It is McGuinn's great virtue that he looks at the record with the cool, trained eye of the scholar. His experience as a high school government and history teacher grounds his work admirably as a political scientist and historian. "In studying policy change," he writes, "it is necessary to place political and policymaking developments in their broader historical context, to create, in Paul Pierson's phrase, 'a moving picture'" (p. 208). McGuinn has created for us a detailed moving picture, and we can only hope that he continues to develop his research agenda and contributes even more richly to our understanding of the interaction between educational politics and policymaking.

**Routing the Opposition: Social Movements, Public Policy, and Democracy.** Edited by David S. Meyer, Valerie

Jenness, and Helen Ingram. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005. 360p. \$70.50 cloth, \$23.50 paper.  
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071095

— James M. Jasper, *Contexts Magazine*

Most social scientists cling to a progressive image of history, in which one group after another organizes for various rights and interests, pursues them in a number of arenas until—often after much struggle and bloodshed—they gain the legal recognitions and influence on policies they seek. The circle of rights and recognition slowly and inexorably expands outward. Scholars of social movements, in particular, are committed to the idea that the protestors they study have a broad impact and play a key role in history. Their faith in this idea often outpaces the evidence and makes the proposition difficult to test.

Anyone who studies regimes that claim to be democratic faces a similar question: How do preferences among organized and mass publics work their way into political decisions and public policies? Or do they? Most current theories of political movements were formed during and inspired by the protests of the 1960s and 1970s, which kept the progressive vision alive despite occasional setbacks. Perhaps we need new theories that incorporate the lessons of the great backlash that began in the 1970s and entrenched itself in two globally powerful governments with Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan. Has progress toward social justice stalled, or actually reversed?

The editors and contributors to *Routing the Opposition* (mostly political scientists and sociologists) examine the interaction between state and movement in some detail,

across diverse American cases both historical and contemporary. These include struggles over worker compensation a hundred years ago; old-age pensions in the 1930s; benefits for veterans of the Civil War, World War I, and World War II; prisoners' rights during the last 30 years; regulation of organic agriculture; local antidrug activities; the inclusion of women in government offices; and the rights of legal immigrants in California. Many of the chapters are useful summaries of contributors' larger research programs and findings, and all are useful efforts to see whether and how movements affect policy. Such different mobilizations, with diverse goals, promise some comparative theory building.

Unfortunately, the theoretical terms and causal mechanisms uncovered are almost as diverse as the cases. Edwin Amenta presents a "political mediation model" in which challengers must match their strategies (more or less radical, essentially) to the political contexts they face. Frank Baumgartner and Christine Mahoney use the language of agenda setting. John McCarthy sees a "Velcro triangle" of "state-movement interpenetration" and "channeling." For Lee Ann Banaszak, the attainment of "insider status" is a crucial form of "state-movement intersection," while for Ryken Grattet, a "policy nexus" forms through networks of professionals. Suzanne Mettler looks for "policy feedback effects." These are all reasonable metaphors and concepts, skillfully deployed, but it is not always clear if they also amount to different causal mechanisms that we could combine into broader models. Despite the editors' efforts, it is not clear how the different ideas are related to one another. As it stands, the book offers a rich but random grab bag.

Perhaps the editors and authors have set an impossible task for themselves. To address the "relationship" between states and social movements is, in the end, to reify each of them. A state is as much (or more) an arena for contestation as it is a player, and it is rarely a unified player at that. The same is true of movements, which are complex, tentative (and largely imagined) networks and cooperations among a variety of groups and individuals. Every government agency or protest group is also an arena of struggle among those individuals and factions with their own goals and favored means. Only if we forget this can we be surprised, for instance, at the degree to which members of a movement may also be government officials, or at coalitions between those who work for nongovernmental organizations and those who work for the state. Any number of players, with multiple and shifting goals, can occupy almost any positions inside or outside the state (an extremely porous boundary, as many of these authors show).

If we take strategy seriously, we need to rethink who the players are. We need to accommodate both individuals and compound players in our models, recognizing that compound players are at the same time arenas as well as players. We need to think in terms of actions and goals,

rather than trying to assume these from players' structural positions. We need to look at strategic choices made at many different levels, and put aside metaphors of insider and outsider, as though the state were a fortress surrounded by movements battering at the portcullis—to add to the metaphors already used in this book to simplify a messy set of strategic engagements.

**Ivory Towers and Nationalist Minds: Universities, Leadership, and the Development of the American State.**

By Mark R. Nemeec. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006. 312p. \$70.00 cloth, \$24.95 paper.  
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071101

— Heather R. McDougall, *Christopher Newport University*

The end of the Civil War ushered a new era in American state-building as the government sought to reshape the structure and identity of politics, group formation, and individual identity. During this period, nongovernmental agencies became central to disseminating and legitimating state authority. Although universities have been recognized as influential agencies, Mark R. Nemeec argues that prior works overlooked the process by which they gained this influence. In *Ivory Towers and Nationalist Minds*, Nemeec illuminates the rise of American universities as active partners and independent agents of state building from 1862 to 1920. Universities provided services to national development through promoting democratic ideals, industrial competitiveness, and intellectual vanguardism. Primarily through the "institutional entrepreneurship" of university presidents, American universities rapidly expanded their role and influence in society. Rather than the government, it was the university leaders who took the leading role to define what their universities would become.

The book utilizes case studies drawn from four major groupings: older eastern elite institutions, newer midwestern and western state institutions, newer private institutions, and antebellum southern state institutions. Within these case studies, Nemeec focuses on the "institutional entrepreneurs" who worked both in competition and conjunction with each other to expand the influence of their respective institutions. Specific leaders include Andrew Dickson White of Cornell, Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins, James Burrill Angell of Michigan, and Gifford Pinchot of Yale.

Nemeec categorizes the process of university expansion in two transition eras: the "loosely coupled era" of 1862–99 and the "formally aligned era" of 1900–1920. During the first era, the government initiated growth of public institutions through the 1862 Morrill Act. The act provided land grants for colleges that would focus on agriculture and mechanic arts. However, it was the university leadership who structured the act's implementation and impact upon further academic initiatives. University officials limited the government's influence and worked in