

unintentionally ineffective in executing their regulatory responsibilities.

The final theme relates to responsiveness and responsibility. The degree to which Congress is responsive to the demands of state and local governments affects preemption choice. Preemption also shapes how policy responsibility is perceived and understood both by government actors and by private interests. These are difficult issues to sort out. State and local governments typically bristle at congressional mandates, but ultimately they must successfully engage the political process to safeguard their authority. Regulated industries see a trade-off between stringency and consistency of regulatory standards. Public interest groups often favor strong federal action, though the track record of complete preemption is not particularly strong. Zimmerman engages all of these complexities in grappling with the products of preemption efforts.

Ultimately, these issues of responsiveness and responsibility, of goal achievement, and of a theoretic characterization of regulatory federalism are fundamental issues to the study of American public policy. *Congressional Preemption* offers important insight into how the mechanics of policymaking authority shape the substance and politics of policy outcomes. Understanding the critical nature of preemption is an important starting point for a clearer understanding of federalism generally and regulatory policy in particular.

A New Engagement? Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen. By Cliff Zukin, Scott Keeter, Molly Andolina, Krista Jenkins, and Michael X. Delli Carpini. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. 253p. \$19.00. DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071150

— Kristi Andersen, *Syracuse University*

Should we be really worried about declining public engagement? Or should we accept that it is merely changing shape? This book describes substantial alterations in the ways Americans are involved in public life, particularly younger citizens, and analyzes a wide range of empirical data with the goal of understanding the implications—both negative and positive—of these emerging patterns of participation.

In the course of their National Youth Civic Engagement Project, Cliff Zukin and his colleagues consulted experts in youth activism; convened a number of focus groups; conducted two nationwide surveys of civic engagement; and supplemented these data sources with information from the National Election Studies, the General Social Survey, various Pew Research Center studies, an Internet-based National Youth Survey, and a National Council of State Legislatures survey.

A New Engagement? offers the careful reader many provocative findings and sensible, nuanced arguments. Take the distinction between “civic” and “political” participa-

tion. Does this make sense in a context where (as they discuss on p. 53) devolution, privatization, and the growing importance of nonprofit organizations continually blur this distinction? The authors deal nicely with this puzzle in their concluding chapter, briefly describing what the literature proposes about the connections between civic and political activities, and then going on to probe their respondents’ expressed motivations for volunteer and community work. By one measure, about half see this work as having direct political relevance (an effort to address social or political problems).

One of the most useful aspects of this research project is that it allows us a deeper look than we normally get at a number of interesting questions having to do with political socialization, political attitudes, and generational differences. For example, the authors develop models (based on two different sources of survey data) of the civic and political engagement of high school students (pp. 147–50) that confirm the importance of political talk in the home; learning specific political skills; being female (which, of course, begs the question of why a participatory gender gap exists later on in life); and frequent Internet use (the latter served to reassure me about my own children and their friends). The same chapter also argues convincingly that providing volunteer opportunities, rather than requiring students to volunteer, encourages involvement; and that high scores on measures of civic involvement are produced “when teachers encourage open discussions” about politics (p. 142). Similarly, I found very intriguing the authors’ investigation (via factor analysis of adjectival terms) of young peoples’ views of government, and the fact that young people who associate neutral, descriptive terms with “politics” (terms like “government,” “power,” “democracy”) are more likely to engage in conventional political activity than are those with either negative or positive views. I also liked the survey questions about reasons for not voting. Here, the authors find that older generations have reasons for not voting, such as disliking politics or perceiving no difference between the parties, whereas younger generations frequently give no reasons at all: They “have not so much dropped out as they have never tuned in” (p. 93). Finally, their examination of the political views of younger citizens suggests a sometimes contradictory mix: social liberalism, support of environmental policies and health-care reform, a feeling that corporations have a big impact on their lives, negativity about “politics” but (a bit surprisingly) fairly positive views of what government can and should be doing.

The book has some weaknesses, perhaps not surprisingly for such an ambitious and complex project. There is some conceptual fuzziness around the notion of “cognitive engagement,” which initially (pp. 57–58) is treated as one of the four categories of engagement, along with civic indicators (community problem solving, volunteering, etc.), political indicators, and “indicators of public voice” (contacting officials, petitions, boycotting, etc.). Later on,

however, this same concept seems to morph into “political capital,” which is treated as a “precursor” to political engagement. Perhaps a more serious problem has to do with the likelihood that the altered shape of civic participation that the authors describe will persist over time. This is a critical question, yet they are not really able to separate out generational from life-cycle effects. They acknowledge this, of course, but the fact that this dilemma is given such a central position in their inquiry makes its insolubility frustrating.

The significance level of the differences among groups—particularly among the four generational groups (termed Dutifuls, Boomers, GenXers, and DotNets)—is not generally presented. This is particularly problematic in cases where the differences are not especially large, but the text makes claims based on the differences. For example, on page 127 we read that the youngest two generations (DotNets and GenXers) are “somewhat less likely than Boomers, and especially Dutifuls, to report a home that had political talk”—but I wondered whether the difference between the two younger cohorts (16% and 17%, respectively) and the Baby Boomers (19%) was statistically significant.

These quibbles aside, the authors are carefully even-handed in reaching their conclusion. The book attempts to provide both an overall picture of Americans’ civic engagement and an analysis of generational differences in behav-

ior and attitudes. The combination of data sources both strengthens and adds to the complexity of the book’s conclusions. Appropriately, the authors are careful in sorting through all the findings. Overall, nearly half the adult population is “disengaged from both the civic and political realm” (p. 188); those who do participate slightly favor the traditional political realm. Using a generational lens, they find that the younger generations (GenXers and DotNets) are not—as the stereotypes may hold—apathetic. On some dimensions, particularly voluntarism and charitable activities, they may be more involved than older citizens. They are certainly, however, less politically interested and involved. Nonetheless, in some ways they are less cynical than older cohorts and endorse a higher level of government activity. Further, Zukin et al. argue that the tendency of many young Americans to choose civic over explicitly political involvement may not be problematic, given the increasingly blurry line between the two; and that “in the proper context, civic engagement can be a pathway to political engagement” (p. 200). At the same time, the fact that young people clearly need to be explicitly persuaded if they are to participate politically is a challenge for the system.

A New Engagement? bravely takes on these and other issues of great import for both political science and for American democracy.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Political Movements and Violence in Central America. By Charles D. Brockett. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 404p. \$75.00 cloth, \$29.99 paper.

From Movements to Parties in Latin America: The Evolution of Ethnic Politics. By Donna Lee Van Cott. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 300p. \$75.00. DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071162

— Pablo Andrade, *Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar*

The two books here reviewed make remarkable contributions to our understanding of contemporary Latin American politics. Despite their distinct individual merits and methodological, analytical, and theoretical differences, they are worth reading together, for they both address the theme of political contention in Latin America, a topic of enduring importance.

Van Cott’s work addresses classical and contemporary concerns of political science by studying the formation and performance of ethnic parties in South America (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Argentina, and Venezuela). Analyzing the means through which formerly excluded populations seek to achieve representation in a polity, Van Cott also contributes to the ongoing debate on the new ethnic dimension of Latin American politics.

Central to the author’s argument is her definition of “ethnic party” as an electoral organization grounded in a subordinate ethnic identity that raises cultural or ethnic claims (Van Cott, p. 3). This definition allows Van Cott to include in her sample numerous cases that range from highly successful parties—such as Bolivia’s Movimiento al Socialismo (MAS) and Ecuador’s Pachakutik—to small and frustrated attempts—such as many short-lived parties with limited electoral performance in Bolivia between 1978 and 1995, or contemporary ethnic organizations in Peru and Argentina (the Colombian and Venezuelan cases fall between these two extremes). This large sample helps the author to develop her main thesis: Latin American ethnic parties spring from a rather complex mix of opportunities created by democratization—especially changes in the political system associated with the collapse of the Left and new electoral rules—and a long historical trajectory conducive to ideologically charged and well-organized social movements.

Van Cott makes her case through a reconstruction of the historical formation and recent changes of the institutional structures that mediate the relations among the dominant elites and between the elites and subordinate indigenous populations. In developing her thesis, Van Cott calls into question conventional expectations regarding the relationship between politics and demography. Although it would be reasonable to assume that the presence of at