

great pageant of diversity—to obscure other dimensions of a healthy, free, self-governing society” (p. 275).

In the first section, the author explains the purpose of the common school philosophy in the context of American democracy. That purpose is to acknowledge the diversity of students while homogenizing them into respectful American citizens. He highlights the significant contributions of education reformer John Dewey to the common school cause. Dewey's adamant embrace of the separation of church and state doctrine led him to be highly critical of dogmatic religious communities.

The author critiques the historical problems public schools have confronted in accommodating the concerns of the Catholic Church. For example, Catholics protested the mandatory reading of the King James version of the Bible in schools. Instead, they wanted Catholic students to read from the Douay Bible. In the author's judgment, the demands of Catholics (and other religious groups) fall outside his conception of public reasonableness. According to Macedo, “Catholics were at the forefront of opposition to common schools not simply because some school materials and practices were anti-Catholic, but because some in the Catholic hierarchy rejected legitimate civic ends” (p. 7). Over time, Catholics stopped seeking concessions from the common schools and established a separate system of parochial education.

Much of the weight of this book is put on the challenge of accommodating religious diversity in public schools in the United States. The analysis centers on the issue of religious sectarianism and the establishment and free exercise clauses of the First Amendment. In fact, the 1983 *Mozert v. Hawkins* case guides most of the discussion on the limits of tolerance and accommodation. Fundamentalist Christian families in Hawkins County, Tennessee, charged that a reading series required by the school system denigrated their religious views, and they asked school officials to allow their children to opt out of the reading program. The school refused, and ultimately the courts upheld the school's decision. Macedo states that the *Mozert* families had no right to be accommodated on principled ground. His deconstruction of this case gives a good example of his framework and position. He refers to this section as “The Intolerance for Educating for Tolerance” (p. 157).

The author's conception of liberal public reasonableness guards against the excessive zeal of religious fundamentalists. Macedo states that his model espouses a “tolerance for reasonable forms of diversity and respect for a wide array of freedoms” (p. 179). Given the author's emphasis on religion, perhaps this book should have been entitled “Religious Diversity and Distrust: Civic Education in a Multicultural Democracy.”

Much of the discourse on multiculturalism has become hackneyed, but Macedo offers a bold and refreshing philosophical discussion of the debate. This work represents sound scholarship. Unlike many in the fields of education, ethnic studies, and American studies who have written on multiculturalism, Macedo grounds his work in political philosophy and constitutional principles. Indeed, he draws on John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, J.S. Mill, and John Rawls to guide his analysis. In his defense of a civic liberalism he outlines a range of public principles that move beyond the political liberalism of Rawls.

Rawls developed a template for a public morality that is not grounded in religion. The task for Macedo is more specific: Promote moral education in public schools without infusing religion. Is this possible? Macedo agrees with Rawls that a public morality can be created from public ideals and

principles espoused by liberal democratic institutions that are not entangled in religious or deep philosophical beliefs.

The book is insightful and engaging, but there are limitations. The author fails to specify what a moral education divorced of religious principles would entail: the teaching of mutual respect, cross-cultural understanding, sexual abstinence, anger management, respect for the environment? How does a moral education avoid discussing the Golden Rule and its genesis?

Although Macedo explores the on-going debate about school choice and market competition in school reform, he does not critically examine other important issues in the context of his tough liberalism and prudential accommodation framework. For example, how would the author deconstruct affirmative action, cultural bias in standardized testing, gay rights, English only, and a moment of silence as they relate to public schools? By using these issues as examples, Macedo could have elucidated and strengthened his arguments. In fact, a critical examination of these topics could have put this well-written book at the center of various policy debates.

Irrespective of its limitations, this book is timely and relevant. Genuine education reforms cannot take place unless stakeholders have a conceptual understanding of the intellectual overview that Macedo outlines. I will use it in my “Politics of the Public Policy Process” course to enhance students' philosophical understanding of the role of civic education in a multicultural society.

Realignment and Party Revival: Understanding American Electoral Politics at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century.
By Arthur Paulson. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000. 376p. \$69.95.

Pat Dunham, *Duquesne University*

The topic of realignment has produced much discussion and disagreement. Positions include: There was a realignment in the late 1960s; there was a realignment only at the presidential level; there was a realignment only in the South; there has been no realignment; there has been dealignment; and more. Each succeeding election has been scrutinized by scholars to determine how it supports or refutes these positions. In a meticulously documented work, Arthur Paulson argues that the United States has experienced both realignment and dealignment, and something more as well.

Paulson believes the United States experienced a realignment at the presidential level in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Congressional elections took a long time to catch up, however, and for many years the system exhibited signs of dealignment. With the Republican takeover of Congress in 1994, we now have a system in which both the “top” and the “bottom” have completed a conservative realignment. “Ideological polarization seems to be a much more linear trend in the Senate. . . . But by 1996, the parties are clearly polarized along ideological lines in both the House and Senate” (p. 196). No longer do the parties contain mavericks. Paulson also argues that political parties in the United States have been revitalized. They are important for raising money and supporting candidates, and they also reflect a new, ideologically polarized party system. According to Paulson, this transformation opens the door to the potential for party government. Thus, he rejects the theories of dealignment and party decay.

The historical examination in chapter 1 compares the system of 1896 to the system of 1996. In chapter 2 Paulson describes how the Democratic Party is a multifunctional

organization; power at its national conventions shifted from conservative states of the South and West in 1896 to the more liberal states in the East by the middle of the twentieth century. Chapter 3 describes the Republican Party as a bifactional organization with Wall Street and Main Street wings. Paulson shows in chapter 4 how these factions realigned in the 1964–72 period. “The election of 1964 suddenly correlates positively with 1996, and negatively with 1896, for both parties” (p. 14). Chapter 5 examines nomination reforms and their effect on the parties. Chapter 6 deals with the ideological homogenization that occurred and the party revival that ultimately came about. In chapter 7 Paulson describes split-ticket voting and divided government as functions of the realignment of the 1960s. Chapter 8 discusses the roles played in voting by race and class. In chapter 9 Paulson offers his definition of realignment, and chapter 10 closes the book with a discussion of what this means for the future.

Many of the author’s conclusions are not new (e.g., that race is a more important factor in voting than class in the United States, and that southern conservatives are now Republicans instead of Democrats), but Paulson does an excellent job of supporting his argument. Each chapter contains numerous tables with data from various levels: national voting statistics, voting by congressional district, voting by delegates to national conventions, and so on. This is an impressive effort. Table 6.2, for example, categorizes Republican presidential primaries by ideological alignment of states, which illustrates the homogenization of the vote in those primaries since 1988 (p. 165).

Paulson writes that “dealignment theorists who have been ‘waiting for Godot’ have been waiting for something that even realignment theory, properly understood, would not predict. They have been waiting for a realignment that would fit a rigid ahistorical model” (p. 18). Like Everett Carl Ladd, Paulson holds that previous realignments do not resemble one another, so scholars should not settle on one example of realignment and say this is how it should look. Paulson argues that, before 1896, there was no majority party; therefore, realignment need not involve the displacement of one majority party with another.

Paulson’s analysis rings quite true for those who participate in elections, but for years that group has been about half the eligible electorate. Some will question whether realignment can make sense when there is no majority party. According to Paulson, “this process of elite realignment is the product of electoral realignment” (p. 295), but what kind of electoral realignment is it when so many citizens refuse to participate?

Some will take issue with Paulson’s conclusions about party revival. The parties indeed are more ideologically consistent internally than in the past, but many potential voters and even many voters dislike the parties. As Paulson notes, parties no longer serve the rank-and-file through patronage and constituent services; instead, they serve candidates. Steven E. Schier (*By Invitation Only*, 2000) argues that the parties themselves discourage the public at large from participating in elections. Parties are stronger in some ways, but they also are less relevant to the public. Candidates know this. Party nominees for national office do not invoke party affiliation in their campaigns or even in their nomination acceptance speeches. Victors cannot say that election results constitute a mandate in favor of their party’s platform. Paulson recognizes that parties are different today—but does not believe that these differences impede the development of a party system. He sees potential for party renewal through third parties, but the 2000 election offers little support for this. In 2000 the Reform Party imploded, its nomination process keelhaunched by sup-

porters of Pat Buchanan. The Green Party’s future is nebulous, with many citizens annoyed about the role it played.

Paulson may well be correct in predicting the birth of a new, ideologically polarized party system. Given that few citizens seem to care, one doubts whether this realignment can have the kind of effect demonstrated by previous ones. Paulson contributes to the arguments about realignment, but he will not convince proponents of dealignment that they are wrong.

Beyond Machiavelli: Policy Analysis Comes of Age. By Beryl A. Radin. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2000. 200p. \$45.00 cloth, \$17.95 paper.

Amy K. Donahue, *University of Connecticut*

Many of us who teach in programs that award graduate degrees in public affairs, administration, or policy regularly confront the question: What do policy analysts do? Our students raise it as they seek to understand the policy analysis field, evaluate their potential role in it, and prepare for the job market. As faculties we wrestle with it as we configure and reconfigure curricula to meet the demands of public service in a complex policy environment. We contend with it as professors when we design course syllabi to teach the tools of the trade appropriately and adequately and as researchers when we pursue scholarship that draws on the entangled disciplines of policy analysis, implementation, and public management.

Beryl Radin delivers a multidimensional response to this elemental and omnipresent query, set in the context of an historical retrospective on the field and profession of policy analysis. She draws on a broad range of literature and exemplar cases to provide an insightful analysis of the field’s evolution. Her work is rooted in pragmatism and experience, consciously focused on the implications of important changes in the field for the practitioners who populate it as much as for those who study and teach it. She thus provides a reflective tour that can both support debate about the field’s intellectual direction and serve as a useful guide to those pursuing careers in it.

Radin artfully employs four devices to illuminate the realm of policy analysis as an intellectual pursuit and as a field of practice. The first and most central of these is comparison: She describes and contrasts the practice of policy analysis in the 1960s and the 1990s. She begins by painting a “portrait of the past,” describing the origins and nature of policy analysis as it emerged as a self-conscious discipline, initially tied to the demands of the Planning Programming and Budgeting System in the Department of Defense after World War II, and then in various key offices throughout the federal government under President Johnson. In the next chapter, she details the expansion and maturation of the field, showing us its role throughout the branches and levels of government and also beyond the public sector, until we reach the present, where policy analysis responds to a diverse set of demands and decision makers across society. These chapters point to striking shifts in how analysis is viewed and used by stakeholders in the policy process, how the relationship between analysts and decision makers has been transformed, how the tools of the analytic trade have advanced, and especially how the context of policy analysis has changed. A modest flaw is that many of the salient lessons of history are implied, not consolidated and enhanced by critical examination, which leaves the reader to identify, interpret, and evaluate them.

The second device Radin employs is detailed profiles and short case examples. These appear throughout the text to