mediating character, make visible the struggles over such "fault lines" as "experts and citizens; anonymity and embodiment; the universal and the particular; the moral and the ethical; the global and the local," and so on (113). These, it is quite true, are "important sites of contemporary political, cultural and theoretical tension and struggle," although one might certainly suggest that if Habermas himself has only "scratched" at them (113), this may well be because Habermasian political theory has been more preoccupied with "boundary maintenance" (87) than with boundary blurring, notwithstanding an increasingly loud insistence (especially audible in the more recent work) that these boundaries must always be open to democratic deliberation.

It is ultimately in sympathy with the deeper sociological intentions and spirit of Habermasian criticality, then, rather than with the philosophical letter of his texts, that Goode maintains that we not only can but should "discern a radically different legacy from the Habermasian discourse of the public sphere" (141). For as the author implies more than once, we cannot get away from mass media or spectatorship in complex, large-scale societies (49), and we cannot simply transcend these. This is precisely the blind spot in Habermas's thinking about the relationship between communication and the public sphere that Goode sets out to illuminate, and it is long overdue.

–Stella Gaon

A PECULIAR RHETORIC

Mary E. Stuckey: *Slipping the Surly Bonds: Reagan's Challenger Address* (College Station: Texas A&M Press, 2006. Pp. i, 140. $16.95, paper.)

DOI: 10.1017/S0034670507000848

The study of political science typically focuses its energy on drawing generalizations about institutions, political behavior, and elite decision-making. The conventional research goal is to draw the most relevant and broadly applicable conclusions about a dataset or grouping of case studies. Mary Stuckey pursues a different endpoint in *Slipping the Surly Bonds: Reagan's Challenger Address*. This book is a welcome addition to the Library of Presidential Rhetoric series, which features short, but comprehensive, analyses of individual presidential addresses.

Stuckey utilizes a multifaceted approach to examine Reagan's 1983 *Challenger* speech, which was given several hours after the spacecraft exploded on live television. As a historian, she tells the temporal story of the speech's evolution, focusing on Peggy Noonan's original draft and the ensuing changes. As scholar of rhetoric, she questions the typical classification of Reagan's speech as a eulogy and explains why several characteristics make it a difficult speech to categorize. Finally, as a political scientist, Stuckey considers the political goals of the address, with specific attention paid to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670507000848 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Reagan's desire to restore public confidence in NASA and the U.S. space program.

After a brief introduction and a preface which contains the text of the speech itself, Stuckey begins with the observation that "the *Challenger* address is a peculiar speech" (13). The speech is often remembered as eloquent, yet the most memorable line ("touch the face of God") is actually a quotation, not the product of original composition. But Stuckey calls the address "peculiar" because its rhetorical classification is elusive, possessing qualities of an epideictic address, an encomium, a eulogy, and deliberative speech. The *Challenger* speech is a prime example of a generic hybrid, and it is the ability of the address to speak on many levels that makes it unique in American history. In particular, Reagan used the ceremonial trappings of epideictic address effectively to make a deliberative, political argument about the continuation of the space program. He accomplished this without an unabashed appeal to purely strategic ends by observing that the explosion was "one of the dangers inherent to the pioneer tradition" (20). The ceremonial nature of the occasion gave Reagan the cover to make the policy arguments he needed to emphasize. Reagan tied the deaths of the Challenger crew to specific policy goals, yet the complicated layering of the speech prevented any suspicion of overt politicization.

Stuckey also chronicles the speech's rhetorical development, although the compressed time period between the shuttle's explosion and airtime was rather brief. It was routine practice in the Reagan White House to give speechwriters a week to write an address, and major speeches were afforded even more time than that. Given the exceptional time crunch which the Reagan team faced, the production of the *Challenger* address is quite remarkable. Stuckey's analysis stems from her research at the Reagan Library, which includes drafts of the speech with notations in the margins. For scholars interested in presidential communications and speechwriting, her chronological description of the production process is fascinating. Stuckey correctly gives Peggy Noonan the bragging rights to primary authorship of the speech, but explains how others weighed in before Reagan delivered his oration. The role which Ben Elliot (head speechwriter) played is also detailed. The exposition of the composition of the *Challenger* speech is instructive because it is representative of the normal presidential speechwriting process, albeit compressed. Personal interviews with Noonan, Elliot, and others involved in the speechwriting would have provided even more intriguing detail.

In the final substantive chapter, Stuckey discusses the memories instilled into the public mind by the *Challenger* speech. The key is deciphering the memory that Reagan created with the speech, epitomized by substituting the farewell picture of the astronauts for the fiery explosion over the ocean. Stuckey does this by analyzing the distinct audiences Reagan addressed. The speech is progressive, changing its audience as the argument unfolded. In a deliberate order, Reagan addressed the nation, the families of the astronauts, the children who watched the explosion earlier in the day, and NASA.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670507000848 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Finally, Reagan concluded the speech by speaking to history and the nation once again.

Stuckey analyzes each of the audiences Reagan targeted. In the section on the schoolchildren, she might have said more about an astute and strategic sentence that captured the attention of both children and adults. In the middle of the speech, Reagan interjected, "And I want to say something to the schoolchildren of America who were watching the coverage of the shuttle's takeoff." There is no doubt that Reagan wanted to ease the minds of the nation's children, many of whom witnessed a horrific and frightening event via live television earlier in the day. But Reagan also knew that by making such a stark and direct comment, he would entice the parents of every child watching to listen to his remarks, as well. It is no coincidence that after a few sentences intended for younger listeners, Reagan subsequently proceeded to talk about the importance of the space program and continued support for NASA. Once he had the attention of the adults, Reagan wasted no time in moving to achieve the political goals of his speech. Stuckey does mention that presidents often adopt a "parental" role, but she might have said more about why Americans enable and support that type of executive behavior.

I agree with Stuckey's conclusions, which respond to scholarship that dismisses modern presidential speech as trivial, ineffective, or misguided. Instead, presidential speech is always revealing because it exposes deliberate thought-processes that explicate policymaking decisions and executive leadership. A president's rhetorical choices are a reflection of how he perceives the office itself. The spoken arguments that are chosen inform us about the individual who inhabits the office, and even more importantly, the development of the institution itself. Stuckey's analysis of Reagan's *Challenger* address is a noteworthy contribution to this scholarly endeavor.

–Colleen J. Shogan

A GOOD BEGINNING

Marc Galanter: *Lowering the Bar: Lawyer Jokes and Legal Culture* (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2005. Pp. ix-xvii, 498. $26.95, paper.)

DOI: 10.1017/S003467050700085X

Asked to review "a book of lawyer jokes" for this journal, I was initially puzzled: why would a serious academic publication be interested in lawyer jokes? Upon receiving *Lowering the Bar: Lawyer Jokes and Legal Culture*, however, I saw that this was not the usual slender volume one often sees written about mothers-in-law or dead cats (compared to whom, as it turns out, lawyers fare quite badly) but rather a serious, scholarly volume of over

https://doi.org/10.1017/S003467050700085X Published online by Cambridge University Press