The Academy of Political Science

475 Riverside Drive · Suite 1274 · New York, New York 10115-1274

(212) 870-2500 · FAX: (212) 870-2202 · aps@psqonline.org · http://www.psqonline.org

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY

Volume 118 · Number 1 · Spring 2003

No part of this article may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except:

- one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or
- with prior written permission of The Academy of Political Science.

Political Science Quarterly is published by The Academy of Political Science. Contact the Academy for further permission regarding the use of this work.

Political Science Quarterly
Copyright © 2003 by The Academy of Political Science. All rights reserved.

segregation, including the statewide target (that is, flight from equity was harder), one legislative body, not multiple school boards, the divisible nature of money, and greater trust in elected state judges than in unelected federal judges. Regarding both issues, though, courts must deal with the problem of altering "broader hierarchies of power" (p. 48).

In later chapters of the book, Reed uses a concept he calls "constitutional ordering" to discuss how constitutions shape and are shaped by not only judges but politicians and nonlegal actors such as the general public. All of us are engaged in a project to find constitutional meaning. Specifically, Reed analyzes public opinion surveys regarding school finance equity. He finds strong general support for equal educational opportunity, but that support drops dramatically if the public believes local control of schools is threatened. The merging of the public opinion data on school finance equity in one work, coupled with Reed's analysis of it, is one of the strongest contributions of this book.

Finally, Reed discusses case studies of inequity in New Jersey and Connecticut, and closes with two proposals for remedying both racial and class inequity through the use of "magnet neighborhoods," granting property tax credits for those who send their kids to predominantly poor and minority schools. This idea, although well-intentioned, may be unrealistic; however, it is worth a try.

Overall, *On Equal Terms* is a solid, well-written book on unquestionably important issues. Reed almost takes on too much, occasionally sacrificing depth for breadth; however, there is plenty of food for thought here, making for a worthwhile read.

MATTHEW H. BOSWORTH
Winona State University

Mobilizing Public Opinion: Black Insurgency and Racial Attitudes in the Civil Rights Era *by Taeku Lee. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2002. 272 pp. Cloth, $55.00; paper, $19.00.*

The research of this assistant professor at the Kennedy School boldly undertakes several serious challenges. The author questions both what he identifies as the "orthodox" view that only elite actions shape public opinion and the way in which public opinion has come to be measured. This is done in the course of determining what changed the public's opinion on civil rights. Attitudes about civil rights held by African Americans, southern whites, and northern whites are examined over seventeen years that include the activation of the civil rights movement and continue through the mid-1960s, when Congress passed major policy initiatives.

The primary objective of this research is testing how attitudes about race relations are shaped. Are they exclusively the product of actions taken by political elites such as the courts and presidents, or can they be mobilized by actions at the grassroots level? Put simply, which came first, an active public or elite

actions? In building his case, Taeku Lee challenges two significant works written from an elitist perspective—John Zaller's *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion* and Edward Carmines and James Stimson's *Issue Evolution.* The first sets forth the receive-accept-sample theory of opinion formation, while the latter examines the role of civil rights in party realignment.

In contrast to elite-based claims, Lee contends that African-American mass protests changed public opinion as it related to civil rights before the elite actions of the mid-1960s cited by Carmines and Stimson. Some of the early stands taken by elites, according to Lee, came in reaction to demands coming from a black counter elite. Using American National Election Study survey items on school desegregation and fair employment and housing from 1956–1964, the author shows that prior to 1964—the critical date in the Carmines and Stimson presentation—public support for change was already linked to attitudes about civil rights groups and party identification. Ultimately, distinctions between elites and masses eroded, leading the author to characterize the later relationship as "movement-initiated, movement-elite interactive" influences on public opinion.

In building his case, Lee challenges today's heavy reliance on surveys, the technique that has almost become synonymous with public opinion. He criticizes surveys for often failing to tap emerging public concerns, since topics may not be included until they have already been propelled onto the public agenda. Lee returns to an earlier tradition that saw public opinion manifest in multiple ways and turns to letters to the U.S. presidents who served from 1948–1965 to determine public concerns about civil rights. He tracks the issues raised in these letters to see whether they come in response to elite activities, which Lee defines as actions of political institutions (the president, Congress) or in reaction to mass activities such as the Montgomery bus boycott and a riot at a Paul Robeson concert.

In tracing public opinion, Lee identifies three strains—African Americans, southern whites, and nonsouthern whites. He shows that these were mobilized at different times and by different factors and that the nature of the appeals made by these groups changed over time. Lee poses provocative questions to what had become accepted wisdom concerning the mobilization of public opinion and the ways in which it has been operationalized. He does not reject the influence of elites on public opinion but rather contends that the elite orientation misses grassroots activism, which at times plays a critical role.

CHARLES S. BULLOCK III
University of Georgia

Visions of International Relations: Assessing an Academic Field *edited by Donald J. Puchala. Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 2002. 192 pp. Paper, $16.95.*

Several seminars in the autumn of 1998 were the setting for the presentation of the essays comprising this book by eight scholars with varied but distinguished