

in my classroom than they do in front of their televisions, where the vast majority of implied rolls in the hay lack the sanction of holy matrimony. And I also know of several literary classics, not all of them by D.H. Lawrence, that eloquently question the wisdom of strict monogamy. Shall we purge these works from our syllabi? Deride them? Ignore them? "In a democracy," Honig says, "the whole point is to nurture individuals so that...they begin to make up their own minds on matters of controversy." Let's do it, then, without pretending we have a moral consensus that we, in fact, lack.

And let's admit that the primary responsibility for moral instruction still rests with the family, despite its much-heralded dissolution. Honig is at his best when he discusses parenting and how school systems must work to improve it. I can't count the number of times I've heard parents complain that they "don't know what to do" with a lazy or inconsiderate child. Honig knows—and he's getting the word out, too. Using corporate donations, his system staged a statewide "Parents are Teachers Too" campaign, including parent education programs, TV spots showing parents instructing and praising their kids, and rallies where parents signed pledges promising to review their children's schoolwork, enforce bedtimes, and meet regularly with teachers.

Honig has also pressed for greater responsibility, opportunity, and respect for teachers. When he became superintendent in 1982, a starting toll collector at the Golden Gate Bridge was earning about \$5,000 more per year than a starting teacher in the California public schools. Salaries have risen sharply throughout the nation since then, but status has hardly kept pace. Too many gifted people still believe the adviser at Brown who—in one of Honig's best anecdotes—tells a student, "You're too smart to go into teaching." The comment struck me as particularly poignant, because my mother has been telling me the same thing for about ten years. I'm

glad Bill Honig is around to prove she's wrong.

—Jonathan Zimmerman

Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia. Robert Fishman. *Basic Books*, \$19.95. Most people instinctively identify suburbs with one country (the United States), one means of transportation (the automobile), and one short time period (1945-1970). In this admirably brief and clearly written book, Robert Fishman convincingly argues that the suburbs originated in England, that they long predated the invention of the automobile, and that the supposed peak of American suburbia was actually more of a coda to the suburban age.

The original impetus for suburbs, Fishman says, was the desire of the Anglo-American upper middle class to emphasize the nuclear family as the basic social unit. This was a new idea in the late 1700s, when the urban home was also a place of business and a residence for apprentices. Although there is a dislike of city life implicit in the creation of suburbs, classic suburbs actually strengthen the city as an institution because their residents all go to the city for work, big-ticket shopping, and recreation.

Since World War II, however, the spread of innovations like the telephone and the beltway (and, Fishman might have added, the microcomputer) have made it possible for once-urban work places to move to the periphery of the cities; for all the hype you hear about gentrification, the real change of the last generation has been a reduction in suburb-to-city commuting because most people now work as well as live in the suburbs. The "fall of suburbia" of Fishman's subtitle has come about not because of an urban renaissance but because big cities are dying and most people no longer work in a downtown.

One of the most interesting questions about American life over the next half-century will be what these new non-urban places where people live and work—Fishman calls them "technoburbs," and other experts have coined their own ungain-

ly names—turn out to be like. Will they breed conformity or individualism? A closer or more distant relationship between man and nature? More or less class stratification? Liberalism or conservatism? Will they cause culture to flourish or to die? Fishman doesn't claim to know the answers to these questions, but he sets them up very well. Urban studies tend (and have, as Fishman shows, always tended) to embrace voguish prejudices unthinkingly. Since the fifties, the prejudice has been toward a vibrant city life centered in stable neighborhoods; meanwhile the country has been moving in exactly the opposite direction. It's to Fishman's credit that, while he clearly feels the appeal of the current dream, he's intellectually honest enough not to claim that it's coming true, or that suburbs—even technoburbs—are necessarily barren.

—Nicholas Lemann

Veil: The Secret Wars of the CIA, 1981-1987. Bob Woodward. *Simon and Schuster*, \$21.95. This book, which was expected to delight conspiracy theorists on the left, had a debut that delighted conspiracy theorists on the right. Poor, ailing Bill Casey was the victim of a scheming investigative reporter who slipped into his hospital room against his family's wishes.

A covert operation! Domestic to boot! *Was Ben Bradlee informed? Or did some cowboy assistant managing editor, secretly running a "back channel" book project from a townhouse in Georgetown, start an unauthorized investigation that could potentially topple the entire Graham administration?*

Anyone tempted to feel personal or professional sympathy for Casey will have changed his mind after finishing *Veil*. Someday historians will debate who did the most damage to the Reagan presidency: James Watt, Michael Deaver, Don Regan, Oliver North, and John Poindexter will all be candidates but Casey will ultimately be picked. Watt and Deaver merely made the president appear foolish. Regan and Casey pushed the country into

foolish policy, a worse offense, and the net foolishness of Casey's actions exceeded that of Regan's, several of which were attempts to cover Casey's tracks. North, Poin-dexter, and others from the Iran scandal will ultimately land on the B list of Reagan rogues, as they were responding to a climate created by others, principally Regan and Casey.

Most of the sexy material from *Veil* is familiar to readers. How the inconclusive deathbed interview went from an event the *Post* wasn't even sure it should report to a mega-headline is a fascinating example of how you really can "make" news—especially if there is a dramatic personal confrontation to hang the headline on.

I found the book more rewarding for its little touches than its grand disclosures. At this point everybody knows that Bob Woodward is a superb reporter and a humdrum writer. But he's a much better thinker and analyst than he generally gets credit for. People have come to expect every page of Woodward's copy to be "shocking," so they often miss his subtle points. *Veil* reflects a sophisticated understanding of the way Washington institutions operate, the difference between big-deal B.S. and small but significant gestures. Consider this passage:

"About six weeks after the *Post* ran the story on the Nicaragua covert operation, I went to see [Barry] Goldwater [then chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence], hoping to find out whether the CIA had informed him fully about the operation. Senate officials are attended to as racing cars are by pit crews...[but] in Goldwater's office not a pencil was out of place. The only singular feature was the stack of ham radio equipment on a table behind his desk.

"'When Ben,' Goldwater said, referring to Bradlee, 'called me on the Central American thing, there weren't ten words out of his mouth and I knew he knew about the whole thing. So what I did was say, 'Ah, uh, uh, I don't recall anything about that. Why don't you call Bill

PRIME TIME & PRESIDENTS



NEWS THAT MATTERS

Television and American Opinion

Shanto Iyengar and Donald R. Kinder

This strikingly original contribution to the study of public opinion, political psychology, and mass communication unequivocally identifies the ways in which television news orders priorities and affects how many Americans take part in political life.

"The most important work on media efforts in the political field since the classic research of the 1940s and '50s. Elegantly combining experimental and survey methods, it demonstrates what observers of the media have long suspected without knowing how to test: that if one looks for the right kind of effects, the impact of television on public opinion is profound. The 'agenda-setting' effect is confirmed more convincingly than ever before; and the concept of 'priming' provides a simple and powerful new way to think about the political impact of the news."

—Daniel C. Hallin, author of *The "Uncensored War":*

The Media and Vietnam \$19.95 cloth

THE SOUND OF LEADERSHIP

Presidential Communication in the Modern Age

Roderick P. Hart

Analyzing presidential public speeches from Truman to Reagan, Hart shows how, as they have been speaking more and more, presidents have been saying less and less.

"Roderick Hart's book very perceptively and convincingly points out that we have entered a new and possibly dangerous era where the sounds of presidential rhetoric are being mistaken for—maybe even replacing—presidential action. This is an important book for everyone who cares about the future of American politics."

—Lesley Stahl, CBS News.

"In the era of talking heads of government, Roderick Hart provides us with an arresting analysis of the uses, and misuses, of presidential speech."—Daniel Schorr, National Public Radio
Illus. \$39.95 cloth, \$14.95 paper

The University of Chicago Press