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 119 · Number 1 · Spring 2004

Norris, in a reversal of previous trends in many countries, there is a significant "modern gender gap" in political attitudes among men and women, with women more likely to hold more left-leaning attitudes regarding the role of the state. They also find significant intergenerational differences, with the "modern gender gap" cleavage greatest among younger age groups in post-industrial societies. And, even in post-industrial societies, a kind of "negative" gender gap persists, with women less involved in all forms of political engagement than men. Such distinctive, gender-based differences in political activism have adverse consequences for female political leadership.

The generalized nature of the findings presented in the volume gives rise to some country-specific and some non-country-specific questions. For example, the authors promise to explain the variation in support for gender equality in such "rich" nations as Norway and Japan (p. 48) but they never do. Why does post-industrial, secular Japan stand as an exception to the trend toward increased economic gains made by women in other seemingly similar nations? The data presented also suggest that the United States demonstrates tendencies counter to the growing secularization of many other post-industrial nations, with significant impact on abortion and other social policies, perhaps challenging the relation suggested between decline in religiosity and support for gender equality. Of necessity, this book limits its attention to the role of women's movements and government policies in creating growing support for equality; these may prove to be as significant as or more significant than some of the other change-related variables presented.

In their wish to demonstrate the significance of the "rising tide" toward gender equality, the authors may occasionally overstate the extent of sex role transformations in the home and workplace, even in post-industrial societies; that is, it seems doubtful that "almost any career and almost any lifestyle is opening up to" women, as they suggest (p. 169). The precise meanings of "culture" and "cultural change" remain elusive, despite the authors' efforts to operationalize them throughout the book.

However, these queries do not alter the major contribution made by the research reported in this book; rather, they are intended to stimulate further research to supplement this important work. Inglehart and Norris have provided an invaluable and comprehensive resource with which to assess the causes and significance of gender-related attitudinal change from a comparative perspective.

JOYCE GELB
City University of New York

The George W. Bush Presidency: An Early Assessment *edited by Fred I. Greenstein. Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003. 320 pp. Cloth, $55.00; paper, $19.95.*

The first of the early assessments, this book stems from papers delivered at a conference at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and

International Affairs in the spring of 2003. The authors assembled by Professor Fred I. Greenstein, the organizer of the conference, are a virtual Who's Who of presidency, politics, and public policy analysts. Their contributions, for the most part, live up to their reputations.

After an introductory preface, Professor Greenstein begins the evaluation by examining George W. Bush's leadership style. Using the categories he developed in his book, *The Presidential Difference: Leadership Style from FDR to Clinton*, Greenstein argues that President George W. Bush has become emotionally stable after his prolonged adolescence, is self-assured, smart although not particularly curious and certainly not intellectual, well-organized, a good judge of people, an effective communicator, particularly when his words have been prepared for him, with vision, a president who has exercised his political skills most effectively within the domestic sphere.

Digging deeper into Bush's psyche, Hugh Heclo contends that the Bush family ethos has molded George W. into a well-disciplined, highly competitive political leader, one who has a focused agenda, a non-nuanced outlook, and a penchant for taking decisive action. The dangers, Heclo warns, are that Bush's vision may become truncated and closed to information that does not easily fit into it, that his self-confidence may be premised on faulty or overly simplistic world views, and that his salesmanship may interfere with his need to learn, his capacity to incorporate changes within the political environment into his decisional framework, and his ability to educate people as to the merits of his policies.

Karen M. Hult's essay explores the distinctiveness and continuities in the organization and operation of the Bush White House. She notes that despite the President's desire to impose his own stamp on the White House's structure, professionalism, and policy processes, the institution still operates more like its predecessors than a uniquely Bush creation. The continuities stem from the persistence of external expectations within the political environment in which the White House is forced to function.

The chapter on Bush's budget problem is the most critical of the volume. Alan Schick, its author, makes a very persuasive argument that Bush's tax cuts, coupled with his defense spending, are designed to starve the budget so that domestic spending will have to shrink. Pressures to spend are simply too great for a Congress, even one under Republican control, to resist. Thus, the only way to reduce the size and scope of the public sector within the domestic arena is to deprive it of its lifeblood, money. In doing so, however, the administration has expanded the already large national debt, with dire consequences for future generations and probably even for the next president.

Bush's foreign policy, particularly its unilateral, preemptive character, is subjected to a critical review by Brookings scholars Ivo H. Daalder and James M. Lindsay. After detailing the assumptions, world views, and operational principles of candidate George W. Bush and his national security advisors, the authors describe the policies that followed from them during the early years

of the Bush presidency. Contending that events have worked to reaffirm Bush's world view that America's weakness, not strength, encouraged the terrorists' attacks, Daalder and Lindsay make the case that the administration's emphasis on regime change, such as in Iraq, and unilateralism is misplaced and may, in fact, isolate the United States from the world community, including America's allies.

John C. Fortier and Norman J. Ornstein turn their focus to Bush and Congress. They describe in considerable detail the President's legislative successes with the 107th Congress, which they attribute to his agility in utilizing both partisan and bipartisan strategies, depending on his policy objective. But the authors are leery about whether the administration's balancing act will yield the same results with the 108th, given the administration's need to emphasize domestic policy as the 2004 election approaches.

The remaining papers cast a less critical eye on the President and are more laudatory of his achievements to date. Charles O. Jones explains how George W. Bush, in the absence of an election mandate, has used the position of the presidency to enhance his political capital and public approval, although Jones also notes that there are limits to position alone serving as a continuing source of power, especially within the domestic policy arena.

In examining the polarized electorate, Gary C. Jacobson looks at the impact of the Bush presidency on partisanship. He concludes that despite the administration's strong response to the events of September 11, 2001, the Republicans's victory in the 2002 midterm elections, and the extended popularity of the President, there are no indications that the country's partisan balance has shifted or that its polarization has declined. As far as partisanship is concerned, we are where we were in 2000.

Richard Brody reaches a similar conclusion when tracing the shifts in public opinion before, during, and after the terrorists' attacks. He notes the persistence of different partisan evaluations of the President. Brody suggests that those predisposed to support or oppose Bush have seen him within the prism of their partisan perspective. The author predicts that Bush will be judged, in the end, by how well he keeps his promises and how well those promises affect the country's "peace, safety, and prosperity" (p. 244).

Former Bush staffer John J. Dilulio, Jr. concludes the appraisals with a highly favorable personal portrait of Republican president George W. Bush, whom he describes as a "democrat," with a good heart, open to diverse views. The problem is that the President becomes ensnared in and manipulated by the symbolic politics and constant campaign of the contemporary presidency. It is not his fault, but theirs. (I assume he means those Mayberry Machiavellians.)

STEPHEN J. WAYNE
Georgetown University