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 "Kalanistan," 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

Ansolabehere and David Konisky masterfully respond to these questions in *Cheap and Clean.* In this data-packed examination of contemporary American opinion regarding energy issues, Ansolabehere and Konisky develop a succinct analysis of what Americans want in terms of their energy sources and the factors that are most responsible for these choices.

Throughout the book, the authors nimbly toggle between insightful descriptions of the theoretical decision models that individuals may employ regarding energy choices and an array of mostly original survey data that sheds insight on the energy-related behaviors of Americans. Beginning with a compelling case for the central role that Americans play in energy policy through their roles as consumers and voters, Ansolabehere and Konsiky successfully build a strong rationale for their dive into public opinion on energy. Given that many scholarly examinations have either ignored or placed public opinion as only a marginal factor in terms of the development of energy policy, their efforts to establish the primacy of public opinion early in the book was both necessary and well executed.

While arguing for a central role of the public in energy policy, the authors neither ignore the misconceptions that Americans maintain regarding many of the attributes of energy sources nor belittle the public's views on energy matters. They find that the public is generally quite accurate in its appraisals of both the environmental impacts of an array of energy alternatives and the broader costs associated with energy production. In essence, Americans rationally seek energy sources that are both low in cost and enact minimal harm on health and the environment. However, Ansolabehere and Konisky find that the fairly good handle that the public has on the environmental and economic realties of fossil fuels is not matched with solid appraisals of the costs of developing large-scale alternative energy sources. They offer a cogent explanation for the variability in accurate appraisals that rests on inaccurate information provided to the public.

One of the most important contributions of this book to the broader literature on both environment and energy policy is that individual decisions regarding energy are driven much more by consumer concerns than by partisan considerations. Given the broad body of research that finds partisanship to be the most potent predictor of individual beliefs on key environmental issues such as climate change, it is easy to overlook evidence that on many energy choices, party affiliation and ideology have very marginal impact. These findings have important ramifications for scholars and policymakers alike, as they suggest opportunities for the development of an energy policy that might avoid the partisan gridlock that has come to dominate many areas of policy at both the national and subnational levels.

Another salient finding in *Cheap and Clean* involves the order of preferences that Americans hold in terms of energy sources. While individuals clearly want affordable energy, when they are asked to choose between lower costs and cleaner energy, Americans generally come in on the side of cleaner energy. These findings run counter to many of the assumptions that are made by those in the policy-making domain, who consistently doubt the commitment of the American public on environmental matters. However, Ansolabehere and Konisky make clear that on the whole, Americans do not consider all environmental concerns as equal. In particular, their willingness to pay for cleaner energy is more in response to localized environmental and health concerns related to issues such as clean air and water than it is to concerns with a globalized issue such as climate change. These findings have tremendous ramifications for policymakers as they seek to find communication frames that engender public support for mitigation efforts like cap-and-trade regimes or carbon taxes.

While the relatively small size of the book is an attractive quality, it does leave a few areas where the reader may want more detail. For readers interested in survey methods, a bit more about the methods employed in the measurement of public preferences would have been quite useful. Ansolabehere and Konisky utilize a very impressive array of survey data from the MIT Energy Initiative and the Harvard University Center on the Environment to draw conclusions about where the American public stands on energy. These surveys include some deliberation techniques, as well as innovative experimental designs that would have been valuable to share in more detail with the reader.

It would also be valuable if the authors had paid more attention to isolating any differences in opinion regarding fuel preferences and such matters as willingness to pay across the mobile—stationary divide. In particular, the differences in support for various energy policies may be tied more to the way in which the public interfaces with the energy sources. The authors give broad attention to this subject but would have helped.

This book is a valuable addition to the literature on both public opinion and energy policy. It nicely integrates an abundance of public opinion research into a cohesive narrative regarding where Americans stand on energy issues. Given the central role that public opinion plays in the formation of policy in the United States and the ever-increasing importance of energy as a policy domain, the need for such a complete study is clear. Ansolabhere and Konisky do an outstanding job of building a thorough picture of the views of the American public in terms of their energy preferences and concerns and the ramifications of these views on energy policy in the United States. The writing is clear, and the use of data is accessible to audiences with only moderate quantitative skills. The size of the book allows for a fairly comprehensive review of the research on public opinion regarding energy, while not

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592715003734 Published online by Cambridge University Press

becoming either redundant or too detailed for a more general academic audience. Ultimately, *Cheap and Clean* establishes an important framework for further efforts to understand one of the most important and quickly changing policy domains in America.

Godless Democrats and Pious Republicans? Party Activists, Party Capture, and the "God Gap." By Ryan L. Claassen. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015. 194p. $92.58 cloth, $27.75 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592715003758

— Ted G. Jelen, *University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

In this book, Ryan Claassen addresses an interesting, but relatively narrow, research question. He seeks to address the issue of whether or not the major political parties in the United States have been "captured" by unrepresentative activists who are religiously distinctive. As the title suggest, Claassen considers the hypothesis that the contemporary Republican Party is disproportionately responsive to the preferences of religiously motivated evangelical conservatives, while the Democrats have come to be dominated by irreligious agnostics.

Claassen regards this hypothesis as fundamentally flawed, and seeks to supplant it with a "representational" model of partisan activity. He acknowledges, as he must, that something about the issue attitudes of supporters of the U.S. political parties has changed. There are clear, and growing, partisan difference on issues such as abortion and same-sex marriage, as well as similar distinctions on issues of assistance to African Americans and foreign policy. Nevertheless, Claassen argues that these changes are not attributable to the increased visibility or influence of religiously unrepresentative activists, but rather are occasioned by the "usual suspects" surrounding partisan change: generation replacement, attitude change, changes in partisan affiliation and voter turnout among certain groups (such as white, southern evangelicals), and increased strength of the relationship between issue attitudes and party identification.

Partisan activism clearly does matter in the mobilization of voters, and, perhaps by extension, electoral outcomes. However, Claassen shows that changes in the pool of activists for both parties are generally representative of the religious, attitudinal, and demographic bases of the mass publics affiliated with each party, and that changes in activism are caused less by ideological motivation than by more mundane causes, such as increases in social capital (education, income, leisure time, etc). The issue bases of the Democratic and Republican Parties in the United States have changed, but have changed in response to more mundane forces like population replacement and the gradual empowerment of religiously distinctive citizens.

Godless Democrats and Pious Republicans? has a great deal to recommend it. Claassen makes his case carefully and ultimately persuasively, demonstrating an impressive, yet accessible, command of statistical methods. His analysis of diverse religious traditions is sensitive and nuanced. Of particular interest is his analysis of the dynamics of activist recruitment, in which he demonstrates conclusively that changes in the religious composition of the parties' activist pools are a consequence, rather than a cause, of changes in each party's religious base (Chapter 6). Further, contrary to the most commonly drawn conclusions of the "capture thesis," the relationship between religious variables and the composition of the activist pool has changed most noticeably among Democratic activists (especially African American evangelicals). Thus, this work contains a great deal of material that will serve as a starting point for future research on the role of religion in long-term partisan change.

On the other side of the ledger, the book contains a few problems, and they are mostly conceptual in nature. My first reading led me to suspect that the hypothesis that the parties had been "captured" by religiously unrepresentative groups of activists was something of a straw man. The material Claassen uses to document the existence of the capture hypothesis is a mix of journalistic and scholarly sources, with an unfortunate emphasis on the latter. It is interesting to note that Claassen does not reference Morris Fiorina's *Culture War? The Myth of a Polarized America* (2005), which contains a cogent argument that the heated controversies over social issues are in fact an elite-dominated discussion. Fiorina's analysis would have greatly complemented Claassen's use of Edward Carmines and James Stimson's *Issue Evolution* (1989).

More generally, Claassen's overall literature review (which will be a valuable resource for other scholars in its own right) suggests that, among academic political scientists, there exists substantial skepticism about the party-capture hypothesis, and that the weight of scholarly evidence seems to reject this idea. While the idea that one party or another has been "captured" by religiously motivated or distinctive activists might make a compelling story for Fox News or MSNBC, most of Claassen's intended audience (academic political scientists) are likely already sympathetic to his analysis.

This may seem like a small matter, and perhaps it is. However, the focus on the capture hypothesis represents, in my view, something of a missed opportunity. Claassen's empirical analyses provide a great deal of material for more general theories of partisan change and party realignment. The notion that changes in the demographic and attitudinal bases of America's political parties come about glacially (e.g., both very gradually and inexorably) would seem to have profound implications for previous partisan changes. This work evokes analyses of secular