In light of the preponderance of null findings, the consequences of variance inflation deserve consideration.

In sum, Casellas' research constitutes a significant intellectual contribution to the literature on Latino representation. The issues of substantive representation, currency, and possible multicollinearity do not seriously detract from the overall quality of the book, a book that is sure to stimulate additional research on Latino descriptive representation and to contribute to ongoing controversies in the demanding, provocative area of Latino substantive representation.

Arms and the University: Military Presence and the Civic Education of Non-Military Students. By Donald Alexander Downs and Ilia Murtazashvili. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 456p. $34.99.
doi:10.1017/S153759271200374X

— Michael W. Mosser, *University of Texas at Austin*

What does a military presence bring to the American academy? Does the military even belong on college campuses? And what exactly is the state of security studies in American higher education? In their book, Donald Downs and Ilia Murtazashvili take a threefold approach to answering these questions, and in so doing have produced a work of uncommon breadth and scope that will appeal to audiences in both camps.

Divided into a pedagogical survey of military education within the university, a "field guide" to security studies programs at major American universities, and a detailed account of the complex and evolving relationship between Columbia University and its Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program, *Arms and the University* reads very much like three separate (and not entirely equal) works. This unusual organizational scheme presents challenges and opportunities both for the reader and for the reviewer. In the end, however, the book succeeds reasonably well at weaving its disparate strands into a coherent whole. It does so by remaining true to its focus on its core question (p. 5): "What is the appropriate role or presence for the military and military-related studies in American higher education?"

The majority of the book is concerned with answering this question via an examination of the evolution of the ROTC program at Ivy League campuses, looking specifically at Columbia University's relationship with it. The story of the decreasing antipathy of at least some parts of the academy, primarily the Ivy League, toward the military (that is, the ROTC program) was still unfolding as the book was going to press. Naturally, a compelling narrative such as this comprises a large part of Downs and Murtazashvili's comprehensive examination of the relationship between the military and the university in contemporary America. But it is not the only narrative told in the book. The other sections include a theoretical overview detailing the authors' intellectual framework and driving questions, as well as a thorough survey of security studies programs at major universities across the country. But it is the ROTC/Ivy League story that occupies center stage.

Since the end of the Vietnam War, the association between the academy and the military has been at best a reluctant partnership. The passage of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT) legislation in 1993, which barred openly gay service members from serving, only deepened the rift. The passage of the Solomon Amendment in 1996, which gave the Secretary of Defense the ability to withhold funds from universities that prohibited ROTC recruitment on their campuses and was upheld in an appeal to the US Supreme Court in 2006, added to the tension. It gave a specific twist to the general question asked previously: Should universities allow the military a presence on campus when at least some of its regulations run expressly counter to the stated intent of university charters and mission statements?

In the 1990s and 2000s, that problem was far from an academic exercise. Indeed, scholars of this specific issue considered it to be of paramount importance in untangling at least two strands in the complex web of state/society interactions in contemporary American society (e.g., see Clay Calvert and Robert D. Richards, "Challenging the Wisdom of Solomon: The First Amendment and Military Recruitment on Campus," *William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal* 13 [2004–5]: 205–44; and Geoffrey M. Wyatt, "The Third Amendment in the Twenty-First Century: Military Recruiting on Private Campuses," *New England Law Review* 40 [2005]: 113). Many scholars saw DADT as only the most public evidence of the growing "gap" between the academy and the military, and indeed between the military and society as a whole (e.g., see Gary Schmidt and Cheryl Miller, "The Military Should Mirror the Nation: America's Armed Forces Are Drawn from an Increasingly Narrow Segment of American Society," *Wall Street Journal,* 26 August 2010; and Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security,* 2001).

Yet in 2011, only a few short months after the repeal of the DADT legislation, Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale Universities readmitted ROTC to their campuses, implying that the disconnect between the university and the military (at least in the case of these Ivy League schools) was not so much a fundamental question of identity as it was a fairly straightforward antidiscrimination stance that was easily reversed once the offending piece of legislation was repealed. Downs and Murtazashvili strongly agree with this sentiment and indeed argue that the military as a whole (and not just ROTC) deserves to have a *greater* role in both the academy and in the public's perception (pp. 28–34, 411–20).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759271200374X Published online by Cambridge University Press

In what is the most explicit treatment of civil–military relations in the volume, the authors mention the Defense Department's funding of social science research through Project Minerva (pp. 381–82) and look extensively at security studies programs at MIT, the Ohio State University, and the University of Wisconsin–Madison (pp. 388–93) as evidence that the military (or at least the security establishment) already has a presence in the American academy. They here place themselves firmly in the camp that thinks any discussion of civil–military relations needs to operate from an informed perspective on *both* sides.

The security studies survey and the pedagogical overview embedded within the book, however, take a back seat to the tale of how Columbia University (standing in here for the rest of the Ivy League) brought ROTC back to campus. Indeed, ROTC almost serves as a stand-in for the military as a whole, and Columbia for the academy. This raises the one major objection to the organization of the book: its scope. Downs and Murtazashvili note early on (p. 5) that their analysis of the military presence in the American higher educational system "beckons a broader inquiry into the meaning of higher education itself." Indeed, the subtitle of the book implies that it will undertake a thorough discussion of the impact of a military presence on the American university system. This is a worthy goal and an admirable subject of inquiry, but it falls a bit short in the end. While three chapters (or roughly 20%) are in theory dedicated to this question, the authors really only discuss it at length in Chapter 2 and revisit it in the conclusion, preferring instead to devote much of the book to the treatment of the evolution of the academy/ROTC relationship. This is understandable, given the timeliness and inherent attractiveness of this topic, but it makes the theoretical section of the work suffer by comparison.

This issue notwithstanding, *Arms and the University* should be included in the reading lists of ROTC programs nationwide. In addition, it represents an important contribution to scholarship in security studies and on civil–military relations more broadly.

The Jury and Democracy: How Jury Deliberation Promotes Civic Engagement and Political Participation. By John Gastil, E. Pierre Deess, Philip J. Weiser, and Cindy Simmons. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010. 288p. $99.00 cloth, $24.95 paper.

Civic Participation in America. By Quentin Kidd. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 208p. $80.00.
doi:10.1017/S1537592712003751

— Albert W. Dzur, *Bowling Green State University*

The last two decades have brought a surge of concern over civic engagement in the United States. There is worry about quantity: the large numbers of nonvoters, nonsubscribers to serious newspapers, nonviewers of nightly newscasts. Catalyzing the debate with his 1995 article "Bowling Alone" (*Journal of Democracy* 6: 65–78), Robert Putnam presented a range of data showing that as American voters, readers, and viewers were aging, a similarly active cohort of citizens was not stepping forward take their place; the postwar political culture was failing to reproduce itself. There is also worry about quality: the concern that contemporary political discourse, strategies, and behavior are dangerously shallow, impervious to rational reflection, balkanized, and narrowly ideological. Writing about the neopopulist Tea Party, for example, Mark Lilla pointed to their "blanket distrust of institutions and an astonishing—and unwarranted—confidence in the self. They are apocalyptic pessimists about public life and childlike optimists swaddled in self-esteem when it comes to their own powers" ("Tea Party Jacobins," *New York Review of Books,* May 27, 2010, 53–56.)

Small wonder that from shore to shore, committees, commissions, and think tanks have offered reports and action agendas determined to address what is seen as a major social problem. Rare, too, is the American college or university that does not have civic engagement and critical thinking placed prominently in their revised mission statement and embedded in their undergraduate curriculum.

Much practical work on nonparticipation as a social problem is focused on behavior modification and civic education. What will get young people interested? What sort of high school service learning could be required to trigger further political activity? What kinds of campus–community work might college freshmen do to imbue a sense of public ownership and encourage problem-solving collaboration that bridges social differences? Despite this flurry of concern and practical application, however, no amount of service learning and credit-bearing civic engagement course work can change what nearly all 18–24-year-olds know very well: *Meaningful* and *efficacious* citizen participation is the exception rather than the rule in stratified, professionalized, and often complex American social structures and institutions.

Quentin Kidd's *Civic Participation in America* and John Gastil and his colleagues' *The Jury and Democracy* make significant contributions by focusing attention away from behavior and toward the crucial question of which institutions discourage and which encourage citizen participation. While Kidd's book tells a familiar story about American political development, it does so in a way that helps inform the civic participation discussion. The book by Gastil and his coauthors, based on extensive original research, provides much-needed evidence for the importance of an institutional environment to citizen participation.

Kidd distinguishes participation motivated by self-interest from participation motivated by civic duty and argues that the latter has lost much of its institutional support over the last two centuries. Although these are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759271200374X Published online by Cambridge University Press