

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 123 · Number 2 · Summer 2008

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 © 2008 by The Academy of Political Science. All rights reserved.

lar appeal of molecular biology,” which has “substantially earned its reputation as a specialty for number crunchers and other pseudoscientific poseurs” (p. 17). By way of contrast, Gitlin seeks an engaged and thoughtful left with a serious commitment to democratic education, a left that is *for* something instead of *against* everything. Ironically, perhaps, beyond the reflections on his intellectual heroes, much of the book is given over to describing what the left should *not* do, with essays on postmodernism, the “Antipolitical Populism of Cultural Studies” (p. 87), and the values of the media, citizenship, and higher education, all highlighting the left’s perceived failures. It is only in the final essay, which also gives the book its title, that Gitlin offers anything amounting to a positive vision for the American left.

Describing the work of David Riesman as that of “a sympathetic citizen who wanted to counsel society, not lecture it” (pp. 17–18), Gitlin clearly sees himself in the same mold. He should then perhaps take note of his own adage that “smugness goes with myopia” (p. 150). For Gitlin’s positive vision—a liberal patriotism that “would refuse to be satisfied with knee-jerk answers but would join the hard questions as members of a society do” (p. 151)—simply recreates a destructive binary for which he criticizes the American right: one between true and false patriotism. In the aftermath of September 11, as Gitlin notes, the administration of George W. Bush silenced its critics by smearing them as “unpatriotic,” defining the term and controlling its usage. Gitlin does the same, contrasting “the real thing” with some of its supposedly shallower manifestations (p. 138), and projecting onto it his own values. “Lived patriotism,” he declares, “requires social equality. It is in the actual relations of citizens, not symbolic displays, that civic patriotism thrives” (p. 143). Similarly, Gitlin echoes the Bush administration by repeatedly invoking the passengers of Flight 93 as exemplars of *his* particular patriotism (pp. 128, 145). In so doing, Gitlin simply offers more of the same, declaring his own values patriotic and dismissing those on both the right and the left who think differently. Some critics would hold that this is the inexorable logic of patriotism: one that demands patriotic *bona fides* as a precursor to speech, distorting democratic debate by making patriotism, not policy, the subject of discussion. There are moments when Gitlin plausibly manages to suggest otherwise, but these are few and far between in this episodic and largely unconvincing text.

SIMON STOW

The College of William and Mary

The Impact of Women in Congress by Debra L. Dodson. New York, Oxford University Press, 2006. 312 pp. Cloth, \$95.00; paper, 29.95.

The title understates the scope of this book. While students of Congress indeed should read this book—and not only those interested in women—so

should those concerned about policymaking, representation, and new approaches to studying institutions. Its conclusions are sophisticated and nuanced, and illuminate all of these fields. It also answers persistent questions about the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation, concluding indisputably that women's presence matters but that their impact is moderated by numbers, power, position, issue opportunity, and the attitudes, ideas, and concerns of both voters and men in Congress, especially male leaders.

Debra L. Dodson uses extensive interviews with congresswomen, staff, and lobbyists to compare policy processes in the 103rd (1993–94) and 104th (1995–96) Congresses, through six case studies. Her smart policy choices enable her to probe the meaning of “women’s issues” from the obvious—breast cancer—to the gendered but contingent issue of health insurance reform. Reproductive rights policy also illustrates challenges when women disagree and when male Congress members constrain them formally and otherwise. She adopts a modified approach to the garbage can model of policy studies, looking at various policy streams that shape outcomes, including structural aspects of the institution, internal and external politics, windows of opportunity, and shifting participants in particular contexts. This complex approach makes this book richer than many in its findings. It contributes substantially to three overlapping but distinct areas.

First, case studies unpack the complexity of legislative behavior in policy making, focusing on the interplay among institutional structural power, the people involved, and internal and external politics. Although at first the complexity of the streams may overwhelm those not already familiar with this mode of analysis, their straightforward use in case studies easily demonstrates their dynamics, reiterating the importance of each, even as the differences across policies become evident.

Second, the analysis quickly dispenses with the oft-employed fallacy embedded in simplistic liberal assumptions that all Congress members can equally tap institutional power. Clearly, women are positioned differently from men in these Congresses, and the gendering of both interests and power matters. To make the masculinity of this governing institution obvious is a major contribution, and should lead to better knowledge about the gendering of institutions and its effect on democratic equality.

Third and most centrally, the book answers questions about the relationship between the descriptive and substantive representation, clarifying many contested ideas surrounding it. Although what it means for congresswomen—or congressmen—to represent women eludes simple conclusions, the book details nuances of what constitutes a women’s issue and highlights tensions arising from the usual concealed gendering of most issues. In the process, one also ponders what it means to represent men, and which issues heretofore understood as universal may more accurately be recognized as gendered toward men and masculinity. The analysis further illustrates how it does and

does not matter when congresswomen take the lead on an issue. Perhaps most importantly, the book shows how and why a gendered power structure means that women usually face enormous disincentives to even acknowledge that they are women or assert that women have their own interests.

Debra L. Dodson helps readers recognize how often the wrong question is asked about women in political office. By clarifying the many forces shaping women's impact, she shows how to discern when a capacity to influence *as women* is likely, and how norms, expectations, ideology, and power curtail and enhance the impact of women. This book provides a suitably complex framework for understanding a major change under way in representation, policy making, and institutional power.

GEORGIA DUERST-LAHTI
Beloit College

Dilemmas of Representation: Local Politics, National Factors, and the Home Styles of Modern U.S. Congress Members by Sally Friedman.
Albany, State University of New York Press, 2007. 277 pp. \$75.00.

Thirty years ago, Richard F. Fenno, Jr. published his seminal *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Fenno convincingly argued that understanding members of Congress required political scientists, to say nothing of journalists, to learn about how legislators operated in their home constituencies. Coupled with David Mayhew's *Congress: The Electoral Connection* and Morris Fiorina's *Congress: Keystone of the Washington Establishment*, it appeared that scholars would take Fenno's admonitions seriously and study lawmakers on their home turf. Although congressional research has examined casework and the incumbency advantage, with some forays into members' constituencies, Fenno's solid advice has generally fallen on deaf ears, as students of Congress have emphasized the growing partisanship and polarization on Capitol Hill.

It thus came as a pleasant surprise to read Sally Friedman's intensive analysis of the constituency lives of ten members of Congress from New York State. Although she draws on Fenno's overall approach and insights, Friedman approaches her legislators without the "soaking and poking" that characterizes his work. Rather, through an extensive use of the public record, Friedman takes a fresh look at representation in an era when national politics have increasingly shaped the relationship between legislators and their constituencies. Friedman provides a chapter on method, which emphasizes the availability of public information and the placement of her work within a broader, multiple-case study framework. Her data collection ends with 10 September 2001, which makes sense, given her 1990s perspective on her ten House members and the potential for change in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in New York City. She includes a brief postscript that