cupied with the presidency. This book demonstrates the rewards that await us if this preoccupation can be transcended.

GERALD BENJAMIN
The Rockefeller Institute

Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policy *by John W. Kingdon. Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1984. 240 pp. $9.95*

This book's chief objective is to discover how and why policy issues rise and fall from the U.S. government's agenda. Kingdon defines the agenda as "the list of subjects to which government officials and those around them are paying serious attention" (p. 4). This is equivalent to what others have called the "institutional" agenda, in contrast to the "systemic" agenda, which includes subjects that do not crystallize into public issues. Because of its focus on the institutional agenda, this book misses an opportunity to directly challenge critics of pluralist theory who focus on the discrepancies between these two types of agendas in order to demonstrate that some issues and groups are systematically excluded from the political process. Or, as E. E. Schattschneider put it in *The Semi-Sovereign People*, "the flaw in the pluralist heaven is that the heavenly chorus sings with a strong upper class accent."

Kingdon's analysis is based on 247 interviews, about half with government officials and half with other active participants in health and transportation policy. Individuals were questioned annually over a four-year period (1976–1979) about what problems they were interested in, why they were paying attention to them, and what they thought might be important in the future. The time-series data are supplemented by four case studies, only briefly described in the book, concerning proposals for health maintenance organizations, national health insurance, waterway user charges, and the deregulation of aviation, railroads, and trucking.

Analytically, Kingdon approaches agenda-building from the perspective of Michael Cohen, James March, and John Olsen's "garbage can model of organizational choice." He describes the federal government as an "organized anarchy" (p. 89) in which preferences and technological solutions are problematic and participation is fluid (p. 92). He concludes that an issue is most likely to achieve agenda status when problems, policy alternatives, and political opportunities intersect.

The author usefully distinguishes between agenda issues and policy alternatives as components of agenda-setting. He, then, is able to argue that elected officials have considerable influence over the creation of agenda issues, while experts inside and outside of the bureaucracy play a more significant role in defining the policy alternatives that receive serious consideration. He also contends that interest groups are relatively weak in promoting issues to agenda status, but are more influential in promoting specific policy alternatives.

Overall, Kingdon's data lead him to conclude that "nobody dominates" agenda-setting (p. 47), issue attention is highly contingent, and agenda-setting processes are fluid. These findings add to the already considerable empirical evidence that supports pluralist theory. However, those who are familiar with the arguments of pluralism's critics in this area—among them, Peter Bachratz and Morton S. Baratz, Matthew A. Crenson, and Roger W. Cobb and Charles D. Elder—may have considerable difficulty with the inferences Kingdon draws from his data. One might ask, for example, how issues such as health and transportation compare to issues involving international trade or taxation when one examines the role of political and economic elites. Also, how do internalized values, institutional pressures, and funding opportunities influence the experts that Kingdon credits with developing policy alternatives?

Kingdon's book is valuable in providing an account of how policy participants perceive their own roles and the influence of others in bringing issues to government's attention and in framing debate on those issues. However its greatest value may be in stimulating further empirical investigation and debate on competing models of the agenda-setting process.

EVELYN BRODKIN
Harvard University

The Making of the Mayor: Chicago 1983 *edited by Melvin G. Holli and Paul M. Green. Grand Rapids, Mich., Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984. 172 pp. $13.95.*

The election of Chicago's mayor in 1983 was a national event. Democratic presidential candidates endorsed the Democrat of their choice in the primary; when party choices were complete Walter Mondale joined Harold Washington in campaigning. After Washington won the Democratic primary the Republican National Committee, sniffing victory for the first time in decades, met with candidate Bernard Epton to pledge generous financial support. All the major actors in Chicago politics for the last twenty years played a part in this election; the fortunes of every politician in town were affected for better or for worse. The election of Harold Washington as Chicago's mayor raises many questions: Is the machine dead? Is Washington really a reformer? Which white voters supported Washington? More simply but perhaps fundamentally, how could it possibly have come to pass that a black, self-proclaimed reformer is mayor of Chicago?

The book of essays reviewed here offers answers to these questions and provides a surprisingly coherent account of what happened. I say surprising, because one expects a collection of essays to offer a variety of perspectives without necessarily paying close attention to telling the story. In contrast to these expectations, this volume is so well organized that it might well have had the same chapter titles if a single author had set out to describe the election.

The book begins with a sketch of Harold Washington and his political career. This is followed by a close account of the primary and some commentary on the role of the