

As a historian with some knowledge of earlier immigrant ethnic incorporation in New York City, I find Rogers's discussion of pluralist and minority models somewhat reified and think more parallels may exist between contemporary and earlier patterns of immigrant incorporation than he allows. In proposing this, I mean to develop tendencies in Rogers's own discussion rather than sharply disagree with him. Rogers notes that students of machine politics in New York, such as Steven Erie and Martin Shefter, earlier revised the classic pluralist model by Robert Dahl showing that party machines often did not mobilize immigrants beyond a certain balance relative to existing party resources. Machines preferred gate-keeping to mobilizing newcomers. Absent serious party competition or insurgency, earlier immigrant incorporation rates lagged also. Rogers draws on such "revisionist scholars" (p. 83) when he emphasizes similar outcomes and processes for Afro-Caribbeans. Moreover, earlier immigrants too adjusted to politics not in purely assimilating ways as Rogers says classical pluralist theory implies but by becoming at one and the same time more American and more ethnic, like the Irish, or later like the Italians. Also, some European groups, like East European Jews, went outside existing party channels and rules, seeking reform and redistribution in ways Rogers characterizes as fitting mainly the minority model of politics.

These quibbles with Rogers's binary theoretical frame—which straightjackets historical complexity—aside, the book represents a significant contribution to the study of immigrant (ethnic) and minority politics in New York and the United States. It draws on excellent work by Nancy Foner, Phil Kasinitz, Mary Waters, and others on Afro-Caribbean identity and adjustment in New York, but goes considerably beyond, contributing originally to understanding the broader political picture, emphasizing how institutions, group experiences, and racial and ethnic constructions and self-constructions all matter. Bottom line, Rogers says Afro-Caribbean immigrants think of themselves as temporary sojourners and maintain emotional and economic attachments to their home countries. Along with the benign neglect of party politics, this mindset delays citizenship and political incorporation and also shapes orientations and forms of participation in the emerging Afro-Caribbean politics. Afro-Caribbeans lack the same racial consciousness as African Americans, are outside institutions reinforcing racial consciousness, are not aggressively recruited to racial politics by African Americans, and embrace a transnational identity rooted in immigrant social networks that Rogers rightly thinks is also not new—as parallels exist in earlier immigrant experiences.

Rogers's book also puts the Afro-Caribbean experience in New York in conversation with other contemporary group experiences in New York and elsewhere, including studies on Latinos by Rodney Hero, Michael Jones-Correa, and Peter Skerry. The book offers several insights

into issues of incorporation of new groups "living between nations," to use Jones-Correa's phrase, and concludes by raising important questions about the future when second generation immigrants born here will mature.

**The Race to 270: The Electoral College and the Campaign Strategies of 2000 and 2004.** By Daron R.

Shaw. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006. 216p. \$50.00 cloth, \$20.00 paper.

DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071137

— Scott D. McClurg, *Southern Illinois University*

Part political memoir, part political science, this is a valuable book on presidential elections that should be read by consultants and academics alike. Drawing on his experience as a Bush strategist and a political science professor at the University of Texas, Daron Shaw argues that these two audiences could learn a great deal about what interests them by paying more careful attention to each other. This theme is woven throughout Shaw's consideration of Electoral College strategies, execution of those strategies, and their effect on American electorates. Though he has clear political predilections that may make Democratic readers occasionally bristle, his rigorous examination of the *best data on presidential campaigns* available to date keeps him squarely in the realm of political science. The end result is a book that provides irreplaceable insight on how campaigns might better function, on the subjects that political scientists could do a better job of exploring, and on the potential future of elections research.

*The Race to 270* is organized into six chapters. In the first, Shaw outlines the principal arguments of the book: 1) that presidential campaign strategy must be viewed through the dual lens of the Electoral College and campaign efficiency; 2) that media markets are an overlooked, but essential, level of analysis; 3) that campaign effects must be understood in dynamic terms; and 4) that campaigns aim to shape voters' perceptions of the candidate before they try to win their vote. Although many of these themes are familiar from Shaw's work, his intent on reshaping the way we think about *studying presidential campaigns* has the effect of putting them in a new light. As such, this chapter is best viewed as a call for political scientists to work differently rather than as a set of new theoretical propositions about campaigns.

After a relatively straightforward review of previous research in Chapter 2, Shaw provides three strong empirical chapters that should set the agenda for presidential campaign research in years to come. In the first, he uses his firsthand knowledge of the Bush campaign to inform our understanding of how Electoral College strategies are formed. More descriptive than explanatory in nature, Shaw builds on his previous work to explain how states—and media markets—obtain the attention of a campaign's decision makers. The gist of this discussion is that campaigns

use a state's previous electoral history, Electoral College value, and current polling data to prioritize them for campaign outreach. Importantly, he points out that these strategies are constantly in flux, responding to a variety of short-run organizational and political pressures. Though this is supplemented with a "best guess" as to how his opponents developed their strategy, one is left wondering how much of what we learn here is a product of Shaw's input rather than a description of more generic processes that stretch across elections. I was also somewhat surprised that Shaw does not take up the issue of constructing messages—probably the key to understanding campaign effects from the perspective of both political scientists and consultants—even though he was in a first-hand position to shed light on how this affects decisions on both where to send resources and how to spend them. As a consequence, I suspect that most readers will find this particular chapter an interesting read, even if it is not quite the theory of campaign strategy that some might expect to see.

The next two chapters are more analytic in nature and therefore more likely to garner a response from the scholarly community. In Chapter 4, he examines the extent to which the campaigns followed their plans using a spatial *and* geographic examination of resource allocation. Not surprisingly, he finds that the strategic plans are followed to a significant degree, with some states and media markets receiving tremendous attention and others being ignored almost to the point of irrelevancy. Of particular interest was the handful of market-by-market temporal examinations Shaw conducted that provide a valuable tool for studying both how campaigns deviate from their plans and shed light on the extent to which this is linked to the less systematic aspects of strategizing. For example, Democrats seemed more willing to ride the wave of free media provided by presidential debates than Republicans were.

Although this chapter illustrates the tension between academic concerns with a central tendency and a consultant's obsession with deviations from the norm, it successfully accomplishes its goal of raising new issues for both groups to consider. Shaw accomplishes this by illustrating the value of media markets and time-based data for evaluating the conventional wisdoms that emanate from campaigns. Most compelling on this score is Shaw's analysis of Tennessee in 2000—he shows that the Bush campaign did make the first move in appealing to this supposedly Gore stronghold, but he also demonstrates that the Democrats did not ignore it as the mass media implied. Indeed, Shaw goes one step further to suggest that it was West Virginia that better fits this storyline. This insight notwithstanding, I found myself wishing that Shaw had done more to more systematically theorize about and then test for the factors that explain variation in these data.

The final empirical chapter addresses what might be the most frustrating question in American electoral behav-

ior: What effect does all of this campaign activity have on election outcomes? As much as Shaw dismisses the validity of the campaign effects debate earlier in the book, he remains concerned with the fundamental question of how effectual campaigns are for understanding votes. The primary stimulus for this is his belief that disaggregating data by media markets, weeks, and candidate impressions will likely shed additional light on this subject. On this score, Shaw is right. Drawing on a "smorgasbord of data," including internal polls from the Bush campaign, Shaw shows that campaigns have generally impressive effects that act in the expected direction (i.e., candidates benefit from more advertising and appearances), even if they frequently do not measure up to standard levels of statistical significance.

Even though Shaw does an outstanding job in both analyzing the data and drawing appropriate conclusions, this chapter is likely to garner the strongest reaction from other scholars. Two questions stand out in my mind. First, I think we must think more clearly about possible endogeneity in estimating the impact of presidential resource allocations on the electorate's opinions of the candidates. Shaw makes a compelling argument that his specific data and model accounts for such problems, though I am not yet convinced that the subject is entirely closed. In particular, a better understanding of how campaigns react to information over time in adjusting their strategic plans (noted above) would potentially yield better insight as to whether campaigns are effective. Second, Shaw's analysis discounts the value of nonbattlegrounds for understanding campaign effects. On the one hand, I am sympathetic to his argument that you can only understand campaign effects by examining the places the campaign occurs. On the other hand, the nonbattlegrounds provide a useful baseline against which we can judge the battleground dynamics and evaluate the mechanisms by which campaign effects occur.

The closing chapter ends by using the tools developed in previous chapters to evaluate the purported "mistakes" attributed to Democrats and Republicans in 2000 and 2004. It then discusses the potential insights that Shaw's two audiences hold for each other, most notably arguing that political scientists should consider expanding their repertoire of tools to include techniques favored by consultants (e.g., dial groups). The final section evaluates potential trends in the future of presidential elections, including a potential movement away from over-the-top television advertisements and an increased emphasis on personal contact. Though this chapter holds many useful lessons, I found it most interesting for its well-defined agenda for future research on presidential elections.

Presidential campaigns have been the subject of intense interest for many years, usually because the evidence of their influence is milder than what common sense suggests it should be. This book is an outstanding resource

for how we can move past that agenda with new data, techniques, and questions in an effort to better understand the American electoral process. It is well-written, well-conceived, and well-done. It is appropriate for undergraduates and graduates alike, but it is most notable for its undeniable contribution to the scholarly and practical debates on the operation and impact of campaigns.

**Congressional Preemption: Regulatory Federalism.**

By Joseph F. Zimmerman. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006. 288p. \$70.00 cloth, \$24.95 paper.  
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071149

— Brian J. Gerber, *West Virginia University*

The adoption by Congress of major statutes regulating the environment, workplace, and consumer transactions, beginning in the mid-1960s, has been seen by critics as granting too much authority to the federal government at the expense of the states. The critique of federal social regulation initiatives questions not only whether such policy interventions can be justified per se, but as importantly, whether congressional preemption itself is appropriate. Presidents Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan sought specific legislative and policy changes aimed at shifting formal authority away from Congress and back to the states—a “new federalism” to reverse the expansion of federal authority. At least rhetorically (though not necessarily substantively), President George W. Bush has taken a similar stance. But the perceived need to check federal authority is not the sole purview of conservatives; President Jimmy Carter supported a significant program of economic deregulation, and President Bill Clinton oversaw initiatives to devolve federal authority as part of a broader reform of federal public management practices.

The broad contours of this tension between federal and state governments are well known by those who follow policymaking in the United States. What is less well understood is how the specific mechanisms that define the distribution of policy authority in a federal system actually function in practice. Joseph Zimmerman’s *Congressional Preemption* provides a definitive account of preemption statutes, how they are used, and to what consequence across a range of regulatory policy domains. His efforts are important because to understand preemption is to understand a central dynamic factor in American regulatory federalism. Though the subject of congressional preemption has not attracted significant scholarly attention, Zimmerman’s account of the nature of federal–state regulatory arrangements convincingly demonstrates that federalism and regulation scholars will gain much by directing more attention to the topic.

In addition to an examination of judicial evaluation of preemption statutes and of their fiscal implications, the book presents three key themes. The first and most important theme is that the two prototypical conceptions of

dual and cooperative federalism are unable to adequately identify and explain the complexity and mutability of policymaking relationships between levels of government. Preemption is critical to these relationships, but it is not a simple construct. Preemption can be complete, where Congress removes all regulatory powers from a state and its political subdivisions. It can be partial, where a statute completely occupies a segment of a regulatory domain or where Congress establishes minimum regulatory standards that state governments must meet. And it can be contingent, where applicability depends on a state’s actions. Because the Constitution provides Congress with broad authority to restructure the federal system, it is perhaps no surprise that Congress has utilized these different types of preemption actions so frequently in responding to perceived national problems and social demands. In recent decades, Congress has altered the basic nature of federal and state regulatory responsibilities and behavior. In essence, Zimmerman argues, we have moved beyond cooperative federalism to a new model that is generally more coercive, though one that still exhibits its cooperative elements.

As a consequence, what is needed today is a more general theory of federalism—one that characterizes and explains how and why the different forms of preemption are used in particular instances and to what effect. Zimmerman does not actually develop such a theory but does offer the broad outlines of what such theoretic development must address. However, these postulates do not actually point to the general conditions under which readjustments to the balance of policy authority will occur. Thus, there are limits to what the reader can infer from his argument about the particular shape a revised theory of federalism should take.

A second theme of the book is that the manner by which preemption statutes are employed is critical to the assessment of whether nationally established policy goals are achieved. There are significant constraints on their utility (e.g., technological limitations may preclude the realization of a regulatory goal), and Zimmerman shows that several major preemption statutes have not accomplished their stated aims. The most successful approach is the one that establishes minimum federal standards and gives state government enforcement responsibility (with federal monitoring). The author suggests that allowing primacy has increased the responsibilities of both state regulators and state legislatures, which paradoxically has forced the states to do more. But does this represent something akin to a unitary system, as he suggests? This seems a bit overstated if one considers that even in the case of “successful” partial preemption statutes, state governments have considerable leeway in developing and enforcing regulatory implementation plans. In fact, the federal government has often been rather reluctant to seriously sanction state governments who are either intentionally or