

mistaken.) Lincoln's machinations regarding the 13th amendment are another matter. (I wrote about Lincoln in a 1994 essay on dirty hands.) Unfortunately, Uhr relies solely on Stephen Spielberg's film *Lincoln*; he has not consulted the work of historians. Not surprisingly, the Hollywood production simplifies the story and omits the principal ethical dilemma (a corrupt vote in the old Congress or a clean vote in the new Congress six weeks later), in order to present Lincoln in a certain agreeable light. Is Uhr reluctant to admit openly that leaders may have to get their hands dirty? This is a reasonable question because Uhr often suggests that great leaders are superior people who grasp what their role requires, but have to explain themselves to audiences who lack the capacity to fully understand (e.g., p. 136). The prudent leader sometimes hides and dissembles.

And, apparently, so does the prudent theorist of leadership, such as Henry Sidgwick (pp. 84–86, 96–100) and perhaps Kant (p. 115–118). I do not have space to discuss Uhr's often illuminating reflections on the three major theorists; instead I will highlight the underlying claims: (1) Theory enters when leaders attempt to explain their conduct publicly (p. 23); (2) the theories leaders appeal to are the three familiar ones (p. 7); and (3) the importance of theory is evident when leaders disagree about policies or practices, because theory assists in adjudicating such disagreements (p. 24). I have to say I am skeptical. My experience suggests that, when leaders offer justificatory accounts, their repertoire is much broader, including cultural, religious, and political ideals that do not fit easily into the three theories. And the three theories are not very useful in adjudicating disputes, since they themselves are highly contested. By not examining ethical reasoning "as it really is through the eyes of practical leaders" (p. 80), and instead turning to the writings of certain "great thinkers," I believe Uhr has missed an opportunity to illuminate the real world of leadership.

Still, I think Uhr is on the right track in highlighting the central place of prudence in public ethics. Most importantly, he recognizes the gap between principle and action. When a practitioner asks, "What should I do in these circumstances?" the question is strategic, and the answer must take account of what is feasible and what authority the practitioner has, as well as what consequences are likely to ensue for specific individuals. The answer is guided by principles, but what it means to be guided by principles is not straightforward. To guide is not necessarily to determine. The prudential leader knows the limits of abstract theory and the dangers of ideology.

In his two concluding chapters, Uhr presents a few more vignettes, along with a set of "talking points," to review his main themes. Of the stories, the most interesting (to my mind) features the unsuccessful efforts of an Australian health minister's chief of staff pressuring a civil servant to dismantle a consumer website on the health risks of certain foods. Despite his government position, the chief

of staff has continued to act as a lobbyist for business firms adversely affected by the website and thus has a clear conflict of interest. What is remarkable is that Uhr says almost nothing about the civil servant who refused to cave in to the pressure. How did she think about her actions? What principles, if any, did she appeal to? Did personal as well as professional ideals play a crucial role? Here is a courageous public servant I would like to learn more about.

Ethics in Public Life: Good Practitioners in a Rising Asia. By Kenneth Winston. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 261p. \$100.00
doi:10.1017/S1537592715003722

— John Uhr, *Australian National University*

This book is published in the Palgrave Macmillan "Asia Today" series under editors Takashi Inoguchi and G. John Ikenberry. The series examines Asia as "the geopolitical epicentre for the global system," with intellectual as well as economic and political impacts on global politics. Author Kenneth Winston, long associated with the Harvard Kennedy School (HKS), is an accomplished expert in the field of public ethics, with important things to say about "ethics in public life" in different global settings.

Here, Winston examines the impact that "a rising Asia" could have on global concepts of public ethics. The book might be *about* Asia but it is not solely *for* Asia: He wants readers globally to think through the application of his Asian-derived examples of public ethics to governance globally. For specialists in the political art of practical reasoning, as Winston is, *Ethics in Public Life* presents a wide variety of fascinating examples of practical reasoning by Asian governance practitioners. But the author goes many steps further: He provides a challenging restatement about global values in public ethics, with more than a hint of criticism of U.S. practices of good governance.

In several passages, Winston is critical of the public ethics of the United States when engaging with global differences in politics and morality. The balance, however, is his generous use of HKS experts and resources to inform his friendly criticism of the way we can understand public ethics as a feature of global governance. Winston's main claim is that Asia can teach us much about public ethics. This teaching comes from the drama of official disagreement, rather than the dogma of official doctrine. Four of the five numbered chapters are case studies of official disagreements managed by reflective practitioners who protect vulnerable interests against powerful dominating interests. The three remaining non-numbered chapters provide more theoretical accounts of contemporary public ethics, often based on HKS research papers on integrity in governance. The case chapters are rich with the names of many traditional Asian codes and practices, but the theoretical chapters revolve around the names of a small number of political philosophers who construct the framework of public ethics celebrated by Winston: notably, such Harvard giants as

the philosopher John Rawls, the political scientist Joseph Nye, and the legal scholar William P. Alford.

Winston's case-study picture blends Asian and Western principles of public ethics in an interesting variety of forms, as different national traditions adapt or modify Western ethics to reshape and modernize Asian ethics. The book provides a gallery of case studies of Winston's "good practitioners" of governance, who promote quite different types of public ethics reflecting the practitioners' own judgments about how best to balance the competing ethical responsibilities. If the author has a personal or preferred model of cross-cultural public ethics in a rising Asia, this does not distract readers from the simple but compelling task of soaking up the specifics displayed by the assembled good practitioners. Not all of these good practitioners achieve the good they set out to promote. Some even have setbacks or failures, which Winston uses to help readers reflect more deeply on the surprising limits of what he terms "absolutes" in public ethics—be they Asian beliefs or Western values. The "good" in good practitioner refers to their skill in the hard-won but messy practice of governance, and not to their abstract moral virtue or off-the-job personal excellence.

This book is not a theory or even a framework of Asian governance or public ethics but a very readable review of turning points in public governance experienced by practitioners known to Winston. Many of the case studies highlight the professional careers of former students at the HKS whose political and cultural circumstances Winston has had the opportunity to look at closely through his Asian field trips. The countries that emerge in the case studies are Singapore, Cambodia (twice), China, India, and a very corrupt "Kalani-stan," which is not revealed under its own name. Each case study shows a midcareer practitioner using their own professional judgment to interpret the right ethical balance among many competing demands. The cases are similar in that each practitioner knows the limitations of strict compliance with the norms of prevailing local traditions or of Western modernity, yet each devises their own workable balance—given the demanding circumstances of governance they must work through.

The reference to "good practitioners" reflects Winston's core argument that emerging across Asia are exemplars of good governance who are departing from Asian traditionalism but not fully accepting Western democracy as a universal political

norm. Part of the "goodness" of these exemplars is the encouragement they give to Winston to value new forms of public ethics free from the mainstream models promoted in Asian and Western political systems. Advocates of public ethics might be surprised by his defense of "dirty hands" as a core component of leadership ethics. By stepping away from the dry formality of virtue ethics, Winston invites readers to wonder about the nature of public ethics he attributes to Machiavelli in his introductory analytical framework.

Near the center of the book is an unusual 20-page "Addendum" to the 35-page third chapter called "Missionaries in China." Chapter 3 resembles a case study in that it examines the historical role of Matteo Ricci, the famous Jesuit missionary who lived in China from 1583 until 1610. Winston argues that these early Jesuits practiced a form of "accommodation" by speaking, dressing, and styling themselves as Chinese—in order to gain greater influence in their quest to transform China into a Christian country. The Addendum compares the early missionaries to contemporary rule-of-law exporters who promote a type of modern democracy, frequently based on U.S. norms and institutions, to the developing world. This Addendum has little of praise to say about the "triumphalism" and contemporary anti-accommodation that preaches about, but displays so little of, public ethics.

Several names tend to recur in Winston's analysis. One is John Dewey, whose democratic pragmatism is often used to identify the importance of due process and of informed judgment in the role of governance. Surprisingly, Winston makes no reference to Dewey's lengthy visit to China in 1919–21. Another name is Selznick, whose study of the arts of institutional leadership helps give Winston valuable perspective when he is searching for lessons in his Asian case studies. Selznick's place here clarifies what Winston means by the term "professional" as one with an art or style of practical decision making promoting the public or social institution being served. A third name is Machiavelli, who plays a prominent role as a coach or tutor in practical reasoning, even for those promoting public ethics. Machiavelli's high respect for the low craft of dirty hands is used by the author to warn readers off the misguided formalism of virtue ethics, which is marginalized here as a formula for personal, as distinct from public, ethics.

AMERICAN POLITICS

Cheap and Clean: How Americans Think about Energy in the Age of Global Warming. By Stephen Ansolabehere and David M. Konisky. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014. 272p. \$27.95. doi:10.1017/S1537592715003734

— Christopher P. Borick, *Muhlenberg College*

Over the last decade, energy policy has risen to a level of prominence among the American public not observed

since the 1970s. The confluence of energy-related environmental threats, emerging energy technologies, and an aging energy infrastructure has propelled energy issues to a higher profile than at any time since the energy crisis during the Ford and Carter administrations. As energy issues have reached higher levels of prominence in the United States in recent years, the policy preferences of Americans regarding energy have taken on an elevated level of importance. What do Americans want by way of energy policy and what drives those preferences? Stephen