

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

enhance and clarify the discussion, and chapter three is devoted entirely to case presentation. She describes six very different organizations to highlight the diverse nature of policy analysis in terms of its locus, practitioners, clients, approach, tools, and contribution to policy design and implementation. These “profiles of practice” bring home the overt and subtle tensions between ostensibly objective analysis and the political policymaking process by depicting actual institutions and their unique circumstances. By the author’s design, these examples are not representative, but they raise the question of what lessons, embedded in these particular cases, are generalizable.

Subsequent chapters take on this question, to some extent, as Radin applies her third approach to analysis: direct attention to key contextual factors that affect the nature of policy analysis both as a field and as a profession. This discussion is a particularly salient contribution of this work. At several points, Radin shows us ways in which wide-ranging changes in the institutions of government and in society more broadly have influenced the type of analysis in demand, the purposes for which it is solicited, and the very nature and quality of analysis itself. She points out how these shifts in the field have had ramifications for the norms of the profession, and in turn, for those who practice analysis. She raises a pertinent concern for practitioners as their linkage to the policy process evolves, decoupling somewhat from questions of policy design and intervention and more frequently engaging issues surrounding the evaluation of outcomes: that of how they should gauge the value and quality of their work. The question of the influences of the social and political environment on policy analysis is addressed at a general level that successfully orients the reader to prominent issues but belies the complexity of the analytic system and its interdependence with policymaking and implementation.

As a fourth device, Radin reiterates the implications of substantive and contextual changes in the field with hypothetical composites. Each chapter is framed by a depiction of one of the two fictional analysts the author has created, one with the characteristics of an archetypal analyst of the 1960s, and one who typifies an analyst of the 1990s. These characters reflect on (and, in the final chapter, discuss) their jobs and roles to highlight the distinct nature of policy analysis in their respective decades. They also illustrate the personal and professional demands and dilemmas a practitioner in each circumstance would likely experience. This technique is gimmicky and does not contribute to the substance of the discussion provided in the body of each chapter, but it makes the discussion accessible, particularly to students, for whom these vignettes can draw attention to the more subtle dimensions of each chapter’s presentation.

The strength of this work is a direct approach that makes it accessible and useful to scholars, students, and practitioners alike. To students, it offers a valuable counterpoint to the range of “how to” policy analysis texts that can help students envision analytic techniques in practice and themselves in the field. To teachers it offers a perspective that focuses attention on what graduate schools provide and how well we prepare students for the exigencies of the policy analysis world. To researchers, it offers an intellectual history that can prompt reevaluation of the role, contributions, and responsibilities of policy analysis and of the relationship between policy analysis and other disciplines and fields. An important attribute of this book—its broad appeal—also is a disadvantage: The broad brush approach forgoes depth on some of the knottier issues of how high-quality policy analysis can be accomplished within and contribute meaningfully to today’s complex, fast-paced, and interdependent governance

processes. Many of these issues are raised, which is helpful, but few are explored in detail. Nonetheless, Radin does what she commits to do: She provides fertile ground for serious discussion of the field’s foundations and future.

Republicans in the South: Voting for the State House, Voting for the White House. By Terrel L. Rhodes. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000. 160p. \$49.95.

Aubrey Jewett, *University of Central Florida*

As the title indicates, this concise yet thorough book seeks to document and explain the extent of Republican voting and electoral success in the South. It examines in great detail the percentage of Republican vote received by presidential, senatorial, congressional, and gubernatorial candidates. It also looks at the number of GOP wins for these offices and for both houses of state legislatures. The South is defined as the eleven states of the former Confederacy, and numerous tables and graphs are presented for individual states, for the peripheral and deep South states as a group, and for the South overall. Trends are tracked from the 1960s to the present, with the exception of presidential voting, which is traced from several decades earlier.

The book establishes in the first chapter several main themes that add to and/or reinforce the literature on southern politics and partisan change. The first and most important is that to understand adequately Republican growth in the South, one must examine both national and subnational gains. The second is that GOP gains have occurred unevenly over time, across the southern states and for different offices. The third is that despite the increased number of elephants in the cotton field, the Democratic Party remains very competitive. The book also makes clear that increasing Republican strength has had and will have important political consequences for the South and for the nation. An important secondary theme that emerges is that the growth of GOP strength in the South has many causes.

Chapters 2–4 cover southern Republican electoral patterns for president, Congress, and state offices, respectively. The evidence is presented very clearly with tables and figures, and a rich narrative helps bring the data to life. The early penetration of Republicanism at the presidential level is covered thoroughly, as is the propensity of southern voters to turn to third parties. The section detailing the critical nature of the South to GOP electoral vote strategies is particularly timely, given George W. Bush’s razor-thin margin in the electoral college and in Florida, as well as his ability to win the rest of the South, including Al Gore’s home state of Tennessee. Yet, the chapter also clearly points out that the South may be vital to Republican presidential success, but it is not a sure thing, as demonstrated by Democrat Bill Clinton’s assorted southern state victories over two elections.

Southern GOP senators, beginning with John Tower of Texas in 1961, emerged in the 1960s. Except for the election of Strom Thurmond in South Carolina, these gains were largely limited to the peripheral South until the 1980s. The early strategy for Senate GOP victories set the tone for what has now become commonplace: Republicans run as conservative candidates who paint their Democratic opponents as liberals who follow “policies set by Northerners and minority groups” (p. 44). The GOP was clearly competitive by the late 1990s, but Democrats continue to show vitality at the senatorial level. The 2000 Senate elections clearly illuminate both these trends: GOP candidate George Allen beat incumbent Democrat Chuck Robb in Virginia, but Democrats Bill