Eldon J. Eisenach, *The Lost Promise of Progressivism.* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1994) pp. 291. $27.95 ISBN 0700606254

The recent resurgence of conservatism in national politics, accompanied by pronouncements of the "death of liberalism," marks a shift in American politics away from the course charted by the New Deal and Great Society programs of the past sixty years. To evaluate the significance of this shift it behooves students and observers of politics to understand the intellectual origins of progressivism in the writings of late nineteenth and early twentieth century progressives and the influence of progressivism on liberalism's emergence and its supposed demise.

Presuming an in-depth understanding of progressive literature on the part of the reader, Eldon Eisenach seeks "to restore intellectual, moral and institutional coherence to the new ideas and new identities called into being by progressive intellectuals and reformers" (pp. 2-3). Eisenach identifies nineteen influential, mostly academic, writers who sought to redefine the way Americans view our moral, social, economic, and political life.

These progressive intellectuals created new ideas, institutions, networks, publicity techniques and opinion shaping organs based on common bonds of religion, region, cosmopolitanism and anti-party attitudes. The overwhelming majority were protestant, lived in what Eisenach calls the "core" (an industrial axis from New York to Chicago), had studied in Germany, and had ties to the "anti-party" reform wing of the Republican party.

Deeply critical of the prevailing "old regime" of a rights-based language of constitutional law, local democracy, local economy, national courts, coalitional parties, and individualism; these progressives sought a new view of American nationality based on inner character, shared values, spiritual progress, social knowledge, and an active virtue in civic life articulating ideas of national good. In their view, good citizens shared common ends and integrated those ends into their individual lives, including their rights claims.

The "new regime" emerged in voluntary institutions claiming national public good outside of established formal governing institutions. New cultural, intellectual, religious, and journalistic institutions in the form of universities, academic and professional associations, inter-church boards and societies, and mass circulation monthly magazines interwove to challenge the assumptions of the defenders of the old regime in the "periphery" (the backward agricultural south and west), and supplant their vehicle, the mass political party.

For progressives, party government meant compromise of principle, mediocrity, and inferiority. A good partisan could not be a good citizen. Purging state and local governments of the parochialism and corruption associated with parties through reform measures such as direct primaries, short ballots, and nonpartisan and city manager forms of local government would allow the emergence of truly national parties by destroying coalitions of separate local interests.

National parties held together by principle were the only effective means of reform through articulating a "new" public opinion. Public opinion was transformed from collections of individual preferences into an "engine of social control and transformation...constituting the standards, codes, policies, ideals, tastes, faiths and creeds of society" (pp. 74, 75). Thus a new "National Religion" was created, with the university lectern as pulpit.

One chief article of progressive faith was that "laissez faire is unsafe in politics and unsound in morals" (p. 139). Laissez faire stood as a barrier to an emerging social ethic. In the view of progressives, huge industrial combines and monopolistic trade unions in the core could better inculcate wage laborers with civic virtue, competence and cooperation, than hundreds of isolated and undercapitalized farms or little shops in the periphery. Economic structures such as pools, trusts, and monopolies drove innovation and economic growth generating the social surplus to invest in society to insure future growth.

These structures were encouraged because they helped break down the division between individual and society. Large financial, business, and industrial corporations were the only institutions outside of universities willing to reward training, loyalty, and self-discipline. Right acting and successful trusts were essential to the achievement of any vision of the national public good.

Another article of faith for the progressive centered on a redefinition of personal freedom. Rejecting the old regime concept of rights and individualism as the basis for American national democracy, progressives argued that self government was not the origin of government but the goal to be reached by means of government.

A generalized individualism is connected to the democratic liberation of personal capabilities, securing for each individual a right to count in the order and movement of society as a whole. If an individual is not afforded the opportunity to discover and express one's identity in the larger society, the individual will have no choice but to be in perpetual opposition to society. In turning against others he destroys himself. The distracted and bitter individual must be a bad citizen.

Individual rights language reemerged within the framework of social duty. Society has a duty to restrict working hours and Saturday labor and laborers should demand these restrictions as a right so as to use leisure time for self-help, self-improvement and voter education which benefits society and the worker. Society has a duty to encourage, and workers the right to form, trade unions so as to make individual workers loyal, enlightened, competent citizens. Society should provide compulsory schooling, and every child has a right to an education as it is a prerequisite for self government.

For Eisenach the end of progressivism comes with the 1912 election of Woodrow Wilson. Ironically this is when progressivism was reaching its zenith in terms of public acceptance and influence. All three major parties, Democratic, Progressive, and Republican urged progressive measures to a greater or lesser degree. Wherever one looked progressive reform measures were taking hold, ranging from new municipal government to the regulation of railroads and coordinated international trade policy to higher and enforced standards governing the relationship between business and government.

Progressivism's end was hidden in the fact that with the election of Wilson and the Democrats, the periphery reasserted itself by using the newly expanded resources of the federal government to subsidize and preserve the values and way of life that had previously been protected by the old regime. Had it not been for war preparedness brought on by World War I, the national government under Wilson might have been transformed into the equivalent of a gigantic patronage political party using the resources of the industrial core as "manna from heaven" to subsidize its peripheral electoral clientele.

This, then, is the transformation of progressivism to New Deal liberalism, described by Eisenach as the "revenge of the periphery." Wilsonian progressivism, anchored in the old regime, was coupled with the new regime emphasis on large national economic aggregations of power, producing a democracy of "elite consensus" or "the liberal establishment." Progressive institutions in the national government and the economy were preserved and augmented by New Deal legislation, but the high minded ideals of the "national religion" were discarded and replaced with the reassertion of old regime "rights talk."

As with any book there are things with which to quibble. The book is not easy to read. Its jargon-laden tenor makes it difficult to follow. In terms of method, the nineteen influential progressive intellectuals cited were included on the basis of subjective criteria; in order to be selected, the author's textbooks had to be reprinted for an extended period of time and the author had to be discussed in three widely diverse books examining social reform. One might question why others, such as Upton Sinclair, whose works were very influential then and were continually published for many years, were not included.

Taken as a whole Eisenach's work gives great insight into the development of progressive public doctrine. The book laboriously explains the distinctions between the underlying assumptions of populism, progressivism and liberalism. All too often the profound differences between the three are overlooked in order to simplify them on a contemporary left-right continuum. Eisenach reminds us that progressives set the tone for future political discourse in America.

Kirk A. Rodden
Murray State College

Gregory M. Scott and Stephen M. Garrison, *The Political Science Student Writer's Manual*. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1995) pp. 302. $20.00 ISBN 0130606340

In their note to professors adopting this manual, the authors, Gregory M. Scott, a political scientist, and Stephen M. Garrison, a professor of English, ask "How many times have you assigned papers in your political science classes and found yourself teaching the class how to write the paper — not only content, but form and grammar as well" (p. xv)? They offer their book as a remedy. That it is not a remedy is no fault of the manual itself.

A manual, according to my dictionary, is a handbook, "a book containing in concise form the principles, rules, and directions needed for mastery of the art, science, or skill"(*Webster's Third New International Dictionary*). The art described in this manual is political science writing and the "principles, rules, and directions" are on writing *per se* (the two chapters in Part One), on doing research (the five chapters in Part Two), and then quite specifically on eight different types of political science papers (presented each in a separate chapter in Part Three).

Part One, on the basics of writing and Part Two, on research techniques, format, bibliographic style, etc., are handy distillations of principles. Frankly, I would prefer any of the more comprehensive manuals used in college composition courses; and, for writing style, even a dog-eared copy of Strunk and White would do. But the basics are here, they are accessible, and the special merit of this manual is that they are aimed at developing in students an appreciation that writing is central to their future professional lives as political scientists. As the authors say, "the act of writing [is] not... an empty exercise undertaken only to produce a grade, but... a powerful learning tool, as well as the primary medium by which political scientists accomplish their goals"(p. xiii).

For professors of political science, Part Three is where this book really begins. The authors point out that "This text... allows you to assign one of the papers explained in Part Three with the knowledge that virtually everything the student needs to know, from grammar to sources of information to citing sources, is here within one book"(p. xv). In each chapter of Part Three the authors describe the purpose and characteristics of a given type of paper, describe steps for writing it, and suggest an appropriate format. Thus, assigning a paper is as simple as deciding what type of paper one wants. Is it to be a book review? Refer students to Chapter 8. A traditional research paper? That's Chapter 9. I

Political analysis papers are described in chapter 10, position papers in 11, policy analysis, administrative case studies, case briefs, and public opinion surveys in Chapters 12 through 15 respectively. Professors can assign the paper and proceed forthwith with their own course content.

Within each of these chapters, Scott and Garrison provide a definition of the specific type of paper (e.g., "Policy analysis is the examination of the components of decision to enable one to act according to a set principle or rule in a given set of circumstances [a policy]," p. 214), an operational statement of that definition ("A policy analysis paper evaluates a decision by reviewing current and potential government policies," p. 222), a statement of what one might call the real-world uses of that specific type of paper ("The objective of a policy analysis paper is to inform policy makers about how public policy in a specific area may be improved," ibid.), and examples of it (e.g., the Brownlow Commission Report and the Report of the Commission on Health Care Reform, pp. 213-214). Then, in true manual fashion, they set forth a step-by-step guide on preparing and presenting the type of paper. Throughout, the emphasis is upon professional applications. Thus, the chapter on case briefs says nothing about doing a classroom brief of a Supreme Court case, the entire discussion being on *amicus curiae* briefs prepared by those who, in the broader world of politics, would submit their views to the Court.

Without referring to it as such, these chapters offer also some of the politics of doing political science writing and some of the science of writing about politics. "Policy analysis," for instance, "is never completely 'technical.' It is conducted within and immediately affected by numerous currents of political influence" (p. 213) — and as an instance of this, the authors cite the pressure group and media activity around the work of the Task Force on National Health Care Reform. "Policies almost always arise from genuine needs," they say, "but they often reflect the needs of one part of the population more than others" (p. 227), — and with this warning they admonish writers to take the social, physical, economic, and political environments into account as they do policy analysis (ibid.) and to be scrupulously honest in reporting them. "*Never omit important factors merely because they tend to support a perspective other than your own*" [Authors' emphasis, p. 223].

A position paper, by contrast, entails advocacy and problem-solving. Here, a writer "takes a *position* on how to solve a particular problem" (author's emphasis, p. 196) — and though they are not clear on it, that is presumably the ground upon which the authors commend the position paper for use in introductory classes. Even so, it is for its political use beyond the classroom that we assign such a paper: "A position paper is ... an entirely practical exercise... The object is to persuade a public official to take the course of action you recommend" (p. 196).

The authors address the science of political science one small piece at a time, integrating discrete bits of methodology into the actual process of student writing. They incorporate benefit-cost analysis, for example, into their discussion of how to do policy analysis and how to write position papers. In telling how to do political analysis, they describe the practical uses of systems analysis, structural-functional analysis, analysis of the state, and decision-making analysis. A treatment of sample selection, questionnaire construction, and data analysis is found in the chapter on public opinion survey papers and some of the basics of legal research are in the chapter on case briefs. In this manner, the authors take a step in the direction of making method a useable, practical tool rather than an abstraction — and that is much to be praised.

However, having armed our students with a manual, are we better off than before? Realistically speaking, once adopted, the manual must then itself be taught — either that, or ignored by the professors, be likewise ignored by the students. Were we to teach the manual, course content would have to give way — which may explain why many of us assign what the authors call a "traditional research paper" and let it go at that. This paper, the generic academic paper, appropriate to many subject matter fields, is taught in the basic composition course because it is generic; and presumably our students learned there how to write it. Since it has already been taught, we can assign it in our courses and, hardly missing a beat, get on with content.

A point underlying this manual, however, is that political science writing is not generic, that it has its own kinds of papers, a large number of them, and that a truly professional preparation of our students would at least introduce and practice some of the papers in their variety. Professionally speaking, writing is content.

A faculty might agree to teach political science writing in the Introduction to Political Science course; they might agree to adopt this manual for that purpose and require that students add it to their professional "kits;" and they might then agree to refer to this manual as standard when they assign writing in their own courses. It is presumably with this use in mind as a textbook in Introduction to Political Science courses that the authors have opened the book with an otherwise incongruous and distracting introduction on the discipline of political science, a twenty-three page history and overview of the field, only one section of which — that on testing hypotheses - has anything to do with writing — and how even that is so is not there made clear. Whether a faculty can agree to treat the Introduction to Political Science course as such a basic "tools" course is is quite another matter. So, too, is the question whether that course should be made prerequisite to all others — or, in some departments, whether it should even be offered early enough in the undergraduate program to make it foundational for other courses.

Which brings us back to where we started. Some instructors may decide to adopt this manual as supplement in their individual courses. Those who do will have to teach it on their own and it will inevitably intrude upon "content."

William T. McClure, Jr.
East Central University

Greg Russell, *John Quincy Adams and the Public Virtues of Diplomacy.* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1995) pp. 295. $42.50 ISBN 082620984X

John Quincy Adams was the quintessential public servant. His career as an author, ambassador, senator, president, and, lastly, congressman, was marked by a willingness to serve, not pander to, the American public. His constant pursuit of what he considered to be the public welfare often left him at odds with his political party, colleagues, and friends. His public actions can only be understood in light of his carefully considered political theory.

Although much has been written about Adams, Greg Russell's work fills a gap in the literature by, in his words, "bringing together Adams's political and literary careers, by looking at his statesmanship as an expression of distinct intellectual and diplomatic traditions. Foremost among these was Adams's reliance upon the classical and Christian backgrounds of American constitutionalism" (p. 6).

Russell begins his book with an overview of Adams's life and accomplishments. The chapter is a useful introduction for readers who do not know much about Adams, but it will also be of use to experts because of its analysis of his intellectual development. Russell then provides a detailed discussion of Adams's political ideas, with a special emphasis on his moral theory. Regarding the latter, he convincingly demonstrates that Adams's religious views led him to accept a strong version of natural law upon which he based his theory of international law and natural rights.

The core of Russell's book is an examination of how Adams's political theory relates to his view of international relations. Russell's arguments are too numerous and detailed to be summarized here, but one issue deserves mention. Perhaps the most interesting subject that he explores is Adams's solution to the perennial tension between idealism and realism. Adams joined the idealists in their firm belief that statesmen should take morality seriously. Like the realists, however, he recognized that humans, while capable of progress, are essentially self-interested. Therefore, steering a middle course between these two views he became, in Russell's words, a "principled realist" (p. 141).

Adams's principled realism led him to adopt a number of policy positions which, at one time or another, offended just about every American citizen. For instance, he rejected the popular moral arguments for intervention in the Latin American rebellions because he recognized that America did not have the power to do so effectively. Conversely, late in life he opposed the popular Mexican war and eventual annexation of Texas because he thought such actions were unjust and unconstitutional.

Russell concludes his work by arguing that Adams has much to teach us today. On a theoretical level, he provided carefully considered arguments for the importance of religion and virtue in American life and politics. More practically, his insights regarding America's place in the world and the proper relation between morality and power politics are worthy of consideration by contemporary international theorists and policy makers.

Russell's book is well-written, thoughtful, and engaging. He might have been more critical of Adams at times, but on the whole he provides a balanced treatment of the statesman. One minor weakness of the work is its lack of discussion of the relevant secondary literature on American political theory, especially that on the classical republican tradition. Yet this weakness pales in light of the volume's many strengths. Overall this book makes an important contribution not only to the literature on Adams but also to that on American history, politics, and theory.

Mark Hall
East Central University

Richard Lowitt, ed., *Politics in the Postwar American West.* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995) pp. 50. $19.95 ISBN 0806127414

Politics in the Postwar American West is a collection of works by prominent historians and political scientists representing nineteen Western states. Authors were allowed to focus on a single key event in the recent political life of their state (such as an election), a single theme which dominates the politics of the state over time, or a more general analysis of the political evolution in their state in the period since 1945. This diversity of focus is the source of both the strengths and weaknesses of this volume: because the authors are given wide latitude in shaping the content and direction of their chapters, the focus and scope of the book is decidedly uneven. However, the advantage is this structure also allows a degree of richness and detail a more unified effort might very well overlook.

Two important themes emerge from this text: the West is historically distinct from the rest of the country and it is politically distinct. Individual chapters then focus on a wide range of evidence in support of these themes. Of particular note, the text provides significant insights into a number of political themes endemic in Western politics that contribute to this distinctness: water rights; relations with native Americans; economic development; environmental politics; and tensions between roles of the federal and state governments. These explorations are the most substantive contributions made by the text. In fact, the chapters which specifically center on water rights, the environment, or which deal extensively with native Americans are among the best of the chapters to be found here. Outstanding examples include Peter Iverson's "The Cultural Politics of Water in Arizona," Peter Coates' "The Crude and the Pure: Oil and Environment Politics in Alaska," and Hoover and Emory's "South Dakota Governance Since 1945."

In addition to such issues as water rights and relations with native Americans, one of the most distinctive aspects of Western politics has been the cast of political characters to emerge from the region. Without doubt, no other region of the United States could produce personalities running the gamut from Ann Richards to Evan Meacham, or from Ronald Reagan to Jerry Brown. Sadly, *Politics in the Postwar American West* rarely captures the flair of personality so often associated with Western politics. However, there are several notable exceptions. Chapters which especially capture the personality of Western politics include those covering California politics ("A Half-Century of Conflict: The Rise and Fall of Liberalism in California Politics, 1943-1993"), Texas ("The Texas Gubernatorial Election of 1990: Claytie Versus the Lady"), and New Mexico ("The Star General, Three-Time Loser: Patrick Hurley Seeks a Senate Seat in New Mexico").

Two other chapters will be of special interest to us in Oklahoma. The Chapter on Oklahoma politics —"The More Things Change...: Oklahoma Since 1945," by Danney Goble — is one of the standout efforts in *Politics in the*

American West. Goble manages to work within a broad thematic framework while still including much of the depth, character and personalities which mark the politics of Oklahoma. In particular, Goble does a superior job of relating various aspects of political culture, regionalism and economic development to the changing political landscape found in Oklahoma. Goble successfully balances historic and political themes and presents them in a way which is insightful as well as interesting — a comment which does not fit all chapters in this text. This chapter is a must read for students interested in either Oklahoma politics or history. Unfortunately, this chapter went to press before the 1994 election; Goble's comments on that election would provide an interesting postscript to his chapter.

The other chapters which, in light of the bombing in Oklahoma City, is of topical interest to Oklahomans is the chapter on Idaho. Steven Shaw traces the social and political roots of white supremacist and terrorist groups most active in northern Idaho in, "Harassment, Hate, and Human Rights in Idaho." As increased media, government, public and scholarly attention has recently been focused on right wing, anti-government groups in response to the Oklahoma City tragedy, it should be noted that Shaw's chapter is one of the few recent scholarly efforts focusing on these groups which predates the events of April 19, 1995. Shaw focuses on various branches of the Aryan Nation movement including their religious, philosophical, and economic ties as well as some of their more notorious activities (including various bombings). He not only catalogues the basic structure and appeal of these groups, he also examines the political debate and backlash that accompanies discussion of such groups. This chapter is interesting and topical as well as chilling.

Despite its many strengths, there are several shortcomings in this text. As mentioned earlier, the lack of a tight thematic focus can be confusing to the reader. At various points the reader may wonder if he or she is reading a history text, a public policy primer, or a rather straightforward analysis of partisan politics and trends. In addition, the chapters are uneven in their quality. Some are excellent and provide significant insights into state politics in the region; others, frankly, are tepid and yield limited understanding. Finally, a concluding chapter by the editor, drawing together themes found throughout the text, would help leave the reader with a better sense of perspective for the work as a whole. Such a chapter would lend a sense of unity to the project, which is somewhat scattershot, as well as reiterate the common political themes which make the politics of the West distinctive.

Overall, *Politics in the Postwar American West* is a worthy effort on several levels and it deals with important subject matter. However, regardless of its merits, the book fails to fully deliver on its promise.

Richard R. Johnson
Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Gary W. Copeland and Samuel C. Patterson, eds., *Parliaments in the Modern World: Changing Institutions*. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994) pp. 50. $ 17.95 ISBN 0472082558

Why should this book be reviewed by *Oklahoma Politics*? On the surface there are three reasons: (1) the book is a product of a conference on legislative institutions held at the University of Oklahoma a few years ago, (2) one of the editors is among the more prominent researchers on legislative politics currently resident in the state, (3) perhaps least known is the fact that the other editor, an internationally-renowned scholar of legislatures, started his career as a faculty member at Oklahoma State University, 1959-1961.

But a more substantial reason for considering this book is that increasingly political science is comparative in design and theoretical implications, including not only comparisons across countries and states, but also comparisons across different levels of government. The concept of legislative institutionalization, first developed in the 1960s, is an example of this. Studies of how it works in one polity can be applied elsewhere, even at different levels of government.

This relatively short book contains eight chapters, including both an introduction and a conclusion by the editors. The six country and region-specific chapters, are, with one exception, authored by prominent scholars from these areas — Philip Norton on Britain, Suzanne Schuttemeyer on Germany, Maurizio Cotta on Italy, Erik Damgaard on the three Scandinavian parliaments of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, and Ilter Turan on Turkey. The one paper neither originally presented at the conference nor written by native scholars concerns the newly-developing democratic parliaments of Central and Eastern Europe, by John Hibbing and Samuel Patterson.

Institutionalization is a hardy concept — although — little developed since the 1960s. Here it is used basically as a synonym for "change" or "development" of legislatures in democracies, established or aspiring. As such, it rests lightly on the individual chapters of the book. More impressive is the variety of theoretical perspectives used including types of legislative responsiveness (Turkey), the significance of fundamental institutional choices of parliamentary/cabinet or congressional/presidential democracy (Central and Eastern Europe), cycles of majoritarian and consensus (centripetal) tendencies (Italy), the strength of cooperative impulses despite importance of interest groups in affecting legislation (Britain), and newly-found parliamentary assertiveness against the executive (Scandinavian countries).

Aside from the wealth of information about particular legislatures, in developmental perspective, to be gained from this volume, what do these essays have in common? For one thing, they show that not all parliamentary regimes function in Westminster fashion, with an ongoing legislative majority composed of one or more parties, subject to the possibility of the government chosen by parliament losing a vote of confidence and being replaced if cooperation and/or party discipline of the majority breaks down. Not only is there a persistent tendency for minority governments in some countries, especially the Scandinavian democracies, but in some instances the constitution makes it difficult or impossible to have an election before the next regularly scheduled one, thereby restricting dissolution as a possible alternative to a sitting government.

Another theme that emerges from this body of work is the decreasing utility of the distinction between arena and transformative legislatures, i.e., between those which merely reflect partisan debate without having much impact on the direction of government and those which can affect policy. The Italian, British, German, Scandinavian, and Central and East European cases indicate that legislatures are not helpless in the face of overwhelming outside forces such as executives and disciplined parties, even if their independence does not rival that of most legislatures in the United States. One unresolved issue, however, is the relative contribution of such elements as parties, electoral systems, bicameralism, decentralization of polities (whether it is called federalism or not) and political leadership to the nature of legislatures. Different chapters emphasize different variables.

The chapters usually compare legislatures with their own previous practices rather than with other legislatures. A broader theoretical orientation would examine legislatures on several different dimensions, such as cooperation versus conflict (among parties, chambers, in relations with the executive, and with other levels of government), individualism versus group-induced behavior (whether party, interest group, or chamber), recruitment and turnover (including societal sources of legislators, how frequently they are replaced, and why), internal structure (the role of committees, methods of selection and powers of leadership) and what effects these variables have on legislative behavior and public policy. The ultimate aim of such an exercise is to determine how much relative power each legislature possesses both within and across polities.

For instance, the chapter on Scandinavia does not even mention that these legislatures have been increasing their women members to the point that now they are three of the top four in the democratic world in percentage terms. Does that have any influence on legislative behavior, as feminist scholars (see Sue Thomas, *How Women Legislate*) have contended? Only four of the six chapters, those on Germany, Italy, Turkey, and Central and Eastern Europe, contain information, sometimes fragmentary, about legislative recruitment or turnover. Similarly, Cotta's argument about cycles in the Italian parliament needs to be compared, both in terms of concepts and time periods, with development elsewhere.

Schuttemeyer makes a striking argument that the tendencies toward cooperation in the German parliament are stronger than ideological differences of the parties and the formal institutionalization of federalism within the legislature through the frequent need for policy approval from the upper house, the *Bundesrat*, which is often in opposition hands. Her figures about the lack of defeats in the *Bundesrat* and how parties vote on second and third readings there beg to be compared with Norton's well-known data on parliamentary dissent in Britain and Richard Rose's contention that patterns of votes on second and third readings show British government to be more consensual of legislation that may suppose. But such a comparison will not be found in this book because Norton's chapter, as noted above, goes in a different direction.

Nevertheless, this book makes a useful contribution toward resurrecting the field of comparative legislative studies, rather moribund since its heyday in the 1970s. Events in the 1990s have provided further impetus which may herald a renewed interest in this subfield. Democracy has continued to survive in the former Eastern bloc countries, and some of them have had changes of government. The Italian party and electoral systems have been transformed. The status of democracy in Turkey continues to be uncertain. The Free Democratic Party may be on the verge of disappearing as a legislative force in Germany. It will be interesting to see how developments such as these, and others elsewhere (Japan, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States spring to mind) affect the performance of legislatures.

Donley T. Studlar
West Virginia University