

and attitudes irritates rather than enlightens. Wrestling James Madison to the couch is not exactly the most convincing way to take seriously his principles of constitutionalism against the onslaught of contemporary revisionism.

Another nagging style problem weakens this book's central argument: It is cluttered with the most staggering number of errors one can imagine. We learn for example, that *Dred Scott v. Sandford* was handed down in 1856, not 1857; Stanley Fish becomes Stanley Fisk; Eugene Hickok from one footnote to the next suddenly becomes William Hickok; and, most appallingly, with but few exceptions Chief Justice Rehnquist is identified as "Rhenquist."

Along these same lines, it is worth mentioning that the decision to print the text in side-by-side columns was a poor one; the up-and-down exercise is an unnecessary distraction. Moreover, the nominal effort that went into what is called an index was a complete waste of someone's time. Raoul Berger, for example, who appears throughout these pages, is given but three entries; others who are also frequently present do not appear at all in the index. The absence of both a bibliography and a case index is especially puzzling.

The devil, as they say, is in the details, and these details are worth mentioning because they point directly to what is the major substantive weakness of *Saving the Constitution from the Courts*. This is one of the most poorly edited books one is likely to read. The inattention to spelling, dates, and names that mar this book and the decision to forego various scholarly apparatuses that would make it usable obviously reflect a more thoroughgoing editorial indifference. This book is a bucket filled with trowels of information scraped from a variety of sources but lacking clear differentiation and thus clear argument. It reads more like a review of the literature than a book as such. What has been published as a book is in fact a manuscript that has not found its voice. Instead of a clear and compelling argument, the reader confronts a muffled roar. It is at this level that Professor Gangi's important argument gets lost.

The weaknesses here are not simply the fault of lazy editors, however. There is also the deeper problem that much of what Gangi presents has been argued elsewhere and more convincingly. Most of what one finds here is derivative, from writers such as Christopher Wolfe, H. Jefferson Powell, and, most significantly, from the many books and articles by Raoul Berger. Even the heart of Gangi's thesis—that the authors of *The Federalist* posited a theory of limited constitutional government that has been increasingly ignored by judges bent on doing the right thing—is hardly new.

One would like to think that *Saving the Constitution from the Courts* would add intellectual weight to the right side of the argument in the effort to defend the Constitution from both constitutional law and constitutional theory, but that is a highly doubtful proposition. The most one can hope for is that the repetition of the sound arguments of *The Federalist* against the intellectual pretensions of our age may be its own reward; in this case, it will have to be.

Everybody's Children: Child Care as a Public Problem. By William T. Gormley, Jr. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1995. 243p. \$38.95 cloth, \$16.95 paper.

Jane Waldfoel, *Columbia University*

William Gormley accomplishes three very important things in *Everybody's Children*: He makes a compelling case for government intervention in the child care market; he

provides an analytic framework for thinking about that intervention; and he provides a wealth of information about the workings of that market. The result is a volume that is likely to be the definitive work of child care policy analysis for some time to come.

Even those who know the child care market well are still likely to learn something new from *Everybody's Children*, and for novices the book serves as a wonderful introduction to this policy area. Gormley presents the basics of the child care market in a clear and engaging manner, but the presentation is by no means elementary. This book has been meticulously researched and is carefully footnoted, thus providing both an accessible introduction to the topic and an entryway to further reading and research.

Gormley's goal in this book is not just to describe the current state of the child care market but also to make the case for government intervention, and this he does very effectively. He argues, first, that we as a society should care about child care because it is important for children, parents, and society and because children are unable to advocate for themselves. He next provides several reasons why government should intervene in the child care market. On efficiency grounds, quality child care would offer externalities (benefits not just for the individual child and family but for society more generally), yet, the supply of child care may be less than optimal due to market failures. On equity grounds, quality child care would be important in redressing inequality, which the private child care market left to itself might just reinforce. Finally, on pragmatic grounds, government intervention in the child care market may be required in order to help attain other government objectives, such as having children enter school ready to learn or having parents able to leave welfare for work. In choosing an analytic framework with which to weigh policy options, Gormley rejects both the work-family perspective, with its view of child care as necessary to enable the employment of women, and the parental perspective, with its focus on the "iron triangle" of quality, availability, and affordability of child care. Neither of these perspectives is adequate, he contends, when it comes to deciding among competing policy options. Instead, he proposes a societal perspective, with an emphasis on principles of justice, efficiency, and choice. This, he demonstrates, facilitates institutional policy analysis because it allows one to balance sometimes competing interests.

In describing the operations of the child care market, Gormley is particularly strong in his analysis of its two weakest sectors: the for-profit sector and the largely unregulated family day care sector. It is well known that for-profit day care centers, particularly those that are part of large chains such as KinderCare, tend to be less expensive than other centers; it is also widely believed that they offer lower-quality care. Gormley shows that this is in fact the case and documents the reasons why: All else being equal, for-profit centers have less-qualified teachers, fewer teachers, and higher teacher turnover. What can we do about it? Although we might be tempted to regulate for-profits out of existence, we can ill afford to do without them, at least in the short-run, since they constitute one-third of the American child care market. Gormley suggests that it may be more practical to work with this sector to improve quality by using a mix of self-regulation, tougher enforcement, and the threat of public exposure. Gormley is also a pragmatist when it comes to recommending policy to improve quality in family day care homes. The vast majority of these homes are presently unregulated, either because they are exempt from state regulations or because they are operating ille-

gally. To bring family day care providers into the formal sector, he points out, we will have to make it worth their while by, for example, setting up networks that give providers access to substitute caregivers, lending libraries, and other resources that they value.

The strongest part of the book is the institutional analysis of the formal and informal child care infrastructure. Gormley has done a great deal of research on child care regulations and speaks very convincingly of the failings of the formal regulatory structure. Part of the problem is inadequate enforcement, but there is also a problem of competing interests, since regulations to improve quality may also drive up costs and/or reduce availability. He also details the many information problems that plague the child care system. For example, he points out that child care resource and referral agencies provide a wealth of information to parents about how to choose a child care provider, what providers exist in the community, and which have openings, but they do not provide the information parents really need, namely, which providers are good and which are known to be bad. Resource and referral agencies usually have this information about providers in their community, but they are not mandated to share it with parents and reasonably fear repercussions if they do. Thus, we rely to a (too) large extent on parents to be informed purchasers of child care and enforcers of quality, even though they are neither well suited nor well positioned to carry out this responsibility. Gormley also covers the wider array of institutions that are involved with child care, with one notable exception: He mentions schools only as providers for school-age children, ignoring the growing involvement of schools in providing programs for pre-school-age children.

If the book has a flaw, it is that the set of reform models outlined in the final chapter, "Reinventing Child Care," has little relationship with the analysis that precedes it. As Gormley himself emphasizes in the policy sections at the conclusion of earlier chapters, in this enterprise there are no easy answers. Armed with the information he has provided about the complexities of this market, the reader is likely to want to see his prescriptions for reinventing child care more fully developed and more closely linked to the remainder of the book.

In spite of this one shortcoming, the book succeeds as a work of policy analysis because Gormley understands this policy area so well and is able to convey his understanding. Although the policy conclusions in the final chapter do not hold up to the standard Gormley himself sets, the policy recommendations within the other chapters do. This is clearly an analyst who can speak with authority about the child care market, and it behooves us to listen.

Candidate Images in Presidential Elections. Edited by Kenneth L. Hacker. New York: Praeger, 1995. 201p. \$18.95.

Mary E. Stuckey, *University of Mississippi*

Candidate Images in Presidential Elections is based on the beliefs that elections are central to the maintenance of American democracy and that political images—especially images of candidates—are central to elections. The book unites a variety of studies, all of which are concerned with questions pertaining to the content of images and how they are constructed and communicated as part of the campaign process. Such questions are important because, in Hacker's words, "candidate images mediate political messages and voter thoughts about those messages [and] perceptions of candidates are significantly related to how voters make

judgments about candidates" (p. xii). The various chapters detail existing knowledge about the connections between candidate images and voter behavior, as well as positing new ideas and suggesting promising areas for future research. The chapters do assume a certain amount of knowledge on the part of the reader, making the volume more suited to a scholarly audience than for the undergraduate classroom.

The book is divided into two sections, one dealing with research and theory and the other treating research methods. Despite the problems caused by the unevenness of most edited collections, and present to a degree here, readers trained in the disciplines of political science, sociology, communication, and history will find much in this collection, ranging as it does across extensive epistemological and methodological terrain, that is both enlightening and useful.

In the first section, for instance, there are discussions of the standard models and theories of voting and campaign research, with chapters on advertising (Kaid and Chanslor), debates (Zakahi and Hacker), the rational voter model and its alternatives (Kendall and Paine), and political socialization in a campaign context (Savage). But these models and theories are not merely given yet another standard treatment. Instead, there are new ways of synthesizing the literature, such as in the Hellweg chapter; new challenges to these models, such as the one offered by Kendall and Paine; and new ways of conceptualizing often-studied material, such as Hacker's offering.

There is also much to excite scholars of campaign processes in the section devoted to methodology, as the authors bring a variety of methods to bear on material that has hitherto been the province of a very few methodological perspectives. There are chapters here on meta-analysis (Hellweg and Spitzberg), on semantic differential measurement (Kaid), on intensive analysis (Nimmo), on a Rashomonian approach (Kruse and Kendall), and on linguistic discourse analysis (Hacker).

As research has become increasingly multidisciplinary in scope, it has also tended to become more fragmented. Researchers working in similar areas, or in the same area but from different methodological perspectives, may never encounter one another's ideas. As numerous scholars have noted, this is a particular problem for scholars of political communication, whose work often parallels research in public opinion, elections, and political behavior. All of the authors included here have provided analyses that illustrate how profitable the building of bridges between disciplines can be. While most of the authors are affiliated with departments and schools of communication (Savage is the lone exception) rather than political science, they display impressive command of a wide array of literatures and are equally at home with analyses originating in political science, psychology, sociology, and communication.

For example, in "Campaign and Candidate Images in Presidential Elections," Susan Hellweg synthesizes the literature from political science, communication, and sociology, covering such topics as how images are defined and studied, the relationships between images and voting, the role of voter and candidate demographics in the evaluation process, the relationships between images and issues, how images are conceptualized by voters across elections, and the role of the media, concluding with suggestions for future research based on this synthesis. Hellweg provides more than a mere literature review here, however; like most of the other authors included in this volume, she both synthesizes and critically analyzes the material, providing a