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able to exploit those experts whose theories and perspectives best fit their own objectives.

Finally, McKay finds that presidents have greater freedom over adaptation strategies than previously thought. Institutional reforms centralizing power in the White House, such as the 1978 Civil Service Act and the 1980 Paperwork Reduction Act which gave presidents new powers over civil service recruitment and mobility as well as over OMB rule-making powers have contributed to that freedom.

Both the bargaining model of presidential leadership, which implies that potent interest groups wield significant power, and the state-centered model which stresses institutional constraints are too pessimistic in McKay's view. Presidential leadership in terms of presidential abilities to shape domestic policies, even within the context of the crumbling New Deal regime, is alive and well. Future presidents have opportunities for shaping domestic policy they are duty-bound to exploit.

McKay's breadth is both considerable and commendable. His optimism surrounding presidential leadership skills stands in dramatic contrast to the more pessimistic models he critiques. While he may underestimate the institutional, political, and cultural constraints presidents confront, his viewpoint that strong presidential leadership does not have to be a phenomenon of the past, or even a temporary and transitory aspect of realignment is refreshing. While presidents who believe they have abilities to shape domestic policy may not do so, surely those lacking such a belief will not. The presidency, more than other institutions within American government represents the highly personalized but comprehensive interests of the state.

Marcia Lynn Whicker
Professor of Public Administration
Virginia Commonwealth University


In the Preface of *Judicial Review and American Democracy*, the authors describe their primary concerns: "Whether judicial review is a usurpation of power and whether it is consistent with democratic thinking . . ." (p. xi). Upon reading this, I must admit that I was skeptical. As a student of law, courts, and judicial processes, I could not help but ask myself if the subfield could endure yet another book on judicial review and its place within a democracy.

Having now read the work in its entirety, I can report that my skepticism was replaced by interest and intrigue. Astonishingly, the authors have produced a valuable and fresh look at an old and endlessly-debated subject.

They accomplished this, in part, by using a deceivingly simple format. Rather than bombard the reader with material supporting one side of the debate over the other, they present a highly balanced treatment. They intersperse commentary with classic readings and writings on two of the most important dimensions of judicial review: whether it represents a usurpation of power and whether it is compatible with democratic values.

To address these questions, Melone and Mace divide the volume into three major parts. The first, *Judicial Review and American Government*, contains five introductory chapters, providing overviews of the Court, of its role within a democratic society, and of Marshall's opinion in *Marbury v. Madison* (which is reproduced).

On balance, the authors do a fine job in untangling what can be confusing and complex material. Moreover, while Melone and Mace include this section mainly to set the stage for what is to come (and, thus, they review past work and interpretations), they also integrate into their discussion current trends, debates, and they argue that judicial activism/restraint do not necessarily go hand-in-hand with any particular ideologies. Thus, this is not a new observation, it is one that continues to require emphasis in light of present-day judicial politics.

Part II—The Usurpation Question—contains five chapters exploring the important question of whether judicial review, in fact, represents a “usurpation of power.” Here, the authors reprint 1) Judge Gibson's dissent in *Eakin v. Raub*, the “classic” judicial response to Marshall's opinion; 2) James B. Thayer's statement that the Court ought exercise judicial review with “great restraint;” 3) Justice Horace H. Lurton's defense of judicial review; 4) lawyer Louis Boudin's rebuttal of Lurton's article; and, 5) Charles A. Beard's classic examination of the intent of the framers on the subject of judicial review.

The arguments put forth in these pieces are sophisticated, but, of course, contradictory. Those new to the debate, though, can plumb right in thanks to the concise and lucid commentary of Melone and Mace. Not only do they include biographical sketches of the authors, but they also provide frameworks and questions with which the reader can approach competing claims and arguments. Even as one familiar with the authors' selections, I found their discussions informative and thought provoking.

The selections in the final part—The Compatibility Question—address the other important question raised by judicial review: “How may one reconcile judicial lawmaking with the doctrine of majority rule?” In other words, why should courts, lacking any electoral connection, have the power to strike down the wishes of representative bodies?

To explore this question, they follow the same format used in Part II, bringing together diverse writings: 1) Robert Yates’ ("Brutus") letters, comprising part of the "Anti-Federalists;" 2) Alexander Hamilton's classic explication of the role of the judiciary in Federalist #78; 3) Eugene Rostow's defense of judicial review; and 4) several pieces written by the authors in agreement or rebuttal to the other selections. Once again, Melone and Mace provide interesting commentary, helping the reader piece together the often ill-fitting parts of the puzzle of judicial review.

Overall, this book has something new to offer, perhaps the highest compliment one can pay to a volume on judicial review. It presents the debate in an informed, contemporary, and lucid manner. What I also appreciate is that the authors “recollect from reaching hard and firm conclusions” (p.x). At the onset, Melone and Mace stated
that some readers might be troubled because they refrained from attempting, generally speaking, to resolve the debates presented. On the contrary, I find their approach refreshing and one that would naturally lend itself to interesting classroom discussions. I wholeheartedly recommend it to all students of the political and judicial processes.

Lee Epstein
Associate Professor of Political Science
Southern Methodist University


This short book is a critique of American press coverage of the rise, struggle and eventual triumph of the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua. The theme is that American correspondents in the field failed to report the distinctly revolutionary and Marxist sentiments of the guerrillas because the reporters were themselves sympathetic to the goals of the movement, and upset with continuing U.S. support of the Somoza regime. As a result, "Press coverage of the Sandinistas during the year before they took power and their first year in power fell well short of the best in American journalism (page 106)."

The obvious implication of this book is that the behavior of the American press in Nicaragua raises serious questions about the accuracy, professionalism and impartiality of foreign journalists assigned to cover events overseas. For Muravchik, the blame for these events rests with both electronic and print journalists, but television's sins are venial because they devoted little attention to the issue. The real press shortcomings, those of prejudice and neglect, are laid at the feet of the print media.

To document his thesis of a bias among reporters in press coverage, Muravchik analyzed hundreds of articles on the Nicaragua uprising from the pages of prestigious papers like the *New York Times, Washington Post* and *Los Angeles Times*. Articles from *The Economist, Wall Street Journal* and other papers as well as television reports were considered when appropriate, but most of the documentation on press sympathy is from the major dailies.

Muravchik finds too much reporter discretion in the interpretation of events. Journalists consistently misread the intentions of government leaders and the consequences of political action on the populace. One might wish that the author were more skilled in the techniques of content analysis, for most of his comments reference specific paragraph descriptions which he finds incomplete or erroneous. There is no overarching methodology to compare the amount of coverage and document the extent of the bias. Still, the methodology is revealing, the author is able to demonstrate consistent "gaps" in coverage, and document the differences between coverage by the *Los Angeles Times* and *New York Times* reporters.

The major criticism of reporters in foreign capitals is a familiar one, they don't know enough about local politics to figure out what is going on. As a result, reporters are usually captive to the official government explanation of events. In Nicaragua, the press was told the new regime was not Communist, so they dutifully wrote as much.

The implication of this book for students of the presidency is that press coverage of government officials tends to follow set patterns and established routines. In the case of Nicaragua, officials critical of the Carter administration were given disproportionate play in the press because their interpretation of events fit that of the reporter in the field. Selective interviews reinforced the impression that the Carter policy was unpopular at home as well as abroad. Subsequent events showed that the Sandinistas were not "pragmatic" or "moderate" nationalists, but by that time the original reporters had a new assignment and the United States had a different president.

J. David Woodward
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Clemson University


At the outset, I ought to confess my lack of affection for John C. Calhoun. He seemed such a severe and unappealing figure of a man that I seldom enjoyed reading about him in my undergraduate days. Indeed, I used to wish that Old Hickory had hanged him. Calhoun's writings baffled me as a graduate student, and I could never resolve to my own satisfaction their effect upon his auditors or his readers despite my Virginia rearing, laced as it was with more than a whisper of Old South mythology. As a teacher, I still tend to tread lightly with the South Carolina. John Niven's biography of Calhoun is the sort of book I wish I had run across earlier. Had it existed then, perhaps I might now react to him differently than I do.

Another in the LSU Press' Southern Biography Series, this handsomely turned out volume comes from the capable pen of skilled biographer. It is of a piece with his earlier treatments of Israel Putnam, Martin Van Buren, and Gideon Welles. Not unexpectedly, Niven stakes a claim for the value of biography as history. There is, he contends, "a place in historical scholarship for writing about leaders without denigrating the followers who have so captivated some modern historians" (p. xvi). His portrayal of Calhoun is convincing on that count.

Calhoun, of all the antebellum Southern figures, looms among the most difficult to comprehend. For more than forty years the South Carolina strode the stage of national and regional politics. Going to Washington as something of a nationalist, he distinguished himself in both Congress and the cabinet. He helped to organize