Book Reviews

Understanding Affirmative Action: Politics, Discrimination, and the Search for Justice. J. Edward Kellough. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2006. 200 pp. $19.95 (paper).

This book stays faithful to its title. Rather than staking out a polemical or overtly normative position, Kellough meticulously sorts and elucidates the morass of antidiscrimination policies developed over the last 47 years that we now collectively refer to as "affirmative action." For this battle-scarred political debate, the only "new" or interesting thing to do is precisely what Kellough undertakes: to take advantage of retrospection and detail the forgotten and elided twists and turns in the evolution of a term whose stretching has at times threatened to render it moribund. *Understanding Affirmative Action* manages to revivify this voluminous history through a systematic overview of its political, legal, polemical, and philosophical arguments. In so doing, Kellough strikes a balance between precision and efficiency. This text will serve as an excellent primer for anyone needing a refresher course on the what, why, and how of affirmative action. Its long view complements specialized tracts trained on constitutional law, statutory law, executive orders, voluntary and nonvoluntary managerial and educational policies, and philosophical rumination on principles such as equality, opportunity, rights, and compensation.

Like any political contest, affirmative action is a battle for scarce resources. However, we need to contextualize these battles to understand the nature of the resources at stake at a given place and time. The nature of the institution affects the nature of the affirmative action policies that get developed. Perhaps the most helpful reminder issued by Kellough is that the proliferation of affirmative action policies during the 1960s and 1970s "were an adaptation of the established management practice of responding to a problem by setting an objective and planning for its attainment" (42). In some cases, this meant setting goals and timetables in the hope of warding off governmental sanction; others were compelled, while many colleges and universities sought to promote racial diversity as integral to their educational missions. Across this spectrum, focusing on managerial response helps explain the variance of policies that have emerged under the blanket term of affirmative action.

Kellough traces the lexicon of affirmative action back to Kennedy's 1961 Executive Order 10925, which mandated government contractors and employers to take positive or affirmative "action" and "steps" that would

Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, Vol. 20, No. 3, July 2007 (pp. 545–556).
 ISSN 0952-1895

give teeth to the negative prohibition of discrimination based on race, creed, color or national origin. This policy was a direct response to the reluctance of employees to file complaints with federal monitoring and enforcement agencies (which predated Kennedy under Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, albeit under different names and structures) for fear of retribution. The 1964 Civil Rights Act extended the reach of federal antidiscrimination law to private employers (Title VII) and organizations receiving federal funds (Title VI). Nixon's decision to support and shore up federal affirmative action enforcement demonstrates the partisan slipperiness of this battle. Johnson's 1967 Executive Order 11375 targeted women for the first time, yet Kellough does not pause to consider *why* in any detail. No references to "sex," "gender," or "women" appear in the index—a significant oversight considering that white women have benefited so greatly from affirmative action programs assumed to be strictly about race. What exactly is the etymology of the list "race, creed, color, national origin, and sex" that any student of political science can recite?

Although the book is very readable in its entirety, its chapters and tables are arranged in a way that makes it a handy reference on specific dimensions of affirmative action's development and controversy. Chapters 4 and 5, for instance, detail the "early" court cases, as well as those from 1995 to 2003. An extensive compilation of "gubernatorial executive orders addressing affirmative action in the 1990s" documents an obscured aspect of the debate. Percentage plans instituted in Texas, Florida, and California during the late 1990s that guarantee the top-ranked students in each high school a place in their state college systems are presented efficiently. Missing however is the related story of how nonprofit organizations such as the Ford and Mellon Foundations began to repackage their "racial diversity" programs and fellowships both in anticipation and in the wake of the Supreme Court's 2003 rulings in the University of Michigan cases, *Grutter v. Bollinger* and *Gratz v. Bollinger*. Many of these programs set goals and timetables for the racial diversification of employment in higher education—namely, the professoriate, which were later transformed into general goals for the promotion of minority *interests*.

After taking stock of the political and legal tributaries of affirmative action's evolution, Kellough moves into a judicious summary of the normative arguments that are its public face. Covered in these sections are philosophical approaches to redistribution and compensation, utilitarian arguments on the value of diversity, as well as the tension between individual and group rights. Kellough rightly points out the ad hoc nature of these arguments. The question that counts in the end for Kellough is not whether affirmative action is morally right or wrong, but rather the empirical question of determining whether or not a particular policy is effective in meeting a stated managerial goal. Good research design is of utmost importance in ruling out "extraneous influences," and Kellough proceeds to recapitulate those studies that best meet this criterion. Despite

his resolute neutrality throughout, Kellough's sympathies finally seem to favor affirmative action, but only those programs that are "properly constructed," for these "can be an effective means of helping to ensure that society will enjoy the benefits of the great diversity this nation has to offer" (150).

HAWLEY FOGG-DAVIS, *Temple University*

Policy Bureaucracy: Government with a Cast of Thousands. Edward C. Page and Bill Jenkins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. 214 pp. £40.82 (cloth).

This book, relying on extensive (140 of them) interviews with British civil servants, explores a variety of policy roles for middle-level bureaucrats. Despite many important studies concerning bureaucracy and policy processes, a variety of specific policy activities, particularly among mid-level bureaucrats, have been neglected in studies of public administration and public policy. Many research questions had therefore remained unanswered.

Page and Jenkins explore these neglected policy roles of middle-level bureaucrats through interview research and by drawing on sociological theories of bureaucracy developed by Max Weber and Alvin Gouldner. According to Page and Jenkins, "Much policy work is usually conducted with few direct and specific instructions from ministers and senior officials. Since ministers do not give a detailed steer of all the things in the policy process, bureaucrats should produce precise legal clauses, specific regulations, and various forms of protocols about how policies should work in practice" (79). In the book, three types of policy roles emerge: (1) a production role in making policy drafts and documents, (2) a maintenance role in tending and managing policies, and (3) a service role in offering knowledge and skills to those involved in the policy process.

Chapter 2 provides a basic description of middle-ranking officials with diverse career pathways and frequent mobility. Chapters 3 and 4 show how policy bureaucracies perceive policy work to be different from other forms of civil service work such as casework, operations, and implementation (55–56). This is where Page and Jenkins introduce their three roles and the interactions among them. Chapter 5 demonstrates how much policy work is conducted with few direct and specific instructions from ministers. Rather policy work is guided by five factors in the UK bureaucracy: the perceived thrust of government policy, experience derived from frequent interaction with a minister, departmental priorities derived from departmental practice over the years, the use of government documents, and a consensual solution to a policy problem.

Chapter 6 challenges prevailing academic frameworks of how bureaucrats influence policymaking. The chapter contends that agency theory does not fit well with explaining the trade-off between hierarchy and expertise. The finding that "the middle-ranking officials do their best to

develop policy tools or measures that will meet what they perceive as their political masters' priorities and intentions" (183) seems to contradict bureaucratic behaviors derived from agency theory. The relationships between ministers and middle-ranking officials in the Whitehall bureaucracy involve the cooperative aspects of policy roles. The civil servants are viewed as good stewards and team players.

An inherent tension between expertise and hierarchy in bureaucracy is a classic question in the study of modern bureaucracy. There are many theoretical models to explain the tension in political systems across different countries. Page and Jenkins suggest that the norm-based approach is particularly relevant in explaining the conflict between hierarchy and expertise in the UK bureaucracy, where both invited authority and improvised expertise are key factors to resolving such conflict. Both the substantial delegation of policymaking to the civil servants and ministerial approval are seen to be a solution to the tensions among them. The Whitehall-based policy bureaucracy seems to contrast with Weberian conceptions of bureaucracy. As Page and Jenkins write, "The informal relations and flattened hierarchies in UK policy making contrasts with the apparent 'top-down' model based on the Prussian bureaucracy at the turn of the century" (181). Indeed, the tensions between hierarchy and expertise vary across countries. *Policy Bureaucracy* briefly discusses other models—such as organizational approaches, parallel hierarchies, and expert co-optation—of handling such tensions in political systems in Europe and the United States.

Page and Jenkins believe that understanding bureaucratic reality does not necessarily conform to the application of theoretical models and the testing of hypotheses with empirical data. They argue that survey research is not necessary to unravel the nature of policy bureaucracy and emphasize instead that interviews with civil servants are likely to provide more relevant and context-specific facts regarding policymaking activities among civil servants and their political masters. The information or data from this book tend toward the impressionistic and anecdotal, and no hypotheses are tested.

Policy Bureaucracy makes a substantial contribution to the policymaking literature and is best suited as a text for beginning graduate students in public policy and public administration. It sheds further light on the relationships between ministers and middle-ranking officials as well as their policymaking roles. The interview-based findings in this book provide useful concepts and testable hypotheses about the policy roles of civil servants and the vague boundary between politics and public administration. More comparative research is still required to fully understand how the delegation of policy responsibilities from political masters to civil servants varies across countries. *Policy Bureaucracy* will stimulate further research regarding these unsolved questions.

KWANGHO JUNG, *Seoul National University*

Confronting Income Inequality in Japan: A Comparative Analysis of Causes, Consequences, and Reform. Toshiaki Tachibanaki. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006. 256 pp. $32.00 (cloth).

The longer the Japanese people have dealt with economic doldrums and efforts to revive the economy, the more visible the theme of social inequality has become in political debate. Many recent analyses indicate that economic inequality has increased, and in the past year, Prime Minister Koizumi's critics have been vocal in blaming this increase on his structural reforms. *Confronting Income Inequality in Japan*, an expanded English-language version of a book published in 1998 for a general Japanese audience, provides a comprehensive review of the dynamics of economic inequality in Japan, with special attention to trends since the 1980s. The topic is timely. As recently as February 2006, Iwanami, the publisher of the earlier version, placed the 1998 edition at the head of a list of recommended readings on its webpage for the month's designated theme of "social inequality." The publication of a related volume in English for an academic audience is long overdue. This work by Toshiaki Tachibanaki, a leading Japanese labor economist at Kyoto University, will be a major resource for specialists with an interest in income distribution, social inequality, and poverty, whether their primary geographical area of study is Japan or another part of the world.

Tachibanaki's volume is extremely helpful in systematically parsing the sources and extent of rising inequality. While the image of an egalitarian Japanese income distribution propagated inside Japan and internationally was based on income data from the late 1960s, Tachibanaki demonstrates that this pattern has reversed dramatically, particularly since the mid-1980s. The author places Japan's level of income inequality as "currently among the highest of the advanced and industrialized countries," although not at the levels of the United Kingdom or the United States during the 1980s (7). In a Japan that has been confronting challenges of a rapidly aging population, slow economic growth, and limited employment growth, this analysis adds one more piece to the mosaic of a troubled Japan.

Tachibanaki provides a thorough treatment of the patterns of economic distribution in Japan historically and as compared with those in other industrialized countries. The author traces the evolution of income distribution during the twentieth century in a way that highlights the shift from prewar inequality to postwar conditions shaped by Occupation efforts to promote equality. The general patterns of economic change will be familiar to many readers. Rapid economic growth expanded opportunities for employment in the industrial sector and wage inequalities between large and small firms declined. Tachibanaki further attributes heavy reliance on an egalitarian seniority-based wage system to the type of production (manufacturing) that prevailed. With increased population mobility from rural to urban areas, household size decreased as well, affecting the measurement of income distribution.

For Tachibanaki, the mid-1980s marked a definite shift toward increased inequality, triggered by the rising values of land and equities during the bubble economy, but compounded by changes in the tax system. Real estate and equities, as sources of rents and capital gains, led to increased incomes for those who were already better off (65). Even after the bubble burst, the decline of land values brought no parallel decline in the inequality of wealth distribution as the bubble economy had merely "magnified the upward movement of land prices" over a long-term postwar trend (144). Especially helpful is the discussion of changes in the tax system since the 1980s and the impact these had on income distribution. Tachibanaki provides compelling data on incomes before and after redistributive taxation and social security policies were for years through 2002. While redistributive efforts continued to moderate the unequal pattern of incomes, both pre- and post-tax income inequalities continued to rise over this time period.

Likewise, I found the discussion of how intergenerational transfers of wealth—namely, inheritances—have contributed to inequalities of wealth especially fascinating, as this has not been a major focus of the discussion of Japanese inequality among North American specialists. Such bequests account for a substantial part of the wealth held by Japanese households: "Total wealth inequality [is] explained largely by bequests of real assets. Put plainly, individuals with real assets as bequests show high wealth holdings, whereas those without real assets as bequests show low wealth holdings" (153). Be that as it may, while Japan's comparative position shifted in terms of income inequality, Japan has still demonstrated low levels of wealth inequality internationally, at least based on data for the 1980s. Unfortunately, the data for the 1990s were not yet available for analysis (35), but once available, they may clarify the extent to which Japanese inequalities of wealth have progressed.

This book combines a sophisticated level of technical subtlety with explanations that should make most topics accessible to noneconomist specialists in related fields. Without doubt, it should be required reading for anyone in the social sciences who expects to conduct research related to Japan's income distribution, social stratification, or welfare regime. In addition, the discussion of government data sources, their respective advantages and drawbacks, and their implications for analyzing inequality will make this an essential reference for anyone who intends to employ Japanese data related to incomes, assets, or consumption. The care the author takes to present alternative analyses of data and to situate them in broader international debates over income distribution speaks to the difficulty of conducting such research and discourages simplistic analysis of conditions in Japan.

Confronting Income Inequality in Japan is a comprehensive review of the dynamics of inequality in Japan and the technical challenges involved in evaluating that inequality. This English-language rendition

brings pivotal work by a major Japanese scholar to a wider audience. The book will provide a foundation and a standard for researchers internationally who take up more recent topics related to incomes in Japan, such as employment opportunities for young people, the impact of structural reforms, or the contribution of demographic changes to income inequality.

DEBORAH J. MILLY, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*

Challenging the Performance Movement: Accountability, Complexity and Democratic Values. Beryl Radin. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2006. 270 pp. $24.95 (paper).

This book's essential argument about performance measurement in government is simplicity itself: The performance movement, or at least the "classic approach" to performance measurement, is typically linear in logic and blind to the complexity of the world, narrow in its approach to organizations, insensitive to the appropriate role of professional and technical knowledge, focused on efficiency at the cost of other values such as equity, blind to the fragmentation of government, and far too confident about the reliability and neutrality of information required to assess performance. The result is an enormous amount of misplaced effort that can actually paralyze government instead of improving it, as well as a neglect of the subtler political and democratic context of contemporary public administration.

Radin is obviously right that performance has become an international mantra of management, particularly in the United States. Her 10 chapters explore each one of the features mentioned above, beginning with short, imaginative, narrative scenarios that illustrate situations where accountability mechanisms actually impede performance. There are also numerous extended case studies, particularly of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and the Program Assessment Rating Tool. Her final chapter tries to step beyond critique with a brief list of 10 lessons that might temper a rigid approach to performance measurement.

There is nothing more convenient for a polemic than an exaggerated target. Radin claims that she is critiquing only a "classic" version of performance measurement, but the book as a whole is in effect an extended critique of performance measurement per se, as well as the new public management movement with which it is identified. Indeed, Radin clearly has several other targets in her sights: the Bush administration, pro-market management approach, and corporations. This political orientation is muted and does not overwhelm the text, although it crops up repeatedly in examples and illustrations.

More telling, however, is the claim that proponents of performance measurement are, on the whole, as stupid as she claims. Chapter 2, for

example, on the "performance mindset" is a warmed-over critique of the rational model of decision making that is by now almost half a century old. Who seriously does not believe that the world is complex (the word appears repeatedly in the argument, as though it were a unique insight)? The same is true of competing values, the fragmentation of government, and the problems in the neutrality and quality of information. Outside of a few ideologues, or perhaps early and optimistic proponents of the movement when it was young, most reasonable people working in the field understand that performance measurement is fraught with difficulties. Most credible textbooks or guides to performance measurement in fact highlight precisely the points that she makes in her conclusion: society has multiple values, rely on a basket of measures rather than just one, be modest, build alliances, and consult.

In this sense, there are no new arguments or insights in the book. The case studies are interesting, but the arguments they illustrate are fairly pedestrian. The more interesting dimension of the book is what it does not address directly. First, why has performance measurement—across the social and political spectrum, from the GPRA to *American Idol* to the obsession with self-help and improvement in the ministrations of *Oprah* and *Dr. Phil*—become so ubiquitous? Is it because institutions—families, corporations, and government programs—are indeed failing or falling and performance measurement is a way of getting a grip? Second, why is performance measurement resisted? To read Radin, it is always because its pathologies actually impede real performance. She cites two examples that in effect might tell a different story, the response of teachers to the United States' No Child Left Behind's introduction of standard tests, and the response of academics to the United Kingdom's Research Assessment Exercise. In both instances, performance measures have consequences for salaries and advancement, but they can only be publicly opposed in terms of professional standards and "complex" measures of quality. Anyone who has participated in a faculty debate about the use of teaching evaluations knows the game. Third, why do people continue to play along with performance measurement when its many pathologies (paralysis, inertia, and game-playing) are perfectly obvious? Finally, who wins and loses in the performance management process, and how do governance institutions evolve and adapt?

Radin touches on some of these issues, although only obliquely (she has the most to say in several passages about the last question above). The major contribution of this book is to provide some detailed illustrations of the drawbacks of performance measurement that are widely acknowledged. What it lacks is diagnosis, explanation, or remedy.

LESLIE A. PAL, *Carleton University*

States of Liberalization. Redefining the Public Sector in Integrated Europe. Mitchell P. Smith. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2005. 242 pp. $21.95 (paper), $60.00 (cloth).

Over the past 15 years, public services that Europeans once took for granted and regarded as the core of their state's activities have been transformed beyond recognition. Gone are the days when *Èlectricité de France*, the United Kingdom's *Royal Mail* or Germany's *Bundespost* were not only unchallenged monopolists, but also the epitome of the nation's power and resourcefulness. A wave of liberalization and privatization has swept across Europe and changed the way electricity, postal services, telecommunications, and banking are provided. What explains these changes and how far will they ultimately go? These are the two key questions that Mitchell Smith addresses in his excellent study.

In a more general form, these questions have been at the heart of the long-standing debate in comparative political economy between those who expect ever more convergence between national policies and institutions and those who insist on the possibility of diversity in the face of ever increasing interdependence and a globalizing economy. This debate has rather recently entered EU studies, too. After decades of mostly explaining why nation-states choose integration, exploring the mechanics and effects of "Europeanization" (i.e., the transformation of national institutions and policies through the process of European integration) has become one of the most productive areas in the field.

Smith's book makes an important contribution to both the more general and Europeanization debates by examining three cases where liberalization occurred to different degrees and in different ways. The first case is public procurement. There, far-reaching liberalization had been enacted by the European institutions by 1993, but little interpenetration of national markets ensued. The second case examines postal services, a sector where liberalization has been slow and incremental, especially when compared to industries such as electricity and telecommunications. Here, Europeanization has had the effect of increasing, rather than decreasing, protectionism in some member states. The third case is a one-country, one-sector study of government aid to public enterprises: Germany's system of public sector banks, the *Sparkassen* and *Landesbanken*. Germany strongly resisted the European commission's attempt to transform its banking system. In all three cases, debate was highly politicized because domestic interests over political control were at odds with European interests in a truly competitive single market. By examining these cases in detail, Smith hopes to solve the puzzle of why the "powerful forces of liberalization built into the very structure of the European Union" have produced the "uneven, incomplete, and sometimes halting nature of liberalization actually attained."

According to his findings, the timing and scope of liberalization depends on three factors. It depends, first, on the extent of formal complaints of actual and potential competitors of protected public service providers. These complaints allow the European Commission (EC) and

the European Court of Justice to police and enforce European competition rules. Accordingly, much depends on whether or not market structures and EC competition rules foster the emergence of such complaints. If complaints arise, the reactions of the public sector monopolists are crucial. Do they reform in expectation of inescapable liberalization or do they resist and fight back? Second, liberalization depends on the cost-benefit calculations of public sector monopolists and protectionist governments. These may change over time, in one direction or another, depending on whether the hope of gaining market share in other EU member states or the fear of facing foreign competition in the home market dominates the calculation. Finally, liberalization depends on shifts in actor constellations. It becomes more likely if the weight of public sector monopolists in national policy formulation can be reduced either by "participation expansion" or by the extension of the political arena to the European level.

The fact that these "it depends" answers are nuanced and permit neither easy generalizations nor predictions will be applauded by some and deplored by others. Those who look for an original and sweeping new theory of liberalization or Europeanization should look elsewhere. The same holds for those who want a formal model that reduces the political analysis of the liberalization process in Europe to a computational problem. Rather, this is a book for those who believe that the best we can do is to narrow down the possibilities of what the "it" entails in "it depends" formulations and to formulate a number of "more likely, less likely" scenarios, while recognizing that actual decisions charting the course of liberalization and Europeanization are ultimately up to the multitude of actors and their unpredictable interactions. This is a book for those who believe in the value of theoretically informed case studies and carefully documented process tracing.

Quite obviously, *States of Liberalization* is mandatory reading for anyone interested in public sector liberalization in Europe. However, it should appeal equally to those who are mostly interested in public sector liberalization more generally (because they get a crucial regional case study) or mostly in the dynamics of Europeanization (because they get an important sectoral case study). The clarity of the book's research design and Smith's concise and simple prose make it an outstanding addition to syllabi for graduate or advanced undergraduate courses.

MARC SCHATTENMANN, *University of Erfurt*

Public Security and Police Reform in the Americas. John Bailey and Lucia Dammert, eds. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2006. 336 pp. $27.95 (paper).

John Bailey and Lucia Dammert have assembled an important and provocative set of papers analyzing police reform and security policy in Brazil, Chile, Columbia, El Salvador, Mexico, and the United States. There are two papers for each country, one focusing on local policing and one

addressing law enforcement at the national level. The contributors are a mix of academics, NGO-based researchers, government officials, and private consultants. The editors themselves have written the opening and concluding chapters, which frame the discussions and identify some common themes.

When law enforcement issues in the United States are placed in transnational perspective—which is not often enough—the points of comparison are typically in the United Kingdom or (less commonly) in Europe, not in Latin America. Bailey and Dammert claim there are advantages to placing U.S. police reform and security policies in a regional context, and they are right. For one thing, studies of Latin American policing are not nearly as common as studies of law enforcement in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Europe. Thus, one simple and straightforward service this book performs is providing English-speaking scholars and policymakers a portal into the distinctive security and police reform challenges faced in Central and South America. And precisely because the challenges faced in Latin America differ in so many ways from those in the United States, the side-by-side comparison throws fresh light not just on Latin American policing but on the much better studied case of the United States.

Some important features of U.S. policing, often overlooked, are thrown into sharp relief by the regional perspective this book provides. For example, police reformers in Latin America confront authoritarian political traditions and strongly militarized police forces, and without close parallels in the United States. The complex, often incendiary relationship between armies and police forces—a central problem in Latin America—has been largely a nonissue in the United States, freeing police reformers and policymakers to focus on other concerns. That may be changing. Over the past decade, and particularly since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the line between state security and public safety has blurred significantly in the United States, and with it the line between policing and soldiering. These lines are still a good deal clearer in the United States than in many parts of Latin America, but here, as elsewhere, the Latin American case studies should provide scholars and policymakers in the United States with food for thought.

Another example: A common theme in the Latin American chapters of this book is the distinction between protective and investigative policing, functions often assigned to entirely separate forces. Latin America in this respect follows Europe and differs strikingly from the United States and the United Kingdom, where patrol and detection are typically carried out by the same police forces, at least at the local level, and governed for the most part by a unified set of legal constraints. This is such a pervasive feature of Anglo-American law enforcement that it often escapes comment and rarely receives serious examination. Transnational comparisons, with Latin America or with Europe, however, can help remedy that invisibility.

As they are less expected, though, the similarities between policing in the United States and in the Latin American case studies prove even more interesting than the differences. The United States differs in so many ways from its Latin American neighbors that it is startling to discover how thoroughly police reform in Latin America has become dominated by ideas, practices, and rhetoric originating in the United States: for example, Computer Comparison Statistics, zero tolerance, and (above all) community policing. Latin American police reform mirrors U.S. police reform in another respect, as well: It is almost entirely top-down and outside-in. Rank-and-file officers have played the same role in Latin American police reform as in U.S. police reform—which is to say virtually no role at all. Moreover, the dramatic privatization of policing the United States has experienced over the past few decades turns out to be paralleled in Latin America too.

Perhaps the most interesting parallel, though, is one that Bailey and Dammert stress in their concluding chapter: the extent to which imagery and perceptions dominate the agendas of security policy and police reform. In Latin America as in the United States, policing aims not just, or even chiefly, at public safety; it aims at reassuring the public and bolstering confidence in the government. Police reform points not just, and perhaps not even chiefly, at correcting abuses; it aims at building trust. Moreover, public fears of crime and disorder often have a life of their own, untethered from actual rates of illegality and victimization. These features of policing have not escaped notice in the United States. Peter Manning, in particular, has written perceptively and at great length about the "dramaturgy" of U.S. law enforcement. However, seeing the same processes at work in starkly different settings brings the lesson home. Like every good exercise in comparative institutional analysis, this book can teach readers as much about their own countries as about the world beyond their borders.

DAVID ALAN SKLANSKY, *University of California*