

Book Reviews

Richard L. Engstrom, Editor

David J. Siemers. *Presidents and Political Thought*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2009. xvi, 241 pp. (\$49.95 cloth, \$24.95 paper).

Writing in the mid-1930s during the heyday of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, John Maynard Keynes observed that “The ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else. . . . Madmen in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back.” In *Presidents and Political Thought*, David J. Siemers looks not at “madmen in authority” but at several of those presumably sane men who have held the office of President of the United States. He hopes thereby to discover the ways in which they have been influenced by the ideas of political philosophers and other “academic scribblers.”

This is a tall order, for most American presidents fall far short of being philosophers or students of political philosophy. As Lord Bryce noted, acerbically but accurately, American presidents, with very few exceptions, have been “intellectual pygmies.” Several, however, have been exceptions to that dismal rule. Accordingly, Siemers’ book might better be titled *Some Presidents and Political Thought* or perhaps *A Few Presidents and Political Thought*. Siemers selects six presidents who have some claim to being men of ideas if not necessarily intellectuals: John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Bill Clinton.

It is surely significant that those on the first half of the list were close contemporaries, and all members of the Founding generation. Adams, Jefferson, and Madison were steeped in the classics of political philosophy—although Jefferson, as Siemers notes in chapter 3, believed that the works of Plato, Aristotle, and the ancients were well-nigh worthless, at least compared with those of the French *philosophes* and other Enlightenment thinkers (p. 53). Adams, by contrast, believed that the ancients had much to teach us about constitutions, political psychology, and the dangers and opportunities that arise in the course of exercising political power. On Siemers’ telling both Jefferson and Madison were deficient in different but complementary ways: Adams in his slavish adherence to the alleged wisdom of the ancients, and Jefferson in his haughty disregard of them. Madison, by contrast, strikes a happy balance inasmuch as he looked for lessons from all previous periods

and thinkers. In the course of his meticulous research before the Philadelphia convention, for example, Madison studied the history of ancient confederations and why they succeeded—or, more often, failed for want of sufficient centralized power (pp. 79-86). That discovery was not only incorporated into the new Constitution but became a weapon to be used against its Antifederalist foes (and might well be deployed today against their “Tea Party” descendants).

Siemers shows nicely how Woodrow Wilson—the most scholarly and learned of 20th century presidents—was a reformer of a Burkean conservative stripe. And he succeeds in showing that Bill Clinton, with his vision of a “New Covenant,” has more than a nodding acquaintance with political theory, and the social contract tradition in particular.

Far and away the most provocative—and I believe problematic—chapter treats FDR as a kind of crypto-philosopher. Roosevelt was by all contemporary accounts an intellectual lightweight. As an undergraduate at Harvard College Roosevelt earned “gentlemen’s C’s” and enrolled in only one philosophy course, which he dropped after three weeks (p. 136). As Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., observed, he had “a first-class temperament and a second-class intellect” (quoted, p. 132). Roosevelt read little, and when he did he preferred detective stories, and Dashiell Hammett to David Hume. Even so, Siemers claims, Roosevelt was much influenced by the Utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and by the 19th century English essayist and historian Thomas Babington Macaulay. From Bentham he took the phrase “the greatest happiness of the greatest number,” using that as a guiding criterion in the making of public policy. From Macaulay he supposedly learned two important lessons. The first was, “reform if you would preserve.” Thus, if you would preserve capitalism, reform and regulate it (a still-timely lesson). The second was that “trimming”—the gradualist strategy of pursuing piecemeal change by tacking back and forth, conceding and compromising wherever necessary—is the best way to achieve such reform. (It might be noted in passing that Macaulay was not the original source of these ideas—the first being due to Burke, the second to “The Trimmer”—the Marquess of Halifax—in the 17th century.)

My guess is that what Roosevelt learned from Bentham and Macaulay (probably at second or third hand) were two useful *phrases*. As for “trimming,” Roosevelt picked up a name for a strategy that he would have used in any case. To attribute anything more profound to Roosevelt seems a stretch.

Siemers’ book is not without other problems as well. The first and greatest of these is methodological. There is a certain sort of slipperiness in ascribing intellectual “influence” to a theory or theorist on the thought of any political actor—president or no—and the translation of that thought into action and public policy. In facing this difficulty Siemers is hardly alone: his

is the perennial problem of relating “theory” to “practice.” At most what Siemers succeeds in showing is that some few presidents have taken an interest in political theory from which they *might* have taken *something* that figured in their thinking about politics and that resulted in real-world policy outcomes.

Another difficulty is that Siemers seems to assume without argument that presidents don’t change their minds—and their ideas. To cite a single instance: In his otherwise fine chapter on Adams Siemers suggests that Adams’ political thought underwent no significant alteration over the course of his long life. But that is not actually the case, as John Howe shows quite clearly in *The Changing Political Thought of John Adams* (1966), which Siemers unfortunately failed to consult.

These shortcomings aside, Siemers has written an intelligent and informative book that will be of great interest to political theorists and presidential historians for years to come.

Terence Ball
Arizona State University

Robert M. Howard. *Getting a Poor Return: Courts, Justice, and Taxes.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009. 138 pp. (\$65.00 cloth, \$24.95 paper, \$24.95 electronic).

Studies of the U.S. Supreme Court have long dominated political science approaches to analyzing the American legal system. While there have been substantial advancements in our knowledge of other state and federal appellate courts in recent years, we still know very little about the role of more specialized trial courts. Moreover, our understanding of the judiciary in American politics is extremely circumscribed by the overwhelming focus on civil rights and liberties cases to the detriment of seemingly less salient issue areas. This is most unfortunate. While I have no doubt that the U.S. Supreme Court is an exceptionally important institution, the almost myopic focus on this tribunal has limited our ability to develop a more complete comprehension of the American legal system. What is more, focusing primarily on civil rights and liberties disputes has limited our understanding of other issue areas that, while ostensibly less significant, nonetheless play a huge role in defining Americans’ everyday interactions with the legal and political systems.

In *Getting a Poor Return: Courts, Justice, and Taxes*, Robert M. Howard provides a most insightful examination of how U.S. tax policy is shaped by the U.S. District Court and the more specialized U.S. Tax Court.

Howard juxtaposes two competing visions for the role of courts in defining tax policy. On the one hand, he discusses the prevailing view that the courts should provide fairness and justice, a particularly significant feature of tax law, given the fact that many of these disputes involve an individual squaring off against the powerful federal government. On the other hand, he establishes the reality that the federal courts charged with interpreting tax policy typically reflect the will of the dominant political majority due to the methods by which these courts are staffed. Building on these theoretical foundations, Howard explores tax forum choice, tax court decision making, and influences on the Internal Revenue Service's (IRS) audits of low-income taxpayers. He finds that, while fairness and justice are most admirable goals, the reality is that both the District Court and the Tax Court are substantially influenced by the dominant political coalitions that play a role in their staffing. In so doing, he makes a much-needed contribution to our understanding of tax policy, litigation strategies, and judicial decision making in trial courts. Moreover, the book is written in a very accessible fashion, making it appropriate for both lay and academic audiences.

Chapter 1 presents an overview of the book and establishes the importance of understanding tax policy. As Howard notes, tax collection is essential for the functioning of the government. Without tax collection, we would have no law enforcement, no emergency disaster relief, and we would lack basic social services. Howard next presents a discerning history of U.S. tax law, highlighting key developments that expanded the role of the IRS in American society. Chapter 2 provides a brief overview of the key actors in the adjudication of tax policy. Here, he discusses the differences between the District Court, the Tax Court, and the Court of Federal Claims. Importantly, he devotes attention to the costs and benefits of turning to each of these venues to seek tax relief.

Chapters 3, 4, and 5 constitute the heart of the book. Chapter 3 explores why litigants choose to file tax suits and, once that decision is made, why litigants file suits in the District Court, as opposed to the Tax Court. Howard argues that litigants are rational and will seek a venue in which their probability of success is maximized, based primarily on the extent to which the court has rendered favorable precedents, the court's ideological orientation, and the ideological tenor of political elites in Congress. Howard finds that politics dominates the process, in that litigants generally respond to the aforementioned influences.

Chapter 4 examines decision making in the District Court and the Tax Court. Once again, Howard hypothesizes that political factors will play a leading role in the interpretation of tax law. Specifically, he investigates the role of ideology, the institutional features of the Tax Court vis-à-vis the District Court, and litigant resources. He finds that Tax Court judges are

more ideological than District Court judges, and correspondingly that District Court judges more closely follow U.S. Court of Appeals precedents than Tax Court judges. The role of litigant resources is also evinced, with both Tax Court and District Court judges more likely to support business litigants than individuals.

Chapter 5 investigates IRS audits of low-income taxpayers. Howard provides evidence that IRS audits follow the ideology of the dominant political coalition, with more audits of low-income taxpayers corresponding to more conservative political elites. Chapter 6 represents a summary of the findings, nicely fitting the book into existing research on the role of courts in shaping national policy.

While this book represents a most important addition to our knowledge of tax policy, venue selection, and judicial decision making, I identified two main shortcomings. First, while the notion that courts follow the will of the dominant political coalition has long been established in political science research, the book would have benefited from more richly developing some of the tangential hypotheses, such as why Tax Court judges are expected to be more deferential to the IRS than District Court judges. Second, though Howard has done an admirable job explaining the statistical results in a clear manner through the use of predicted probabilities, I would have liked to see the author more closely interpret each variable in terms of the underlying hypothesis it is testing.

At first glance, the thought of a book on the role of courts in defining tax policy might induce slumber on the part of all but the most interested readers. Yet, this is far from the case. While this book does focus on a seemingly mundane (but vitally important) aspect of American politics, it is written with pleasant degree of verve. Intertwined throughout the book, for example, are narratives of Joy Anders, a day care worker charged with misusing the Earned Income Tax Credit, and James Williams, who was alleged to have invested in an abusive tax shelter. Moreover, this book has implications far beyond tax policy. Most impressively, it investigates why litigants choose to file their tax suits in particular venues, as well as how those courts render their decisions. In so doing, it advances our understanding of two of the most significant aspects of the study of law and courts: litigation strategies and judicial decision making.

Paul M. Collins, Jr.
University of North Texas

Philippa Strum. *Mendez v. Westminster: School Desegregation and Mexican-American Rights*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2010. 192 pp. (\$16.95 paper).

Philippa Strum's book, *Mendez v. Westminster: School Desegregation and Mexican American Rights*, is an interesting case study of a somewhat obscure 1940s case challenging the segregation of Mexican American children in Orange County, California schools. The study is particularly valuable since this is a story which largely hasn't been told.

Strum begins with a couple of short chapters outlining the history of discrimination against Mexican-Americans in California. This history is frequently ignored. From the Zoot Suit "riots" in Los Angeles in the 1930s to today's ongoing concerns about immigration, reaction to Mexican-American migration into California is one that has often roiled California politics. While California did not follow a consistent policy of segregation, discrimination in access to public facilities occurred all too often. Indeed, in the mid-1940s cities like San Bernardino refused Hispanic's access to the public pools, while the City of Orange allowed such citizens access to their public pool only on Mondays before draining the pool on Tuesdays.

The Mendez family was one of five families who filed suit in Federal District Court to end the practice of segregating Mexican-American children in some Orange County Schools. The suit was filed against the school districts of Garden Grove, Santa Ana, Westminster, and El Modena (now part of Orange). There are lots of interesting twists to this compelling American tale. For instance, the Mendez family resided in Westminster only because they had leased land from a Japanese family that had been uprooted from their home during the Japanese internment actions taken during WWII. Angered by having their children isolated in a small school reserved for Mexican-American children the Mendez family (along with others) went to Court.

Strum's analysis of the argument before the Federal District Court is certainly worth a close read. The plaintiff's lawyer, David Marcus, didn't want to argue that the segregation occurred on the basis of race, partly because he didn't want to directly confront Plessy's "separate but equal" doctrine, but also partly because both he and his clients wanted to emphasize that Hispanics are of the white race. As Strum notes, "scholars writing in the years after the Chicano movement of the 1960s have criticized assertions in court cases and elsewhere in the 1930s and 1940s that Mexican-Americans were white rather than members of a separate race" (p. 63). However for both the Mendez family and their lawyer, it was better to avoid both the pitfalls of the "separate but equal doctrine" and the tangled politics of group identity. Thus, he argued that the children were segregated on the basis of ethnicity.

The school districts didn't want to admit to segregation on the basis of anything other than language proficiency. Thus they sought to defend the segregation by claiming that the English language skills of the Mexican-American students were not sufficient to allow them to progress at acceptable rates. Among various problems with this argument was the fact that the school districts never engaged in any real attempt to determine the language skills of the segregated students. As skillfully revealed by Marcus, the basis of the determination was clearly those who spoke Spanish, regardless of their English speaking abilities. For a reminder of how racist stereotypes get passed along as evidence, a reading of Strum's account of the testimony of Garden Grove Superintendent, James Kent, will do. Superintendent Kent, had written his MA thesis on the segregation of Mexican-American students in Southern California schools and argued that Mexican's were "an alien race that should be segregated socially" (p. 82). Kent claimed that "upon investigation of the mental ability and moral characteristics of the average Mexican school child . . .", their segregation "into separate schools seems to be the ideal situation for both parties concerned" (p. 83). Marcus' ability to get Kent's obviously racist views on record was a major breakthrough in the case.

As detailed by Strum, there were other interesting aspects to the trial strategy. Marcus could have filed suit on the grounds that California law specifically allowed segregation against Asian and Indian (Native American) children, but not Hispanic. However, this had its own problems. Most obviously, California could amend its laws to include Mexican-Americans. Beyond that, such a focus didn't get at the larger questions of equality that he wanted to pursue. Thus he argued that segregation violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment and undermined the quest for an inclusive society. In his closing brief Marcus assailed the detrimental impact of "pseudo theories of intellectual superiority upon the minds and lives of innocent children" and questioned how such segregation could be consistent with our "principles of democracy, freedom and justice" (p. 120).

It was this latter argument which struck the trial judge, Paul McCormick, as particularly compelling. Judge McCormick had been a Coolidge appointment to the Federal District Court back in 1924. McCormick's opinion was, for the time, a bold affirmation of the American egalitarian spirit and an interesting precursor of *Brown v. Board of Education*. Judge McCormick first held that the existing segregation of Mexican-American children violated California law but then went further to tackle the very issue of segregation under the 14th Amendment. His opinion undercut large parts of the existing "separate but equal" rationale. According to McCormick, "A paramount requisite in the American system of public education is social equality. It must be open to all children by unified school association regardless of lineage" (p. 125).

The final chapters of the book recounts the school districts appeal to the 9th Circuit as the case began to attract many of the key players that appeared in the Brown litigation almost a decade later. The school districts appeal was not supported by California's Attorney General under Governor Earl Warren, and Judge McCormick's opinion attracted the support of the ACLU and the NAACP under Thurgood Marshall. Nor surprisingly, the NAACP ignored Marcus' claim that the case had nothing to do with race and clearly thought the case might result in a direct attack on the "separate but equal doctrine." This did not happen as the Ninth Circuit unanimously upheld McCormick's decision but avoided the larger equal protection questions by ruling that the school districts had violated California law. For its part the state legislature voided the existing law ending segregation against Indians and Asians.

Philippa Strum's fascinating account of this largely ignored case reminds us that the civil rights movement had many strands. In the battle to end overt school discrimination the Mendez decision clearly deserves an honored spot. Still the goal of increasing awareness of discrimination struggles forward. One wonders whether Strum's book could be used in the Tucson school districts ethnic studies program.

Donald W. Crowley
University of Idaho

Marisa A. Abrajano and R. Michael Alvarez. *New Faces, New Voices: The Hispanic Electorate in America*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010. xi, 219 pp. (\$27.95 cloth).

The rapid growth of the Latino population and the Latino electorate over the past two decades has spurred scholarly and popular interest in the long-term contributions of Latinos to American politics and the ways in which Latinos may change the nation's politics. In *New Faces, New Voices: The Hispanic Electorate in America*, Marisa Abrajano and R. Michael Alvarez observe quite sagely that the conventional wisdoms that have emerged in the popular discourse about Latino politics in this period have often gotten well ahead of scholarly analysis of its true dimensions. Their analysis seeks to test six of these conventional wisdoms in order to assess both the relationship of Latino political behavior to that of the white majority and the dynamics of change across immigrant generations within Latino communities.

New Faces, New Voices is organized around six themes each emerging from a conventional wisdom about Latino politics identified in the introduction to the volume: the building blocks of Hispanic political identity; public

opinion and partisanship; turnout and political participation; political knowledge, efficacy, and awareness; voting behavior; and intergroup relations and coalition building. The first theme looks within Latino communities to assess change across immigrant generations, contrasting the first and second generations to the third generation. The second taps cross-generational analysis and comparisons between Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites. The authors analyze the remaining themes by comparing Hispanics to whites and, in some cases to Asian Americans and African Americans.

To conduct this analysis, the authors rely on a range of data sources. These include governmental data (particularly the Current Population Survey election supplements), exit polls, Latino-focused surveys, and surveys of the population as a whole that include sizeable Latino subsamples (a theme I return to later). The authors are to be commended for the range of data sources tapped for the analysis. In their conclusion, the authors also offer some concerns that they have with available data on Latino political attitudes and behaviors and some suggestions they would make to improve data collection in the future. These concerns are well taken and should be of concern more broadly in the discipline and among campaign professionals.

New Faces, New Voices concludes with a very timely postscript on Latinos and the 2008 elections. This chapter revisits several key dimensions of political behavior examined in the analytical chapters and introduces structural factors that shape Latino political behavior such as the structure of campaign outreach to Hispanic communities and the design of Latino-focused advertising. Considering the consistent neglect of Latino communities and candidate outreach to Hispanic communities in the political science scholarship on presidential campaigns (for example the series by Michael Nelson [2010] or Paul Abramson, John Aldrich, and David Rohde [2009]), this focused study of Latinos and the 2008 election is a valuable addition to the scholarship on presidential campaign strategy and outreach.

Despite its many strengths, *New Faces, New Voices* has several weaknesses that may limit its utility for readers well versed in the scholarship on ethnic politics and Latino politics. First, it fails to make a case for why we should expect there to be a unique Latino politics that can not be explained by the same predictors as those that predict non-Hispanic white political behavior. Abrajano and Alvarez certainly demonstrate some key attitudinal and behavioral characteristics where Latinos do appear to differ from whites, but they do not analyze what is distinct in the Latino experience that would predict these differences. The book would have been enriched by a more thorough discussion of the unique historical evolution of the Latino political communities in the United States as well as the possible effects of large-scale immigration on the development of Latino political culture.

A second concern is that *New Faces, New Voices* largely fails to assess utility of Hispanic pan-ethnicity for most aspects of Latino political behavior. My own reading of the scholarship suggests that this case can be made, but it is a question that needs to be revisited to ensure that we have a good understanding of the what aspects of Latino political culture lend themselves to pan-ethnic analysis and what areas are better understood through a focus on nation-origin, immigrant generation, region, or some other set of characteristics. Abrajano and Alvarez appear intermittently sensitive to this concern. Some of their analysis distinguishes first and second generation Hispanics from the third generation and some distinguishes political behaviors among the largest Latino national origin groups. Most of the analysis, however, distinguishes Hispanics from non-Hispanic whites. The authors fail to provide a rationale for when they think generational or national origin-focused analysis is relevant to a more complete understanding of Hispanic political behavior.

A related concern is a failure to assess why generational change would appear between the first and second generation and the third generation. The rich scholarship on the second generation demonstrates that it is influenced both by the political socialization of immigrant parents and by the Americanizing influences of growing up in the United States. To the extent that the second generation's attitudes and behaviors are linked uncritically to those of the immigrant generation, the reported findings may ultimately diminish the dynamics of change in Latino communities.

Finally, there is an insufficient discussion of data sources. *New Faces, New Voices* does offer a brief appendix on research design and organization. This discussion, however, does not offer much detail on any of the surveys. For well designed surveys of Hispanics, such as the Latino National Survey or Pew Hispanic Center surveys, I would not argue that authors should devote much energy to convincing their readers that the survey design captures the breath of the Latino community on such dimensions as national origin, immigrant generation, Hispanic residential density, and demographics. For surveys not designed to study Latinos, however, the burden of proof on scholars is higher. In terms of *New Faces, New Voices*, I would particularly like to have seen some discussion of the composition of the Hispanic samples of the National Annenberg Election Studies (2000 and 2004) and the small American National Election Study (ANES) Hispanic sample. The authors do note that the National Annenberg Election Studies failed to ask about immigrant generation and, in the case of the 2000 study, about Latino national origin or ancestry, potential red flags about the generalizability of these data. Prior to the 2008 ANES oversample of Latinos, its Hispanic sample size in any single election cycle was too small for analysis of Latino attitudes and behaviors.

New Faces, New Voices offers a great deal of analysis in a relatively small package. Consequently, it will serve as a resource for upper-division classes in Latino politics, race and ethnic politics, and U.S. political behavior. The small package, however, creates a cost. The complexity of the Hispanic political experience is somewhat over-homogenized. Ultimately, this will limit the utility of the volume for scholars of Latino and U.S. ethnic politics.

Sources Cited

- Abramson, Paul R., John H. Aldrich, and David W. Rohde. 2009. *Change and Continuity in the 2008 Elections*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Nelson, Michael, ed. 2010. *The Elections of 2008*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Louis DeSipio
University of California, Irvine

Lee Ann Banaszak. *The Women's Movement: Inside and Outside the State*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. xi, 247 pp. (\$80.00 cloth, \$25.99 paper).

Lee Ann Banaszak's *The Women's Movement: Inside and Outside the State* seeks to broaden the women's movement narrative that argues that most social movements, including the women's movement, organized and functioned outside government. Organizing this narrative around factors external to the government suggests that the government itself, both as to its institutional structure and personnel, functioned in opposition to the goals and objectives of that movement. Banaszak's approach, which argues that feminist activism occurred within institutions of government, blurs the line between the heretofore understood demarcation between social movements and the state. Feminist activists located within the federal bureaucracy played key roles in the women's movement. "[I]t is precisely where movements overlap within the state that one can see most clearly how social movements can mold the state to their own political advantage—*creating* political opportunities that can help them in the future" (p. 3). Unlike other political scientists and gender studies scholars who focus on how government institutions impact and relate to the women's movement, Banaszak focuses on individuals who took an active role in the women's movement within the confines of their positions within government. Banaszak concludes that "networks of movement activists within the state played important roles in mobilizing and organizing the movement, altering the political opportunities available to the movement, and creating concrete policy changes that altered the social landscape in the United States" (p. 4). One

core contribution of this work is Banaszak's argument that "creating a theory of the intersection of social movements and the state requires an examination of different theories of the state and the development of state interests" (p. 3).

The author utilizes in-depth interviews with 40 female feminist activists (she acknowledges early on that feminists included men although she includes no men in her study) who held upper level federal bureaucratic positions during the Kennedy through Clinton administrations, and archival research.

The book is organized around the notion that the second wave of feminism, which began in the 1960s (the first wave is understood as that period in the late 19th and early 20th centuries when the women's movement focused on securing women the right to vote), created opportunities for women to serve in the federal civil service. These opportunities included changes in both education and employment that prepared women for federal civil service positions, as well as growth in the federal bureaucracy that emerged during World War II. Finally, feminist activity that continued since the first feminist wave "sustained extensive networks of women activists, allowing feminist bureaucrats to participate in networks of activism even before the mobilization of the second wave in the 1960s" (p. 31). Once these opportunities for women were realized, feminist activists utilized their positions within the federal bureaucracy to advance their feminist agenda.

From there, Banaszak discusses her subjects: 40 middle to high level (GS 14 or above) female bureaucrats, who represented a combination of civil servants and political appointees. These individuals were mostly white (90%, with three African-American subjects and one Latina subject) and well-educated. Two-thirds had advanced degrees (of which half of these had a law degree) while just two of the 40 had a high school diploma only. Five of these women successfully pursued higher education while employed by the federal government. The author's subjects are also, by and large, liberal feminists, whose feminist world view incorporates concerns about racism and social justice. Banaszak concludes that her interview subjects held an inclusive feminist political agenda.

Once Banaszak's context and subjects have been identified and discussed, she then turns her attention to tactics, strategies and impact. She notes that her interview subjects were very active in the second wave feminist movement. They were among the founders of key women's organizations, and helped shape the agenda of these organizations based on what they experienced as federal bureaucrats. For example, she notes that founding members of the National Organization for Women used their bureaucratic positions to advocate for equal employment opportunity for women when it was clear that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) was

hostile toward full enforcement of Title VII. The strength of her approach is especially clear in this particular chapter (Chapter 4). Banaszak examines multiple women's interest groups, and the role that her study subjects played in the founding and agenda setting roles of those interest groups. Some of these interest groups were formed "outside the state," such as "Human Rights for Women," which included women (and men) whose activist work took place both within and outside government. Other interest groups, such as "Federal Executive Women" and the "National Institutes of Health Organization for Women" reserved membership to female bureaucrats only. Discussing the formation, policy agendas and activism of each group using extensive case study and interview material strengthens Banaszak's general claim that feminist bureaucrats experienced feminist activism from "inside the state." Still, her limited respondent pool is noted; this concern is overcome in that her efforts cover both woman centered (i.e., the EEOC) and "neutral" bureaucratic entities (Department of State).

The remainder of the book examines the intersectionality that Banaszak notes is critical to understanding how the women's movement has unfolded since the 1960s. Central to this discussion is that the impact is reciprocal; the women's movement, understood as "outside the state," impacted how the federal government created and enforced both gender neutral and gender specific public policies. At the same time, feminist bureaucrats "inside the state" took an active role in the women's movement in two critical ways. First, these women, advantaged by educational and employment opportunities, middle and upper social class, and concerned with social justice, especially sexism and racism, took a meaningful role in the formation, growth and activism experienced by these groups that functioned "outside the state." Second, these women, in working through the federal bureaucracy as insiders, played key roles in realizing the goals of the feminist movement.

Banaszak does an excellent job in her efforts to broaden the narrative of our understanding of how the women's movement functioned within and outside "the state" while at the same time bringing a more complex and meaningful theoretical understanding of the relationship between social movements and democratic governments.

Terri S. Fine
University of Central Florida

Jude C. Hays. *Globalization and the New Politics of Embedded Liberalism.*
New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. 194 pp. (\$28.95 paper).

In his new book, Jude Hays does an impressive job of developing a plausible "third way" between the arguments of the two long-standing

camps in the study of globalization. Globalization pessimists have long believed that the growing integration of the world economy will break down the “embedded liberal” bargain that established the post-war economic order. This bargain satisfied business interests by producing an integrated, capitalist world trade and financial system (upheld by such institutions as the GATT / WTO, the IMF, and, originally, the Bretton Woods dollar regime). But it also incorporated workers by ensuring them protection and insulation from the vicissitudes of world markets. This protection came in the form of activist monetary and fiscal policies as well as social welfare protections such as unemployment insurance. What made the post-war economic order so prosperous and stable was that it harnessed the productive power of markets at the same time that it maintained the support or at least acquiescence of labor. But now, pessimists believe, the increased mobility of capital is exposing workers to greater pressures at the same time that it is undermining the ability of countries to finance their welfare states. As a result, they believe, we are likely to witness either a “race to the bottom” in social protection as states try to attract mobile capital or a popular backlash like the one that put an end to the earlier wave of globalization during the 1930s.

Optimists, by contrast, point to the meager evidence of a decline in welfare state spending, at least in many countries. They argue that globalization is in fact reinforcing trends already observable in different national economic systems, namely that coordinated capitalist systems are strengthening their welfare states to respond to increased exposure to world markets while more liberal systems are weakening theirs. Optimists do not deny the importance of globalization but emphasize the ability of states to react to it in ways that are in keeping with their national political values and institutions.

Hayes steps into this debate first by acknowledging that the optimists are correct in their assertion that different states are reacting to globalization in different ways. There is no single linear effect of globalization. On the other hand, he asserts, only one of the two national trajectories taken in response to globalization is sustainable – the strengthening of the embedded liberal bargain found in coordinated capitalist states. By contrast, Hayes argues, the breakdown of embedded liberalism and the welfare state found in liberal capitalist countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom is leading to crisis. Here he agrees with the pessimists—capital mobility will produce either a race to the bottom in social protection or, more likely, a collapse of support for the open economic order. And, ironically, this collapse of support will happen first in precisely those states whose support is most critical for its survival.

Why, according to Hays, does the embedded liberal bargain break down first in these liberal capitalist states? He believes that two factors are most significant. First, he argues that states with majoritarian rather than

consensus political systems are more reliant on taxing capital to maintain their welfare states. This is because the median voter, who will tend to be an owner of labor rather than capital, is empowered in such systems and will demand higher capital taxes and lower wage taxes. Because of this reliance on capital taxation, majoritarian countries will be more susceptible to the pressures that globalization creates to attract and retain businesses with friendly fiscal policies.

The second factor that Hays emphasizes is the competitiveness of labor markets. Obviously labor flexibility will be greater in liberal than in coordinated capitalist systems, and so it can be anticipated that globalization will threaten workers in liberal systems more. Because liberal capitalist countries with high labor flexibility tend to be majoritarian politically, Hays argues that these two factors constitute a “double whammy” for the embedded liberal bargain. And, contrary to optimists, he fears that the collapse of this bargain will be fatal to the international economic order.

After making his theoretical points, Hays uses sophisticated quantitative analyses to establish (1) that the embedded liberal compromise still works because a stronger welfare system can win popular support for a more open economic system, (2) that workers in coordinated capitalist systems are more insulated from the pressures of globalization, and (3) that majoritarian systems are more financially constrained by globalization because of their greater reliance on capital taxation.

One of the real strengths of the book is Hay’s effort to present policy recommendations for protecting the embedded liberal compromise and, with it, the international economic system. Few books in political economy go beyond positive analysis to a careful consideration of how to fix the problems that they identify. Hays recommends, among other things, passive state compensation for those forced to adjust by global markets. While this recommendation is hardly new, it does flow nicely from the overall argument.

As with any book, there are some weaknesses. Most notably, in my view, is Hays’ counterintuitive assertion that majoritarian / liberal states are more dependent on capital taxation and therefore more susceptible to globalization pressures than consensus / cooperative states. While it is true that such states tend to tax capital at a higher rate *vis-à-vis* labor than cooperative capitalist democracies, the relative metric should actually be the overall capital tax rate. Why would business leaders care that they are responsible for a relatively smaller proportion of the tax burden in Sweden than in the United States when their overall tax burden is actually higher? Moreover, if lower income individuals are more privileged in majoritarian / liberal states than in consensus / cooperative states, it begs the question of why distribution is so much less evident in such states. Why is the median

voter in the US or UK able to get the relative tax burden on labor lower than in consensus states, but not able to get state pensions or, in the US case, universal healthcare? Moreover, why would countries with small welfare states and considerably less import penetration (as is the case with most majoritarian / liberal countries) be more sensitive to the revenue pressures of globalization? Shouldn't these economic differences counteract the effect?

Despite these critiques, Hays has produced a fascinating book and an important contribution to our understanding of globalization and the welfare state. His book will be required reading for those contemplating how global economic integration can survive the pressures that it now faces, particularly in light of the financial crisis.

Charles R. Hankla
Georgia State University

Cara J. Wong. *Boundaries of Obligation in American Politics: Geographic, National, and Racial Communities.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. xviii, 264 pp. (\$80.00 cloth, \$25.99 paper).

Speaking in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania in 1863, President Abraham Lincoln articulated a vision of a government “of the people, by the people, for the people.” At times, however, there is little consensus regarding exactly who should be counted as being a full-fledged member of “the people.” Only through the Civil War were the geographical boundaries of the United States firmly reestablished and the official boundaries of American citizenship extended to former slaves. Moreover, formal political boundaries are not the only type of boundaries that are of great import to democratic politics. Indeed, Cara J. Wong’s task in the ambitious *Boundaries of Obligation in American Politics* is to convince the reader that the ways Americans draw informal boundaries around the various communities they belong to are important determinants of public opinion and political behavior, above and beyond the politics of self-interest and ideology.

In Chapter 1, Wong defines a community as “*an image in the mind of an individual, of a group towards whose members she feels a sense of similarity, belonging, or fellowship*” (p. 6, emphasis in original). This definition highlights the subjective, “imagined” nature of community membership, and differentiates the concept from objectively defined groups such as the legal citizens of a nation. Furthermore, while some communities are geographical, others are based on social relationships such as a shared racial identity.

Much of Chapter 2 is spent validating various approaches to measuring feelings of community. One of Wong’s key claims here is that her theory differs from social identity theory in that the latter relies heavily on actual

interaction between group members, requires that members of groups be recognized as such by fellow group members, and does not require that group members feel a sense of obligation toward other group members. While these distinctions are likely to strike some readers as somewhat strained, requiring a sense of obligation among community members is crucial to Wong's argument that the importance of communities extends beyond self-interest.

Chapter 3 describes where Americans draw the boundaries of the multiple, overlapping communities that they identify with. Different factors predict feelings of closeness to different types of communities. For example, homeowners are more likely than renters to feel close to their neighborhoods, but not any more likely to feel close to their towns or cities. Those who feel close to their local communities are more trusting of local institutions, more active in local politics, and more supportive of tax increases if the additional tax revenue generated will benefit their local communities.

Wong notes in Chapter 4 that Americans often draw national boundaries in ways that exclude various groups of people, such as legal and illegal aliens, recent immigrants, and non-Christians. Those with exclusive visions of the American community are more likely to support protectionist policies and to think that immigration should be restricted to a greater degree. Moreover, those with exclusive conceptions of what it means to be "truly American" are more likely to support the death penalty while being less likely to support gay marriage and government assistance for African-Americans.

In Chapter 5, Wong argues that "heterogeneous communities, which are composed of people of more than one race, enable the passage of policies that benefit minority groups in our democracy" (p. 160). She finds, for example, that among white Americans, those who consider black Americans to be members of their communities are more likely to feel that the government has a special obligation to help blacks.

In the concluding chapter, Wong summarizes the debate between moral parochialists—those who find it morally acceptable to prioritize obligations towards one's fellow community members over obligations to those outside of one's community—and cosmopolitan thinkers, who argue that moral obligations should extend equally to all human beings. Wong does not take a strong normative position here, but the discussion is interesting, and it serves as a reminder that dialogue between political theorists and those doing empirical political research is often mutually beneficial.

My most serious concern with the book is that the measures of feelings of community employed may actually be capturing conceptual variables such as political ideology and affect. Wong addresses this possibility by including pertinent controls in her models. She reasons, for example, that if the community variable is a statistically significant predictor even when a

measure of ideology is included in a model, the community variable must be capturing something other than ideology. This is not an entirely valid conclusion. If, compared to using only ideological self-placement, one can more accurately measure a respondent's underlying ideology by using both the ideological self-placement and the variable intended to capture community, the coefficients on either or both of the variables can be significant even if they are both capturing ideology.

Several models in the book include both a measure of community boundary placement and determinants of community boundary placement as independent variables which predict some sort of policy preference or political behavior. Two-equation models would be more appropriate in these contexts, and would allow the author to evaluate the indirect effects of variables that affect opinions and behavior through their influence on feelings of community. Potential problems of endogeneity and spurious correlation should also be addressed more fully.

Wong might also consider accounting for the geographic centrality of respondents within their geographic communities in future work. Do residents of Detroit, perched on the border between the United States and Canada, tend to feel less close to the United States than residents of Kansas City? Do those same Detroit residents feel a stronger sense of obligation toward residents of New Orleans than toward residents of Windsor, Ontario? Why might this be the case when Detroit and Windsor share a border, have similar economies, and have citizens that could potentially interact with each other on a regular basis? The answers to such questions might shed a good deal of light on the nature of subjective community boundaries.

While readers may not find every piece of analysis presented in *Boundaries of Obligation in American Politics* compelling, Cara J. Wong presents an impressive variety of evidence in support of the idea that understanding how citizens define their communities is crucial to understanding the feelings of obligation that shape public opinion and political behavior. As her ambitious project touches on political sociology and psychology as well as political theory and racial and ethnic politics, the book should be of interest to a wide variety of scholars.

Matthew L. Jacobsmeier
University of New Orleans

Laughlin McDonald. *American Indians and the Fight for Equal Voting Rights*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2010. v, 347 pp. (\$55.00 cloth).

Laughlin McDonald provides readers with a comprehensive analysis of the Voting Rights Act (VRA) in Indian Country that is at once in-depth and accessible. Impressively, he manages where others fail: he breathes life into terse case law, litigation, and legislation by drawing on the voices of Indian people through their own testimony. Following succinct summaries of federal Indian policy and the history of the VRA, McDonald reserves the bulk of his discussion for case studies covering the states of Montana, South Dakota, Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming. Here he documents the discrimination tribal members face in their efforts to vote in state and local elections, and the failed attempts by the federal government to stop such discrimination. Amendments to the VRA in 1975 and 1982 enabled Indians to bring action against local election boards and other parties and McDonald places these cases in the context of tribal histories and socio-economic conditions, as well as the tense relations between tribal members and surrounding non-Indian communities.

McDonald's most significant contributions in this work consist of the depth of his case studies and the presentation of related materials documenting the persistence and prevalence of racism against Indians. Few other texts present a contemporary picture of the hostile environments Indian people and tribal governments must contend with on a daily basis and which are not sugar coated by attempts at political correctness or other displays of public niceties. Moreover, even when (or especially when) Indians and tribes are victorious in court battles or in exercising governmental powers in the 21st century, local non-Indian communities and governments recoil into the racialized language of the 19th century, calling for an end to reservation communities for the betterment and progress of Indians. In this regard, fights for Indian voting rights are taking place not just in the courthouse or other institutional structures, but in blatantly hostile communities where Indians are still not recognized as mature and competent individuals capable of self-governance.

Threaded throughout his work, McDonald asserts that political participation by Indian individuals in electoral politics will enable them to influence policy-making decisions that affect them, particularly policies that affect them as a group. Presumably, McDonald also sees this participation as having potential benefits for strengthening tribal sovereignty. He points to political and economic subjugation of tribes as, in part, a result of the absence of this participation and which voting may help alleviate by ensuring representatives are accountable to tribal communities. From his perspective,

the value of voting and the ability to exercise such a right may be a self-evident good, and in regions where the Indian vote may swing or determine election outcomes it is plausible to argue that voting may be beneficial for strengthening tribal sovereignty.

Moreover, efforts by tribes to participate in party politics, encourage and mobilize their members to vote in non-tribal elections, and other attempts at influencing state and local political institutions, lend support to the notion that tribes will derive benefits from tribal member participation in electoral politics. However, McDonald does not make this link clearly and students of federal Indian law and policy are likely to question exactly how the voting rights of individuals are linked to or related to the advancement of tribes as such, particularly because early voting rights cases relied heavily on evidence that an individual had abandoned their tribal communities and made a commitment to the American political system.

This problem, however, is not specific to McDonald and appears in most texts that address Indian participation from a pluralist account of American politics. American Indian political participation within non-tribal politics has suffered from a lack theorizing, specifically in regards to the impact such participation may have on tribal sovereignty and on Indian identity more generally, to say nothing of the absence of discussion regarding Indians in tribal politics, which I take to be a separate matter altogether. McDonald would be well served to contextualize his discussion of voting in a comprehensive typology of Indian political participation. Unfortunately, few such typologies exist for him to draw on and the absence of this discussion means that it is difficult to assess the power and value of the Indian vote as a mechanism for influencing decision-makers. Does the participation of Indians in electoral politics actually change the outcome of policy decisions or affect the platforms of political parties? If so, how? McDonald suggests at the end of his text, and by reference to studies of black and Latino voting, that political participation in American politics will have desirable effects for tribes, but again the complex nature of the relationship between tribes and the American political system is left unproblematized. The normative framework that positions voting as an unequivocal good does not give rise to questions regarding the tension between tribal sovereignty and individual participation in U.S. politics.

On a related note, McDonald does not engage or acknowledge relevant debates regarding the legitimacy of U.S. citizenship as it is debated within Indian scholarship. This is a matter separate from those questions raised by states seeking to block individual Indian participation in non-tribal electoral politics and which he does a superb job of addressing throughout the text. What is missing is the acknowledgement that U.S. citizenship itself must be problematized in the American Indian context. The absence of consent in

nearly all acts of citizenship placed on Indian people runs contra the narrative he provides, which is that citizenship and the associated right to vote are unequivocal goods for Indian people. There is a tension here and I think he would be better served to at least acknowledge it.

McDonald is concerned with the ability of Indians to exercise their right to vote as U.S. citizens, particularly in hostile environments with a history of discrimination toward tribes. He does an excellent job of bringing the challenges facing Indians to light in this regard and his text certainly is the best effort to date to profile the Indian vote, present the relevant case law, and argue for increased support and protection of Indian voting. The absence of a more comprehensive discussion of Indian political participation is not something that could easily be incorporated in this text. Here, instead and in fine detail, is a rendering of how federal policy can be shaped to incorporate and protect Indians as well as the reasons why such federal protection is necessary and warranted. The case studies will appeal to students of electoral politics and Indian rights advocates, and are excellent fodder for encouraging discussion around the implications of Indian participation in American politics more generally.

Kouslaa Kessler-Mata
University of San Francisco

Bullock III, Charles S., and Ronald Keith Gaddie. *The Triumph of Voting Rights in the South*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009. xiv, 440 pp. (\$55.00 cloth).

Once again Professors Bullock and Gaddie deliver a book that scholars of American, Southern and African American Politics will find indispensable. *Triumph* focuses on hard, but easily accessible data and statistics to paint a clear picture of how the Voting Rights Act continues to affect every political fiber of the South. It starts with the introduction, which is the best rendering of the legal issues of the VRA. The prime focus is on Section 5's preclearance provision with an important nod to Section 4 containing the "trigger" identifying jurisdictions subject to Section 5.

Without question, we know the Voting Rights Act as one of the most significant domestic legislative achievements of the 20th century. What is less well known is the full effect of this legislation four decades after its passage. Collectively, we take for granted the VRA did its best work in 1965 and during the Civil Rights Movement. Yet, *Triumph* persuasively shows the usefulness of the VRA in the intervening years, its relevance today, and

given that Congress recently reauthorized section 5, why it will remain relevant for at least the next twenty-five years.

The layout is notable. Instead of relying on the real, but sometimes clunky Deep South-Peripheral South divide, the authors focus on individual states. The first three parts of *Triumph* divide the eleven Confederate states into three sections. First up are the states Section 5's preclearance provisions originally covered. Next, are Texas and Florida, two states added by the amendments in 1975. Third, are the two states, Tennessee and Arkansas that Section 5 does not cover. These distinctions are subtle, but crucial. In common parlance, we lump all the South together for egregious limitations of the franchise. This is far from true. To be sure, Tennessee and Arkansas were not completely innocent and Arkansas remains the only southern state not to have elected a black to Congress or to a statewide constitutional office.

What Bullock and Gaddie make clear is there are in fact several triumphs of the VRA. Most importantly, or at least first, is the dramatic improvement in black registration and voter turnout. Each chapter details the improvement in black voter registration from pre-VRA voting rolls to today. The primary purpose of the VRA was to provide eligible blacks unfettered access to the polls. To that extent, the VRA is an unabashed success. In Mississippi, only one county had even 20 percent of blacks registered prior to the VRA and Humphreys County had not one black registered to vote out of 5,561. Yet, by 2006, statewide black registration exceeded non-Hispanic white registration.

A second triumph of the VRA is the increase in the number of black elected officials. The authors make a real contribution by including in each state chapter a section on African Americans in Congress, in statewide office and in the state legislature. Oftentimes, we simply read there is a higher rate of the number of black officials elected than in pre-VRA elections; Bullock and Gaddie provide detailed analysis of that claim. As an example, Mississippi, once the bulwark of white resistance to black suffrage, now leads the country with more than 900 black elected officials, including a stranglehold on one of Mississippi's four U.S. House seats. Yet, in Tennessee the number of black state senators has remained at just three (9% of the chamber) since 1983.

While the authors excel at identifying the racial characteristics of southern states' elected officials, a longer discussion of the continued long-term implications of racially polarized voting would prove useful. Bullock's and Gaddie's discussion is number-focused, but this particular topic is too important to be left to the periphery. The consequences on coalition building, policy support, policy agenda, descriptive representation and racial gerrymandering are all effects of the VRA, not necessarily triumphs.

The author's state-by-state format allows for a wealth of state-specific information about the implementation and effects of the VRA. Take North Carolina. Slicing through the clutter, the authors explain the essential elements of the critical Tarheel State racial redistricting decisions. In *Easley v. Cromartie* and *Shaw v. Reno*, the Court made it quite clear that partisanship, but not race can be a "predominant" motivation in shaping congressional districts (p. 200).

Triumph includes a write-up of the curious case of Noxubee County, MS where we have a classic case of reverse discrimination. Having gained political power, blacks wielded that power to discriminate against whites. As bad as racial discrimination is, I can't help but wonder about this story's inclusion, even though it is periphery to *Triumph's* larger themes. I suppose it's an ironic triumph, but it actually seems to harm *Triumph's* central premise that the VRA remains necessary. Critics of the VRA use anecdotal stories like Noxubee to press their claims that it is time to rescind the VRA now that blacks have discriminated against whites (and we have a black president!). Because it is such an isolated case, I'm not sure what large lessons to draw from the telling of this particular story.

Virginia, oddly, is the only southern state to have any of its counties successfully bailout of Section 5 coverage. Even more odd, but not discussed by Bullock and Gaddie, is that each bailed out Virginia county was represented by the same attorney, Gerry Hebert, former acting chief of the Voting Rights Section of the U.S. Justice Department. Clearly, Hebert's intimate knowledge of the Voting Rights Section was crucial in obtaining bail out status for his clients. Without this intimate knowledge, bail out is highly unlikely, nearly impossible.

Speaking of the bailout provision, in an important reminder that the VRA has always had critics (see *Katzenbach* for a primer), Bullock and Gaddie conclude with a consideration of the 2009 Supreme Court decision, *Northwest Austin Municipal Utility District Number One v. Holder*. Ruling strictly on statutory grounds so as to stay true to the principle of constitutional avoidance, the Supreme Court remanded the case to the DC district court so that the local district could apply for Section 5 exemption. The justices left unsaid whether or not Section 5 was constitutional although Chief Judge Roberts and Justice Thomas made it clear they found Section 5's constitutionality suspect.

Despite my elementary quibbles *Triumph* will become the defining account of the long-term consequences of the VRA.

Marvin King
University of Mississippi

Desmond King, Robert C. Liberman, Gretchen Ritter, and Laurence Whitehead, eds. *Democratization in America: A Comparative-Historical Analysis*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009. vii, 337 pp. (\$60.00 cloth, \$25.00 paper).

In this volume, the editors have assembled a notable team of contributors to consider the expansion of the franchise in the United States since the founding era from an explicitly comparative perspective. As the editors note, traditional treatments of American democratization look at these events as exceptionally American, much as the domestic literature on American politics in general often views events in the United States as being somehow *sui generis* rather than simply American examples of trends and relationships found in other societies. In their chapters many of the contributors are able to bring to bear their expertise on comparative democratization in other countries and regions of the world to the American case, with the goal of fitting the United States case into a broader framework; in this, they are generally successful.

There is of course a rich history of bringing external perspectives to bear while attempting to understand American politics; the writings of Alexis de Tocqueville of France and (less famously) Lorenzo de Zavala of Mexico in the early 19th century were among the first to do so for an outside audience, while incorporating explicit comparisons with their home countries' politics in their works; even if, in retrospect, their observations of American democracy in the Jacksonian era might be a bit rose-colored by today's standards, nonetheless their historical contribution was immense. Nearly two centuries later the editors and contributors to this volume provide a more sober, but still explicitly comparative, perspective in their work.

The first four chapters develop the framework of the book. Desmond King and Robert Liberman's introductory chapter argues that the best way to understand American political development is as a process of understanding expansion and retraction of the franchise over time. They argue that "democratization is inherently a long-term and unending process, and not necessarily a progressive one," and suggest that we can gain analytical leverage by looking at "key moments and events . . . that facilitate or hinder the establishment of democratic institutions" (p. 15). The next three chapters develop this theme further; Guillermo O'Donnell begins by placing the case of the United States in the context of American democratization more broadly, indicating that we might fruitfully compare the U.S. case by placing it on a continuum of "democratization" with the countries of south and central America, most of which have dealt with similar problems of integrating slaves and other non-European populations into the broader polity on an equal basis. In the same chapter Laurence Whitehead argues that Americans

(and citizens of other self-identified “democratic” countries, such as Canada and Denmark) take their status as democracies for granted, and classifies these states as examples of “immanent” self-belief—evidence to the contrary be damned.

Whitehead also contributes a chapter exploring the rather peculiar role of Puerto Rico (and, to a lesser extent, the other territories under direct congressional authority) in the American political system. He writes that while the Jones Act extended United States citizenship to Puerto Ricans in 1917, it did not give those who remained in Puerto Rico (as opposed to emigrating to the U.S. mainland) full political rights within the American political system. Whitehead’s contribution in this chapter is to again place Puerto Rico’s seemingly unique status in a comparative context, by considering the parallels between Puerto Rico today with the incorporation of other territories as American states in the past, as well as the status of other “potentially disloyal regions” (Whitehead, p. 59). He ultimately concludes that the relatively unique status of Puerto Rico seemingly ought to contradict Americans’ “immanent” views of having a perfect democracy, but outside of the islands’ political activist communities there is little evidence of the issue permeating the collective consciousness beyond those shores.

The integration of Latino/as into American democracy is also the theme of Francisco González’s contribution to the volume. González notes the comparatively low naturalization rates of even long-term legal residents of Latin American origin, and also considers the complexities of immigration and asylum policies, recounting the political dimension of the latter that favored refugees from communist/leftist states (such as Cuba and 1980s Nicaragua) over those fleeing authoritarian regimes backed by Washington (such as El Salvador and Guatemala).

Subsequent chapters consider changes to the American constitution over time to include women and African Americans in the political process. Gretchen Ritter discusses the successful and unsuccessful attempts to constitutionalize (and thus nationalize) gains in women’s rights, both through formal constitutional amendments and also interpretations by the judiciary. Stephen Tuck, Tali Mendelberg, Daniel Kryder, and Robert Liberman all contribute interesting chapters on the role of African Americans in American civic life. Tuck’s contribution, dealing with the disenfranchisement of black southerners following Reconstruction, will be of interest to many readers, although it revisits well-trod ground from Key’s *Southern Politics*, Black and Black’s *Politics and Society in the South*, and other more recent works on southern political development. Mendelberg marshals empirical evidence on the role of race and racial animus in political campaigns, past and present, while Kryder’s chapter advances a more novel argument that we should consider the incorporation of African Americans into law enforcement

agencies as an indicator of democratization. Liberman's chapter examines the pivotal role played by the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) in institutionalizing the employment guarantees of the Civil Rights Act in American civic life.

The final two chapters of the book attempt to promote an expansion of the research agenda the editors set out for this work. Suzanne Mettler argues that scholars seeking to understand American political development need to move beyond cross-sectional data and accounts of particular instances of democratization (or disenfranchisement) to develop broader theories of how political institutions shape the development of democracy over time. In their final chapter, King, Liberman, Ritter, and Whitehead explore the implications of how a relatively static constitution and Bill of Rights can nonetheless lead to rather dynamic changes in rights and liberties "on the ground" over time, and reiterate their central theme that the democratization of the United States is simultaneously a distinctive and comparable phenomenon.

In sum, I believe the contributions to this volume form a valuable contribution to our understanding of American political development by bringing in a broader, global context that often is lacking in this work. As such, I believe it will be valued reading—not just for students and scholars of American political development, but also for those political scientists like myself (Americanist and otherwise) who frequently teach the democratization of the United States as part of introductory courses on American government and upper-division courses on civil liberties and civil rights.

Christopher N. Lawrence
Texas A&M International University

Anna Stilz. *Liberal Loyalty: Freedom, Obligation, and the State.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009. ix, 230 pp. (\$29.95 cloth).

In *Liberal Loyalty*, Anna Stilz offers a third way in the quest for a source of democratic political obligation. She rejects the two prevailing approaches, the cosmopolitan and the liberal nationalist, in favor of a "Rousseauian-Kantian" perspective grounded in analytic political philosophy. In a tight, meticulous and well-argued discussion, Stilz contends that reason can bring properly educated individuals to the recognition of a "duty to justice," further leading them to conceive and participate in a democratic state in which "they define and enforce rights to property and to bodily inviolability in a way that is consistent with everyone's independence from private coercion and the threat of domination it provokes" (p. 198). The

resulting sense of obligation binds citizens in a committed but rationally critical relationship with their democratic institutions and processes.

Stilz begins by linking the possibility of the ideal of “equal freedom,” a term she uses interchangeably with justice, to the existence of the state. For Stilz, justice requires “that individuals possess a set of rights that guarantees their standing as free and equal persons” (p. 28) and this can only happen, she argues, in the context of a legitimate state. Freedom, as a necessary precondition of all our other goals, cannot rationally be given up (p. 86). Therefore, she argues in a Kantian mode, protecting that freedom imposes a moral duty upon us to create a state. Rousseau’s contribution to this part of the discussion is the conceptual mechanism of the general will which serves to ground political actions in a shared sense of a common good. Political authority is necessary because preserving our external freedom from private persons’ domination requires subjection to the rule of law. The general will manifests itself in impersonal law we give ourselves, so, in her “Kantian-Rousseauian” perspective, freedom is living under the rule of law we make. Through it, citizens recognize an interest in equal freedom binding them to their compatriots.

Tying freedom or justice to the state tells us little about why we should feel solidarity with our democratic compatriots and allegiance to our particular community. To deal with this set of problems, Stilz turns first to the civic education she finds in Rousseau’s *Emile*. Here civic education to “reflective freedom” creates citizens who understand themselves as moral equals and the important role of political institutions in securing that freedom. While anchoring citizens to both polity and compatriots, Rousseau’s account of civic education forces Stilz to confront the issue of culture. While she concludes that he instrumentalizes culture in the service of the state, his gestures to culture are a problem because she is concerned to overcome the argument from a national culture.

Liberal nationalists like Will Kymlicka and Yael Tamir offer Stilz a contemporary version of this challenge. In this form of “nationalism,” only national cultures—manifest in ascriptive features like language, common history, etc. (p. 137)—can bind people together and commit them to a democratic polity. The liberal nationalists concede the viability of multinational democratic polities like Switzerland, which, she argues, undercuts their argument. But this is one of the places that Stilz presses her argument a bit too hard. The liberal nationalist concession yields another reading, i.e., liberal nationalists remind us that people still take their cultures, including their nationalities, seriously. The appeal to “reason” or being “rational,” even in the “Kantian-Rousseauian” sense she articulates here, may not overcome cultural and national influences, which are often tied to moral “duties” themselves.

Stilz prefers a version of Habermas's "constitutional patriot" argument where a state's civic unity "is wholly given by its members' political and legal relation to one another—the relation of being both author of, and subject to, a body of sufficiently just laws" (pp. 137-138). Her reading of Habermas, particularly his theory of law, yields a view in which the loyalty of a democratic citizen is grounded in her capacity to participate in a deliberative democratic politics, that is, to judge and constantly reevaluate the particular project of democratic citizenship under which she lives (p. 160). But Habermas cannot account for how loyalty to democratic practice differs from that to a shared culture, so Stilz utilizes the idea of "shared intention" to construct a model of democratic politics that she thinks can. Shared intention describes an orientation in which "I must intend that our goal be realized by means of both your and my respective intentions; and you must intend the same" (p. 182). A democracy characterized by shared intention would have two aims: a Kantian one in which compatriots are coerced to follow an objective scheme of rights and duties, and a Rousseauian one in which just laws took everyone's interests and input into account. Coercion here issues from the unconditional Kantian duty of justice we have to live in a legitimate state. It is neither consent nor voluntarism but reason which leads us to our natural duty of justice and our corresponding duty to create public institutions for its enforcement.

One of the values of Stilz's work is her attempt to reclaim particular terms and categories from contemporary political and philosophical discourse. For instance, loyalty, a word with most undemocratic implications, she redefines as doing what is required of one as a citizen in day-to-day life. The end of her work, the articulation of a rationally arrived-at duty of justice leading us to be loyal to democratic institutions and processes, is a worthwhile and ongoing project. But the reader is left wondering whether Stilz has substituted out *national* cultures in favor of a commitment to a democratic *political* culture. After all, legal democracy, she writes, "is compatible with a wide variety of institutional forms, as well as significant variation in the particular scheme of civil rights the state actually guarantees" (p. 96). It is unclear whether or not governing principles of justice, arrived at through reason and carrying the coercive force of duty, are, in the end, affective in ways similar to those of ethnic or national cultures.

John Randolph LeBlanc
University of Texas at Tyler

Charles S. Bullock III. *Redistricting: The Most political Activity in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2010. ix, 221 pp. (\$75.00 cloth, \$21.95 paper).

Is it possible to gerrymander a book on the topic of redistricting? Charles S. Bullock III makes a valiant attempt in *Redistricting: The Most Political Activity in America*.

Professor Bullock motivates his book with a tale of a Texas gerrymander. Not *that* gerrymander: the 2003 congressional re-redistricting engineered by Republican Rep. Tom DeLay, which captivated the American public when Democratic legislators fled the state to prevent a legislative quorum needed to adopt a plan. That drama is paid scant attention. Rather, Prof. Bullock describes the post-1990 congressional redistricting engineered by Democratic Rep. Martin Frost. As evidence of the pernicious consequences of this plan, in the 2000 congressional elections Republicans won a majority of the Texan vote but did not win a majority of the congressional seats. Professor Bullock asserts, “The explanation for the failure of popular support to translate into a commensurate share of the congressional seats lay with the redistricting plan” (p. 3).

Prof. Bullock seeks to resuscitate Rep. DeLay’s image by framing the 2003 re-redistricting as righting a wrong perpetrated by Rep. Frost. There are three important reasons why this revisionist history is flawed, none of which Prof. Bullock directly acknowledges but are clearly known to him.

First, as Prof. Bullock ably covers in a chapter on population equality, districts are drawn on the basis of population not votes. Districts do not have equal-sized turnout due to what Prof. Bullock refers to as “affirmative action gerrymandering” (p. 59) or what voting rights scholars refer to as minority-majority districts required by the Voting Rights Act. Minorities, due to their lower socio-economic status and the uncompetitive nature of their districts, tend not to vote at high rates. Thus, at least some of the 2000 election discrepancy is due to the false equation of districts’ populations and votes.

Second, Texas was among the fastest growing states in the 1990s. By 2000, the Republican suburban strongholds had grown tremendously. Some of the 2000 election discrepancy is due to districts’ unequal populations imbalanced between 1990 and 2000. Indeed, the Supreme Court entered the political thicket of redistricting in the landmark 1962 case *Baker v. Carr* to address such creeping malapportionment and this is why districts are redrawn with each new census.

Third, only mentioned in passing, is that between 2000 and 2002 a court imposed a congressional redistricting plan when the divided state legislature could not reach compromise. Rep. DeLay was not rectifying “traces” of harm (p. 118) created by Rep. Frost. He was overturning a court

ruling that was partially a product of Republicans refusing to negotiate with Democrats because they anticipated winning control of the state government in the 2002 elections.

These omissions and others are why I consider Prof. Bullock's book to be a scholarly gerrymander that cuts and rearranges facts and arguments to score political points. This is unfortunate because Professor Bullock has a contribution to make when he sticks to the facts, such as his informative history of the equal population standard. However, the scholarly material is muddled with the argumentative, leaving a reader wondering if they are getting the complete story.

The gerrymander is not limited to the book's motivating example. In "controversy" sections at the end of four of the core chapters, Prof. Bullock appears to lay out balanced arguments for and against a position. However, even a cursory read reveals bias. For example, the controversy section for the chapter on population equality devotes nearly three times more space to the argument that I associate with the conservative argument in favor of drawing districts on the basis of equality of votes than the Supreme Court precedent of equality of population. As another example, the chapter covering traditional redistricting principles such as compactness neglects to discuss how these principles tend to favor Republicans. Ignoring political effect in favor of district shape effectively packs urban voters into heavily Democratic districts.

Another sin that Prof. Bullock repeatedly commits is confusing redistricting plans with election outcomes (e.g., pp. 123, 127). The partisan composition of districts is but one of many factors that affects election outcomes, including the national mood and the quality of the candidates. He fails to understand why elections tend to be more competitive immediately following redistricting, even when districts' compositions are less competitive, as quality challengers emerge to challenge temporarily weakened incumbents displaced from their core support constituencies.

Prof. Bullock asserts straw men without citation; two examples: "academics have long argued the desirability of having competitive districts" (p. 22) and software "facilitates" (p. 48) gerrymandering. Perhaps I take offense because I have written much on these topics and I know these statements can be easily explored in detail. Prof. Bullock goes beyond failing to cite to misrepresenting my findings when he states with citation to my work that "much of the decline [in competition] occurred between redistrictings rather than immediately after drawing new districts" (p. 126). Those familiar with my work know that I argue strongly the opposite.

There are further inaccuracies and omissions. The equal population safe harbor standard for state legislative districts is a ten percentage point range, as first correctly stated on p. 40, not a plus or minus five point deviation as

repeatedly stated subsequently throughout the text. Why omit from the criteria discussion requirements for nesting of districts within each other or prohibitions on drawing districts to unduly favor partisan or incumbent interests? Where is a discussion about technological innovations affecting the next redistricting, such as the integration of the American Community Survey data and on-line mapping tools? And what about describing redistricting processes in greater detail, particularly the not-even-mentioned adoption of a state legislative redistricting commission in California by voter initiative in 2008? Reform efforts are ignored, even though they have significantly contributed to the creation of alternative redistricting processes.

Perhaps the greatest omission is that a non-Southerner will likely not find the book illuminating for their state, as most examples are from Southern states. I found a Georgia case-study chapter to be an interesting read since I did not know the state's history in-depth. However, there is no discussion of a Republican mid-decade state legislative redistricting in 2005. The plan split Clarke County, home to the University of Georgia, thereby violating traditional redistricting principles with the specific purpose to diminish the electoral fortunes of a single Democratic state senate candidate. University of Georgia's Professor Bullock is silent on Republican abuse of redistricting in his backyard.

A reader who agrees with Professor Bullock that Democratic gerrymanders enhance the influence of conservative boogiemens such as "organized labor, environmentalists, and trial attorneys" (2) may like this book. A reader wondering who is benefited by Republican gerrymanders may be offended. Redistricting scholars may find wheat in the chaff. However, for a redistricting neophyte who wants an easy-to-understand explanation of basic redistricting facts, I recommend skipping this book and downloading the Brennan Center for Justice's comprehensive "Citizens' Guide to Redistricting" for free.

Michael P. McDonald
George Mason University

Christian Davenport. *Media Bias, Perspective, and State Repression: The Black Panther Party.* Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2009 xi, 242 pp. (\$80.00 cloth, \$25.99 paper).

Christian Davenport's *Media Bias, Perspective, and State Repression: The Black Panther Party* makes an important contribution to Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics. He breaks away from the narrow disciplinary boundaries that have fragmented the study of complex social movements

and their politics. Davenport employs an emerging research methodology (event cataloging within the framework of the Rashomon Effect) for comparing and contrasting diverse sources of information. Davenport's investigation begins with an examination of information reported by the media, about the interaction between the Black Panther Party (BPP) and government agents (representative or official of a government or administrative department of a government) in the Bay Area of California (which includes the following counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma) between the years 1967 (the first full year of their existence) and 1973 (the ending for the first and most well-known cohort of members). He seeks to understand: 1) why and how the Bay Area Panthers were harassed, beaten up, wiretapped, arrested, shot, and tried by authorities throughout the United States; 2) how alternative accounts of events might be explained; and 3) how such events might illuminate our understanding of what takes place when governments and dissidents square off (p. xiii).

On the morning of October 28, 1967, at about 4:30AM, Huey P. Newton and Gene McKinney were pulled over for questioning by Oakland Police Officer, John Frey (later Officer Herbert Heanes arrived on the scene). Somehow this exchange ended with both Frey and Newton being shot, the police officer dying at the scene, and the BPP leader lying on the ground bleeding, later taken to a nearby hospital and arrested (p. 1).

Exactly what took place next varied according to whom one consulted. Who pulled a gun first? What happened after the shooting? The answers actually depend on which news source you confer with. Davenport, fascinated by the wildly different accounts of repressive responses by local, state, and federal authorities to the BPP, spent more than a year scouring newspaper archives examining state dissident interactions, cataloging, and analyzing events.

An "event" is a discrete occurrence that is bound by time (it occurs within a specific and relatively brief period), space (it occurs within a specific space), and actors (it involves the same actors for the duration of the occurrence). Event-focused analysis has a long tradition within the social sciences (p. 5).

Davenport argues that the geographic locale and political orientation of a newspaper influences how specific details are reported, including who starts and ends the conflict, who the BPP targets (government or non-government actors), and which part of the government responds (the police or court).

The newspapers included: 1) New York Times, a white, mainstream/commercial, authority-oriented, and distant press; 2) the Oakland Tribune, a white, mainstream/commercial, authority-oriented, and local press; 3) the Berkeley Barb, a white, countercultural, dissident-friendly, and local press; 4) the Sun Reporter, a black, politically moderate, and relatively neutral local press; and 5) the Black Panther Intercommunal News Service, the newspaper created and distributed by the Oakland chapter of the Black Panthers (p. 16).

Specifically, proximate and government-oriented sources provide one assessment of events, whereas proximate and dissident-oriented sources have another (both converging on specific aspects of the conflict). However, the variation in accounts identified above is not unique in the area of conflict studies and contentious politics (Sorokin 1937; Eckstein 1965; Gurr 1970, 1993; Hibbs 1973; Tilly, Tilly, and Tilly 1975; McAdam 1982; etc).

In trying to find out about and understand any instance of conflict or any series of contentious interactions between two actors—at least one of which involves the state—it is generally the case that interested parties encounter widely varying accounts of exactly who did what to whom, with events seeming to vary by the source. In academic literature, this is referred to as “the Rashomon Effect,” after the Akira Kurosowa film *Rashomon*. Seldom acknowledged, the Rashomon Effect is crucial for social science research, as well as for popular understanding of sociopolitical phenomenon because it prompts us to ask very difficult, yet fundamental questions. For example, why is there more than one account of events and what is the full range of accounts that could be encountered when one attempts to investigate conflict? What source(s) should one use in trying to understand what happened during and episode of contention? Perhaps most important—what explains the variation across accounts and how does such knowledge contribute to understanding conflictual activity? Unless these questions are answered, we are left with different versions of what took place, no clear strategy for sorting them out, and serious doubt regarding our ability to observe as well as understand what occurs around us (p. 3).

Several questions influence the “Rashomon Effect:” 1) why do sources consulted for information about repression and dissent vary in their account of what took place; 2) what sources should be used when one is trying to understand relevant events, and 3) how drastically does account variation influence our comprehension of repressive behavior and in what manner? The “Rashomon Effect” is the tendency for events to be perceived and reported in different ways, depending on who is telling the story and to whom. The phenomenon is named after Akira Kurosawa’s 1950 mystery film *Rashomon* (a single event, where a 16th-century samurai and his wife are attacked by a bandit and is recalled in four contradictory ways by different individuals). *Rashomon* is the effect of the subjectivity of perception on recollection, by which observers of an event are able to produce substan-

tially different but equally plausible accounts of it (p. 18). Basically, *Rashomon* helps determine how alternative accounts might be explained and how they might illuminate our understanding of events.

Davenport portends, how can one begin to understand the source-variation issue, when newspapers identify only a fraction of the events that exist in the “real world” and treat them as wholes? (p. 7). Not only is it important, it is also necessary to examine the variation in accounts of conflict behavior when one investigates contentious activity (particularly, multiple and contradictory accounts of contentious interactions between the BPP and the authorities).

These narrative contests are extremely important because they remind us what is covered is not a comprehensive assessment of what takes place out in the streets and/or countryside and that it was never meant to be (p. 11).

Davenport employs a research strategy that Charles Tilly (2001) referred to as “event cataloging” and collected information from five different newspapers both in and outside the Bay Area, regarding exactly who did what to whom, during the relevant period. The *Rashomon* framework along with original data collection, events-based research, and source analysis, provide a fresh approach to understanding collective action and the dynamics of protest, violence, and repression.

According to Charles Tilly, “event catalogs” (listing of discrete activities that identify actors, actions, locales, times, and to the extent possible objectives as well as outcomes) had been employed within this area since the early to mid-1930s, but it was during the 1960s-1970s that one saw a dramatic rise in the use of this technique (p. 5).

Davenport’s argument is straightforward. Event catalogs have long figured centrally in empirical studies of political struggle. He argues that event coverage is influenced by space (physical proximity) and orientation (political interest), albeit more by the latter than the former. Hence, scholars of contentious politics must be cognizant of the fact that different theoretical arguments and empirical findings are more likely identified when particular sources are consulted. Sources tend to vary in their coverage of repression and dissent primarily because of the following factors:

1) the political orientation of the source (i.e., its sympathy/preference for either authorities or dissents); and 2) special distance between the source and the events in question. Both factors influence the type of actor and actions that are focused on, whom the source consults for information about what took place and who the audience is for the stories written (p. 180).

Davenport's work demonstrates how difficult it is to draw upon neutral sources; the challenge in covering dissident organizations (particularly, those deemed threatening); the problematic nature of using newspapers in event cataloging; and, how much attention is given to different locales from the relevant sources. In order to understand contentious events, it is crucial to understand who collects or distributes the information in order to comprehend who reportedly does what to whom. However, as information providers are drawn to different aspects of the relevant story, researchers must establish greater sensitivity to the fact that source selection and account variation can yield distinct causal accounts.

This thoroughly researched piece illustrates the drawback of relying on single source accounts of conflict and the reactions to conflict. Different news sources not only covered different events relevant to the BPP, but they also constructed competing narratives about the interactions between the movement itself and state repression. Not only does this work have obvious implications for authority-oriented sources in Western, democratic, and economically developed, societies, it also holds less obvious implications for authority-oriented sources in non-Western, non-democratic, and non-economically developed societies.

Boris E. Ricks

California State University, Northridge

Jeffrey E. Cohen. *Going Local: Presidential Leadership in The Post-Broadcast Age.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. x, 246 pp. (\$26.99 paper).

In *Going Local*, Jeffrey Cohen takes on the puzzle of the Incredible Shrinking Presidency, a state of affairs well demonstrated by the travails of the current occupant of the White House. In running for his current office, Barack Obama had vast financial and technological resources at his disposal that enabled him to overwhelm his beleaguered opponent with sheer force and volume. Once the vaunted "agent of change" took power, however, his once-powerful megaphone seemed oddly muted. Though his administration oversaw the passage of landmark progressive legislation, the victories did not come without serious struggle, especially given his party's dominance of both houses of Congress. And as midterm elections neared, the president struggled with mediocre approval ratings and the prospect of serious losses for his party in November. In short, Obama seems unable to "go national" the way he did in the halcyon days of the 2008 campaign. It is one of the virtues of Jeffrey Cohen's book that he can explain convincingly why this is so.

Once upon a time, a president would engage in bargaining with a small group of congressional elites in order to build coalitions that would convert his policy proposals into legislation. When power in Congress decentralized significantly in the 1970s, the number of bargaining partners for the president increased dramatically. No longer able to count on congressional leaders, the president now had to “go public” with his policy agenda, attempting to influence public opinion on his own and forcing members of Congress to cede to the will of their constituents. This was possible during a media age in which broadcast networks and national newspapers decided what counted as “news” on the national political scene.

Nowadays, Cohen argues, the president no longer can “go public.” In an age of intense party polarization, even an allegedly “post-partisan” president is unlikely to change the minds of voters loyal to the opposing party, much less their elected representatives. Furthermore, Obama and his immediate successors must try to reach the public through the narrow channels of the “post-broadcast” media. Cable television and now the Internet have demolished the tidy universe of NBC, ABC, and CBS. Viewers now have unprecedented ability to access content on demand, and audience share for major media outlets has declined dramatically as a result. In an age of narrowcasting, journalists seem increasingly willing to forego professional standards of objectivity, and revert back to days of outright partisanship in attempts to gain a niche in the news market. As a whole, the media have become more hostile toward the president, while journalists themselves struggle with increasing public skepticism and distrust.

With “going public” no longer an option, Cohen states that presidents have no other choice but to aim small and “go local” in their efforts to move public opinion in their direction. The author spends a small amount of space on the president’s evolving relationship with interest groups, but his major claims concern the president’s ability to influence localities, areas as small as the county or congressional district. Cohen considers, but then discards as wasteful the tactic of sending the president to visit various localities in person. The only cost-effective method for going local, he asserts, is to build a “presidential news management” strategy that would influence local media in order to produce the most positive coverage of presidential activity. Positive local coverage, in turn, could do more than most observers think in moving public opinion in a media age when presidents need to think small and targeted, not large and sweeping.

In order to make his case, Cohen makes a concerted, systematic effort to study local news coverage of the presidency, a topic that has received little attention from scholars. A researcher’s serious effort to collect new data is always commendable. On top of that, Cohen’s command of the relevant literature, thoughtful research design, and painstaking attention to

minute details of coding procedure are all quite praiseworthy, and worthy of emulation by fellow scholars of media and politics.

Cohen's end product is a comprehensive yet fine-grained picture of local newspaper coverage of the presidency during the past two decades. Local newspapers, despite well-known declines in circulation, remain an ample, credible source of information on the presidency for many readers. The author determines that local newspapers display some measure of autonomy in their coverage of the presidency, rather than merely following the lead of national publications such as the *Washington Post*. The amount of news they publish about the president depends on their place in the old-media pecking order; newspapers with larger circulations and access to a Washington news bureau, for instance, publish more news on the presidency.

Presidential public relations teams, in turn, can exploit the economics of local news production to the benefit of their boss. Presidents, for example, can create news when its supply is low by giving a national radio address on Saturdays. Their public pronouncements can produce newsworthy quotes that serve as centerpieces of news articles which heighten the president's status among political actors. The president can even "flood the zone" with newsworthy activities, giving the media too many stories to cover and thus reducing unwanted attention to a controversial decision. Combining media coding with Annenberg survey data, Cohen finds that prudent news management techniques can produce a more positive news tone for the president, which in turn has a discernible effect on his approval rating among casual newspaper readers.

A discernible improvement in presidential approval among a segment of newspaper readers is certainly a finding of interest. As a proxy for presidential ability to build policy-making coalitions, however, it is somewhat lacking. Similarly, as admirable as Cohen's work is in media studies, it is more suggestive than definitive when it comes to the question of presidential leadership. Other scholars might supplement Cohen's work with case studies of local media coverage of presidential attempts to build congressional coalitions for controversial legislation. Media scholars also should consider how much longer studies like Cohen's will be viable—in other words, how much longer will the local newspaper be able to retain its traditional status as a unit of analysis, given the velocity of change in the industry?

Dante J. Scala
University of New Hampshire

Ted G. Jelen. *To Serve God and Mammon: Church-State Relations in American Politics*, 2nd ed. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2010. xix, 188 pp. (\$26.95 paper).

Religion and politics is no longer a dormant field in political science. Alongside articles on all facets of the subject in recent numbers of the main-line journals, a spate of books touching the issue, a formal APSA section devoted to the area, and more than one specialized journal, courses have sprung up at many colleges and universities. Naturally, texts have been written to fill this need, and several are now available. This is the second edition of a widely used text, and it is one of the best. It is intellectually solid, formed around a coherent and defensible framework, fair to all sides, well-written, and contains a number of useful pedagogical aids (such as a set of intriguing questions following each chapter, a glossary, and a summary of the major Supreme Court cases regarding church and state).

The book is built around Supreme Court decisions; however, other matters—public opinion, interest groups, the intersection of democratic politics and citizens’ religious commitments—are covered as well.

The framework begins with the familiar dichotomy regarding the Establishment Clause between Accommodationists and Separationists. The former contend that the clause orders government to be neutral among religions but does not compel it to completely disentangle itself from supporting religious values or religious institutions, while the latter believe that Jefferson’s metaphorical wall should be both high and wide. The Free Exercise Clause division they set out is less familiar though equally helpful, distinguishing between Communalists and Libertarians. Communalists draw on one (or both) of two assumptions: that citizens may “exercise” their religious liberties by enacting policies they favor or that behaviors that pose a danger to public health or safety can be regulated (or banned), even if they are based on religious foundations. Libertarians, in contrast, view free exercise as an individual right that must be protected against majoritarian politics.

As Jelen notes, there is no inherent correlation between one’s views on the proper interpretation of the two clauses. Those who take an Accommodationist stance on the Establishment Clause and a Communalist stance on the Free Exercise Clause are likely to end up as Christian Preferentialists, as Christians will usually carry the day in the political arena. Someone who combines a Separationist view of the Establishment Clause with a Communalist approach to the Free Exercise will become a Religious Minimalist, as policies enacted by a majority will run up against strict separation tenets. Religious Nonpreferentialist is the designation given to those who adhere to an Accommodationist reading of the Establishment Clause and a Libertarian rendition of the Free Exercise Clause. All religious bodies and traditions

would get equal treatment under both clauses. Finally, if someone prefers a Separationist approach to the Establishment Clause and a Libertarian reading of the Free Exercise Clause, he or she can be seen as a Religious Free Marketer, with religion remaining solely in the private sphere.

A chapter is devoted to the historical background of the religion clauses and the Supreme Court's postwar jurisprudence interpreting them. This is ably done, supplying enough information to serve as a springboard for class discussion without getting lost in a morass of legal detail. Moving beyond the case law, the discussion of public opinion should prove enlightening for students. Jelen points out that a majority of the public will offer Separationist and Libertarian positions when asked abstract questions. However, when the issues become more concrete, the public becomes more Accommodationist and Communalist.

Moreover, he explains why state and local officials and members of the U.S. House often sponsor policies they know the courts will strike down. They have strong electoral incentives to do this, since very often their constituencies are relatively homogenous. Governors and U.S. senators, on the other hand, to say nothing of presidents, have a much more diverse constituency. Thus, they tend to be more passive, and when they do invoke religion do so at a very abstract level. George W. Bush was an obvious exception, but it is uncertain whether any other presidents will follow his lead on this. In the meantime, the political incentives which exist for state and local office holders and members of the House means that we are likely to witness a steady stream of initiatives regarding religion.

A significant portion of the book's discussion about democratic politics is taken up with analyzing the Religious Right, among whom an interesting shift has occurred. In the 1980s, Jerry Falwell and his followers took a strong Accommodationist position, arguing that the United States is a Christian nation and that its policies should therefore reflect that commitment. Of late, though, the Religious Right has emphasized a Libertarian reading of the Free Exercise Clause. Take the example of public school curricula. Previously, those on the Religious Right insisted that the curriculum should be grounded in the Judeo-Christian ethos. Now, though, they argue that parents who object to certain subjects or books should be able to have their children exempted on Free Exercise grounds.

Meanwhile, the Supreme Court has been shifting also. It has moved from its rigid Separationist reading of the Establishment Clause to a somewhat more Accommodationist perspective. At the same time, it has jettisoned its previously strong Libertarian orientation to the Free Exercise Clause and allowed more scope for Communalism. Thus, despite the Court becoming steadily more conservative, the Religious Right has found itself on the wrong side of the justices' Free Exercise jurisprudence.

These are both manifestations of the fact, Jelen believes, that there will never be an end to the debate over church and state, and that this is a good thing. Both the vitality of American religion and the vitality of democratic politics are enhanced through their continual interaction. As Jelen states, “The involvement of religious believers in politics serves to remind citizens of the higher aspirations toward which religious faith points. Likewise, politics can serve to remind believers of the limitations within which discipleship can and must operate” (p. 149-150).

In short, anyone teaching a course on religion and politics, particularly if he or she desires to begin with the Constitution’s religion clauses and work outward, should seriously consider this book.

A final, irresistible, humorous note: Would only a Catholic university’s press not catch the typo naming the late Jerry Falwell’s church the Thomas More Baptist Church (p. xiv)?

Jerold Waltman
Baylor University