other cities. Other possible categories of fiscal crisis might be found from a larger comparative city study.

In the final chapter, Monkkonen reflects on the practice of limiting debt and taxes for the promotion of railroads and other private activities. He argues that Illinois voters and delegates to the 1869 constitutional convention did not want cities to end their promotion of economic development, but at the same time they voted to curtail local subsidies: "Illinois voters approved limiting their own local governments' fiscal activities, even as they encouraged their local governments' pursuits of local development" (p. 123).

Monkkonen's meticulous quantitative and qualitative analyses of nineteenth-century debt issuances and state-imposed limitations on Illinois cities will sound familiar to urban analysts today. Many contemporary studies contend that cities' autonomy has been progressively eroded over the past few decades by federal statutory restrictions on tax-exempt debt issuance; the Supreme Court's decision that tax-exempt debt is not constitutionally protected (*South Carolina* v. *Baker*, 1988); and limitations imposed by states (and often the voters) on debt, taxes, revenues, and expenditures, among other federal and state constraints on municipal governments. Yet, cities actively intervene in enhancing the development potential of their land. Illinois cities adapted to constitutional restrictions in the late nineteenth century, just as cities today are adjusting to state and federal constraints. And just as cities in the last century decided either to take risks with their fiscal resources (debt and taxes) or not, and as a consequence either succeeded or failed in promoting their development capabilities, cities today choose to adapt to their changing fiscal and economic environments.

This very readable and reasonably brief history of local debt, which would provide an excellent historical case study in courses on urban policy and public budgeting and finance, offers a hopeful perspective that cities can choose to be instrumental in deciding their own fate. And Monkkonen concludes with the lesson that legal and constitutional constraints only modify city behavior and do not necessarily proscribe entrepreneurial and innovative development policies.

Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government. By Mark H. Moore. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996. 402p. $45.00.

Eugene Bardach, *University of California at Berkeley*

Although this book was not written to prove that public administration can be intellectually interesting, surely this is one of its most valuable accomplishments on a list of many such. Page one invites the reader to join Moore in thinking about some difficult subjects: the ethical responsibilities of public managers, the "diagnostic frameworks" they are to apply to settings in which they must execute their responsibilities, and the "particular kinds of interventions" that can "exploit the potential" latent in their varied settings. It turns out that the invitation is to join in a brisk climb from one well-argued paragraph to another with no let-up for 309 pages. Fortunately, because Moore is a systematic, lucid, and courteous writer, the pace is agreeable. And the view from the top is exhilarating.

Moore is not writing for academics but for practicing managers—though I address below some ways in which academic social science can profit from the analysis—and in particular for the sort of public-spirited and results-oriented managers who have participated in the executive training programs run by the Kennedy School of Government over the last twenty-plus years and in which Moore has been an active teacher. His arguments on the ethical responsibilities of managers are, in the main, not intended to give them responsibilities they have not owned up to but to legitimate their acting as creatively as they may have long wished to do. Their responsibility is to "create public value," says Moore, because their angle of vision, from the roles they occupy, permits them to see the latent potential for doing so. In particular, they can see changes in the demand for existing services (e.g., parents using the neighborhood public library as an ersatz day care center) and the transformational possibilities in existing resources were they to be used in new ways (e.g., police used for crime prevention, crisis response, and fear reduction as well as for crime control). This angle of vision will usually not be accessible to elected officials and to citizens, the more traditional sources of legitimacy for managerial action. Hence, if the managers do not seize the opportunities for value-creating action, the public will end up a loser, albeit an unwitting one.

Moore's signal contribution is probably to show how strategy and tactics can be enriched by ethical ideas, in a pragmatic and a philosophical sense. In playing the realist as well as the moralist, Moore stands Machiavelli on his head, so to speak. Managers should not merely accept accountability, they should embrace it, because doing so will usefully expose others in their organization to the same accountability demands. Managers should create new enterprises without prior explicit authorization and then subject themselves to "after-the-fact" accountability (p. 300). Indeed, if enterprises are complex and not easily described in advance of actually producing a working model, this may be the only realistic option. In embracing accountability, they should selectively scan the entire "authorizing environment" (pp. 118–20) for the mix of sources that can lend their actions legitimacy and hence authority. But because this can lead to demagogy, managers, though enterprising, must not be arrogant, lest they miss the opportunities to receive constructive advice and criticism from others as to how most effectively to carry on the enterprise.

Machiavelli is turned right side up again when Moore comes to appreciating the dynamics of action, and Moore is with him shoulder-to-shoulder. Machiavelli respected the swift current of "Fortune" that the prince had both to read and to ride. Moore writes of a manager "acting in a stream" (p. 290), which entails working with groups outside the manager's organization, balancing opponents and supporters within the organization, letting administrative systems trail the process of "persuading the organizations' employees to think and operate in a new way" (p. 291), capitalizing on and welcoming initiatives by others, and adjusting the pace of change so as to maintain momentum without fomenting rebellion. Unfortunately, Moore's appreciation of managerial dynamics is brief. Such an appreciation is so rarely essayed in the academic literature, though, that we must be grateful not only for its perceptiveness but also for its mere existence.

Can Moore's prescriptions of what managers *should* do be of interest to empirical social science? Machiavelli, too, wrote in a prescriptive mode; yet, in tribute to his broad observations and his seeming realism, Machiavelli is sometimes taken to be the first great postclassical empirical political theorist. Although no more self-consciously "systematic" in data collection than is Machiavelli, Moore offers prescriptions that also emerge from a wonderfully rich body of experience, the experience brought to him by thousands of executive training participants, hundreds of case studies in use at the Kennedy School as teaching materials, wide academic reading, and colleagueship with "distinguished practitioners" (p. 7) on the school faculty. He illustrates his prescriptions with the detailed discussion of six well-documented cases: William Ruckleshaus setting course at the EPA in 1972; Jerome Miller "de-institutionalizing" juvenile offenders in Massachusetts in the late 1960s; David Sencer of the CDC pressing for a nationwide swine flu vaccination program in 1976; Miles Mahoney as head of the Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs in the early 1970s trying to protect poor city dwellers from a politically popular Boston redevelopment project; Lee Brown, as chief of the Houston Police Department in the early 1980s, trying to reengineer the department along community policing lines; and Harry Spence reengineering the Boston Housing Authority when a state judge appointed him the BHA's "receiver" in 1980.

Moore's close analysis of these cases—comparing, contrasting, conjecturing about varied counterfactuals—partly resembles that of a geologist studying a rock specimen. Considered as a statistical datum, the rock is but one point in a large population. But considered as a medium in which underlying forces are known to be interacting with local conditions, it is a window on a developmental process. Some rock specimens, such as Martian meteorites in Antarctica, are much more remarkable as windows than their status as single data points might suggest. As sources of such developmental understanding, Moore's cases are not only well chosen but also well analyzed. I found the comparative analysis of the two "reengineering" cases the most illuminating and the ones that raise the intellectual quality of the book to its highest pitch. They improve the intellectual standard for what it means to "do case studies" in qualitative research generally, not just in public administration.

Removing College Price Barriers. By Michael Mumper. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995. 304p. $24.95.

Anthony W. Morgan, *University of Utah*

Highly publicized increases in tuition charges over the past 15 years, a fundamental shift in federal policy from grants to loans, and the widening income gap between educational haves and have nots have produced a plethora of literature on college affordability. This literature ranges from popular magazine editions on college "best buys" to technical economic analyses of the causes of college cost and price increases. Michael Mumper's *Removing College Price Barriers* covers much of this literature but is distinguished in both its breadth and, to a lesser extent, its policy analysis focus. Mumper addresses four policy research questions. Why have college prices increased so rapidly? What actions have governments taken to keep college affordable? Why have these efforts failed to stem the tide of rising college prices? What policy alternatives are feasible?

Chapters of the book flow nicely from these four questions: (1) the benefits of a college education; (2) forces causing a rise in college prices; (3) changes in college affordability for different income groups; (4) the genesis and evolution of federal student aid; (5) the increasing costs of federal student loan programs; (6) a review of state efforts to equalize educational opportunity; (7) recent state innovations to assure access; (8) the effect of all these aid programs on college participation rates; (9) the failure to achieve college affordability; (10) an analysis of leading reform proposals; and (11) the author's proposal to achieve universal college affordability.

Mumper's argument starts and ends on an important policy premise embedded in Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965—equal access to a college of choice by students from families at all income levels. Like other Great Society programs that assumed sufficient wealth for guns and butter, the Higher Education Act of 1965 set ambitious policy goals of both universal access and choice of institutions. Mumper argues that achieving both of these original goals may not be viable in today's fiscal environment and that we should opt for the primacy of access of lower income students over choice among types of institution. This places him at odds with many of the more prominent writers from the private sector whose proposals Mumper criticizes as economically rational in their arguments of efficient resource allocation but politically irrational and thereby failing the test of both economic and political feasibility. Mumper's own proposal attempts to mitigate the failures of past federal and state "spread-rather-than-target-allocation strategies" (p. 227) by incrementally moving toward a greater degree of targeting student aid to lower income populations through a revitalized and entitled Pell Grant program coupled with reform of student loans.

In the genre of policy analysis (e.g., Weimer and Vining, *Policy Analysis*, 1992), Mumper gathers and synthesizes an enormous range of research and policy studies; analyzes the social, economic, and political context of the issues identified; and then evaluates specific policy alternatives. The work is an exemplar of policy studies usable by both policymakers and students of policy. It is accessible to the general reader, flows from a clearly organized structure, and is well written. The tone of the book also strikes a nice balance between "objective" analysis and advocacy of a policy direction. That balance is manifest, for example, in forthright acknowledgment of limitations in the analyses and in alternative explanations tendered where appropriate.

While breadth of coverage is a strength of the book, some important audiences are omitted, such as students in for-profit or proprietary institutions, graduate students, and part-time students, who now constitute more than 40% of those attending colleges and universities. Proprietary students are important because their higher loan default rates have affected policymaking, and they represent a level and type of training that is central to policy debates on education for a changing labor market—important components in the author's final proposal but not treated in the body of the work. The affordability of graduate education is increasingly important as students attempt to improve credentials to compete for the most lucrative jobs. The book's strengths of breadth and accessibility also mean some sacrifice in more detailed discussions of data and their definitions, which researchers might like to see.

A second limitation, characteristic of many policy analysis works, is a tendency to rely on a limited number of secondary sources. In general, Mumper does an admirable job of drawing from a wide range of the most important research studies. But in some areas, such as the causes of rising college costs, he relies too heavily on a few secondary literature reviews rather than draw more broadly from primary sources. Third, Mumper gives inadequate attention to assessing policies and incentives for institutionally based aid, which he acknowledges "mushroomed to $7.2 billion in 1992 . . . an increase of 160 percent over twelve years" (p. 35). Finally, there are some smaller editorial problems, the most important being the absence of a consolidated bibliography.

The literature on college affordability is a crowded field these days, which complicates the reader's choice. The Brookings Institution, for example, has produced a solid series of scholarly works that focus primarily on federal