her efforts to dismiss the relevance of realism as an explanatory framework for her findings. She recognizes that what she calls "soft realism" portrays international conflict as a result of states' needs to defend themselves against potential aggressors in an uncertain system, where distrust is prudent and where complacency can lead to victimization. Yet she dismisses the explanatory value of realist arguments as a whole by identifying them with the abstract models of game theory, where states are portrayed as unitary actors and where conflict resolution proceeds in a straight evolutionary line, not subject to the fits and starts of domestic politics and personalities. Later she abandons the soft realists and seems to say that realism only works as an explanation when there are real conflicts of interest between states, not when mutually beneficial outcomes are theoretically possible if distrust could be overcome. In these passages, Larson turns the rich and varied realist tradition into an easily destroyed straw figure, and her arguments on this point lack conviction as a result.

This is just a quibble, however. It does not detract from the value of Larson's work, which is not in her arguments against realism, but instead in her arguments on behalf of integrating social psychology theory into the analysis of international relations. This book is the perfect follow-up to Larson's earlier work on the social psychology of America's cold-war containment strategy. Beyond their clear academic value, the findings of this book should serve as a lesson to policy makers: those who wish to build trust in a hostile climate must first build a reputation for conciliatory consistency in the eyes of their opponents.

KIMBERLY MARTEN ZISK
Barnard College

Making Crime Pay: Law and Order in Contemporary American Politics *by Katherine Beckett. New York, Oxford University Press, 1997. 168 pp. Cloth, $27.50.*

This book provides some new insight into possible political and media involvement in manipulating public opinion regarding the "crime problem." Katherine Beckett's main argument is that it is not the "increased incidence of criminal behavior [that] has led Americans to demand that their political representatives crack down on criminals" (p. 4). Rather, politicians, with the help of reporters who depend on politicians for handouts, have led the public to appear to be demanding this of the politicians. Beckett argues that the main beneficiaries of this manipulation are the politicians who inflame the passions and at times help activate underlying racist inclinations of the public in an attempt to win elections.

In Chapter two, Beckett presents survey results of public concern about crime between 1966 and 1974, as well as public concern about drugs between 1986 and 1992, and compares this concern with actual crime rates and drug usage, as well as media coverage and state initiatives to combat drugs and crime. The results are quite illuminating: public opinion does not track actual crime rates or drug abuse; rather, public concern regarding crime and drugs directly tracks media reporting and state initiatives regarding crime and drugs.

In later chapters, Beckett argues and offers evidence that politicians ranging from Barry Goldwater to Daniel Patrick Moynihan linked the crime problem to lack of self-responsibility, the rise of the welfare state, and the passage of civil rights legislation. She argues that both parties resorted to these tactics to appeal to floating white southerners who were left without a party following the passage of civil rights legislation in the 1960s. To help link the issues of crime, drugs, welfare, and race, politicians packaged the issues of crime and drugs

when serving as news sources for members of the press, using different labels for issues. Crime issues were packaged under the rubric of ''respect for authority'': ''respect for authority has broken down because individuals are not being held responsible for their behavior'' (p. 66). Drug issues were packaged under the rubric of ''get the traffickers'' and ''zero tolerance.'' Members of the media carried the stories in this fashion to satisfy their own interest in ''dramatic and sensationalistic news'' (p. 77). In other words . . . ratings!

Beckett's conclusion leaves much for us as a society to think about. Because of the ability of the politicians, with an assist from the media, to successfully frame the crime issue as a problem that requires more prisons and fewer social programs, politicians and citizens alike no longer feel the need to fight the root causes of crime. According to the ''new penology,'' we fight crime as we would manage a business. Those who are in the decision-making process within the criminal justice system argue that ''the language of probability and risk supersedes any interest in clinical diagnosis, social context, or even retributive justice'' (p. 103). There is no consideration of the individual, the facts that led to the commission of the crime, or any plan regarding the rehabilitation of the individual. Unfortunately, while this new penology has taken hold, the prison population has increased sixfold, including a threefold increase in nonviolent offenders. In addition, the budget allocated to corrections has increased from $4 billion in 1970 to $30 billion in 1994. Could this money be better spent on education and possibly help us avoid the need to spend as much on corrections? Beckett argues that as a society we must attempt to reintegrate and rehabilitate these individuals or we must question our very existence as a democracy.

Despite the excellence of the book, the lack of seriousness given opinions that are not in line with the author's is troubling. Is it impossible for one to rationally believe that imprisonment is the answer for nonviolent crimes or drug usage, since individuals who commit these crimes eventually move on to commit more serious offenses? Is one necessarily morally lacking if he/she believes that society is spending enough on social programs? Beckett could have, at least, explored the alternatives, even if only to rebut them.

Above mentioned criticisms aside, I believe that this book is a useful supplement for both undergraduate or graduate students who are interested in both political or media manipulation, as well as a general introduction to the current state of criminal justice theory.

SHMUEL LOCK
The John Jay College of Criminal Justice,
City University of New York

The Legitimization of Violence *edited by David E. Apter. New York, New York University Press, 1997. 416 pp. Cloth, $50.00; paper, $20.00.*

This is a collection of detailed, analytical case histories of violent social and political movements of the late twentieth century. The cases are mostly quite predictable—Peru's Shining Path, Italy's Red Brigades, Germany's neo-Nazis, the Tamil rebellion in Sir Lanka, the Shiite movement in Lebanon, Republican Nationalism in Northern Ireland, Basque separatism in Spain and France, and an array of more-or-less related insurgencies in Colombia.

Editor David Apter has encouraged the contributors to adopt, or at least address, a distinctive conceptual framework. Indeed, to judge from his introduction, it is safe to say that he intends for the work as a whole to make a specific theoretical point. That is that militant