much larger set of issues of broad relevancy to students of American politics. Their central question is clear: "How and why does racial prejudice enter into politics in the modern United States?" (p. 1). Having taken on such a large issue, they examine it in an interesting and enlightening way. They employ original survey data (for both open-ended and standard question formats) and offer an innovative analysis of the content of media sources and other miscellaneous sources such as flyers and posters.

The book has three clear goals: to understand the sociology and psychology of ethno-racial relations, to pay attention to the treaty rights controversy, and to examine these issues though a survey instrument. After laying out Blumer's group position theory in the Prologue and Chapter 1, in Chapter 2 the authors discuss the context under which the treaty rights dispute occurred. Their broad overview of Native American history helps us comprehend the very particular situation of the Chippewa. The overview provided in this chapter, for example, makes it easy to understand how the traditional stereotypes of Native Americans end up impacting white perceptions of the Chippewa people and Chippewa political maneuvers.

In Chapters 3, 4, and 5, the authors turn most directly to their empirical tests. Here they examine the relevance of such explanations as self-interest, the clash of ideological values (what they label the "injustice frame"), symbolic racism, and group position. They do this using survey data from the 1990 statewide Chippewa Indian Treaty Rights Survey (CITRS). Just over 91% of respondents were white Wisconsinites, and almost 45% were residents of the 19 counties most directly affected by the treaty dispute. After assessing the salience of the dispute, the contours of relevant group stereotypes, and the relative strength of the self-interest motive in Chapter 3, the authors turn to a full analysis of all of the competing theoretical concerns in Chapter 4. Here they examine the effects of ideology (as the "injustice frame"), symbolic racism, and group position. It is obvious from the authors' analysis that these three constructs move parallel to one another. After further demonstrating this parallel movement by comparing construct predictors (Table 4.7, pp. 162–63), the authors argue for a theoretically driven synthesis. Their argument centers on these empirical demonstrations and their assertion that group position fully accounts for what we observe in the tables in Chapter 4.

From there the authors move in Chapter 5 to demonstrate how group position aids our understanding of public opinion toward the political aspects of the dispute, such as attitudes toward the antitreaty protestors, actual involvement in the dispute, and feelings toward a political compromise (comanagement of the resources at stake by the state and the Chippewa people). In the last chapter, they step back from their data to again evoke the larger frames and task at hand, noting how their work aids our understanding of race/ethnicity, prejudice, and politics.

There is not much wrong with this book that the authors do not themselves foreshadow. Although I applaud it for focusing on the particulars of the case, letting us know the history of this prolonged debate and interactions, in the final analysis it is about just one state, and it is not clear that its findings can be generalized to the American context at large. Perhaps the most problematic aspect of *Prejudice,* however, concerns its focus on white Americans. Bobo and Tuan's story is about group position and competition. Of course we can only have a full sense of the battle between two groups when we know how they perceived each other, as well as how the groups maneuvered with each other politically, socially, and economically. Unfortunately, *Prejudice* does not provide a full picture of either. As noted, we get an exquisitely detailed view of the proceedings, but a view of one side of the debate only. We simply do not hear from the Native Americans in this story. They are treated in the main as a reference point, not a political group with active protagonists or a sense of agency. To the authors' credit, these are critiques of which they are painfully self-aware. They note that they could not conduct a comparable content analysis since the mainstream papers rarely had a discussion of the Chippewa side of things (other than a few scattered comments from tribal leaders), and they acknowledge that the focus on whites is the biggest weakness of their project (p. 21).

Despite these critiques, this is an important book that will serve as a great source for scholars seeking to understand racial politics. It is comprehensive in its overview of the theoretical underpinnings of such politics, especially for those wishing to know more about the logic of group position theory. It is also laudable for its move outside the white/black paradigm to a relatively unique, but ultimately quite familiar, case.

Multiethnic Moments: The Politics of Urban Education Reform. By Susan E. Clarke, Rodney E. Hero, Mara S. Sidney, Luis R. Fraga, and Bari A. Erlichson. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006. 264p. $69.50 cloth, $23.95 paper.
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071770

— Kenneth J. Meier, *Texas A&M* and *Cardiff University*

This book, which had its origins in the Civic Capacity and Urban Education Project funded by the National Science Foundation and directed by Clarence Stone, examines the politics of race and education in four major U.S. cities—San Francisco, Los Angeles, Denver, and Boston. Each of these cities is multiracial, with substantial populations of Latinos and Asian Americans as well as African Americans and Anglos. The authors' objective is to determine how new ethnic interest groups fit into the politics of education reform, a politics that historically had focused on educational equity in the context of black–white politics.

Susan Clarke and her colleagues loosely use the concepts of urban regimes and two-tiered pluralism to discuss

three key variables: interests, ideas, and institutions. Although the chapters are structured about common themes, the authors explicitly state that they are not constructing a comparative case study (p. x). Rather, they seek to illustrate a set of general points about the politics of education reform in multiethnic cities. They do so because some reforms and some issues are not considered part of the politics in all four cities. Equally important, the dependent variable—successful efforts by Asian Americans or Latinos to reform education—does not vary much across these cities.

The core of the argument is that institutions of education were reformed and redesigned in the 1960s and 1970s to address African American access to public education. This politics, fought out both in the courts and in the electoral arena, achieved some gains, but more importantly, spawned a set of institutional processes that incorporated the interests of African Americans into the education process. Similar successes for Latinos or Asian Americans are more difficult because the politics of ideas in education has shifted from concerns with equity to concerns with choice and performance. The dominant education reforms of the 1990s—site-based management, school vouchers, charter schools, and private partnerships—are concerned with maximizing choice as a means to facilitate better educational outcomes. The interests of Latinos and Asian Americans in equity concerns, as a result, generally lose out in this politics of ideas and are unable to gain access to the policymaking agenda. When these issues do get on the agenda, they are undercut by institutions that were designed under the old biracial regime. These institutions privilege equity concerns for African Americans but not for the new emerging groups. In the end, the authors are pessimistic about education reforms that might benefit Latinos or Asian Americans.

The rich detail of the case studies (often organized in summary tables in a nicely comparable way) provides much fodder for scholars of urban education seeking other explanations for urban politics. Some of the groundwork for such efforts is established by a set of explicit comparisons to six of the other seven cities in the larger study. Differences between the cities and African American–dominated cites (Atlanta, Baltimore, Detroit, and Washington, DC) and the urban machine cities (Pittsburgh and St. Louis) illustrate just how unique multiethnic politics is. Strikingly absent from these comparisons is Houston, one of the original study cities that is also multiethnic. Houston could have provided additional relevant data; its absence from the book is perplexing.

At times the authors appear to stop their analysis too soon. The convincing argument that Latinos and Asian Americans cannot get on the agenda is undercut by the simple assertion that they lack rhetorical capital. Is this not a tautology? Is rhetorical capital anything other than the ability to get on the political agenda? The absence of variation on the dependent variable is especially troubling in this regard since we do not have any counterfactuals for comparison.

While the combination of ideas, institutions, and interests makes a nice explanation for these four cases, one can imagine others that are equally compelling. The most logical alternative explanation is that Latinos and Asian Americans have been unable to gain sufficient political representation (or bureaucratic representation) to force their issues onto the agenda: "The relative absence of both Latinos and Asians from the education policy arena in these multiethnic cities and also their lack of policy influence were striking" (p. 12). Political representation seems to be both a more testable hypothesis and a more parsimonious explanation.

The institutional argument is also a bit troubling. If institutions reformed in response to African American political action are the problem for Latinos and Asians, why do these institutions not benefit black students? Data in the appendix show that African American students do poorly in all four of these districts. The authors allude to Wilbur Rich's argument about racial patronage and cartels, but do not fully explore this possibility.

In the end, the authors have examined four interesting cases of urban education politics. What we still do not know is how typical those cases are. Do Latinos fare equally poorly in Corpus Christi or San Antonio? Do Asian Americans face similar problems in Seattle or San Diego? But one should not criticize authors for not writing a book that they did not intend to write. *Multiethnic Moments* provides a rich set of hypotheses that could be tested with larger samples and different data sets. That is a valuable contribution to scholars and well worth the reading. A second major contribution that needs to be recognized is the utility of the book for classroom usage. The cases are engaging, and the analysis is accessible. The book has the potential to be useful in upper-division undergraduate classes in urban politics, race and politics, and education policy, as well as more specialized graduate classes.

Troubled Pasts: News and the Collective Memory of Social Unrest. By Jill A. Edy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006. 240p. $71.50 cloth, $23.95 paper.
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071782

— Karen M. Kedrowski, *Winthrop University*

Jill A. Edy seeks to answer a difficult question: How do Americans construct a "collective" memory—as opposed to individual memories—of past events through the news media? Edy focuses her analysis on two case studies: the 1965 Watts riots in Los Angeles and the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. She chose these cases because they were complicated, significant, newsworthy events when they occurred and each case became a basis