

concepts in the book's subtitle—immigrant, political, incorporation.

The Introduction, written by Jennifer Hochschild and her coeditors, establishes a guiding framework by reviewing previous research, scrutinizing and grappling with each of the central terms, and then specifying their own preferred definitions thereof. This provides the foundation for the sections and the chapters within this “handbook” (to use a term the editors occasionally use themselves). The three parts of the book, and a Conclusion, follow. The first part, which includes five chapters, is focused on how to define immigrants and, further, addresses questions of whether and how immigrants are “distinctive” and how and why that matters for analytical purposes. A second part, which includes five chapters, engages notions of “the political,” and, more specifically, the question of how broad the role of politics is in immigrant political incorporation. Part III, with the most (eight) chapters, focuses on how one should approach the topic of incorporation. So many chapters (20 in all), topics, themes, levels of and units of analysis, and varied emphases on ideas and interests, on culture and/or context, and on agency versus institutions or structures indeed provide a “rich smorgasbord,” as the editors suggest. The Conclusion nicely encapsulates a range of major questions and issues and goes a good way in helping us digest all that the preceding chapters offer. Nonetheless, that very richness makes it difficult to summarize or extensively assess individual chapters; I therefore briefly highlight several themes.

The definitional delineations and their exhortation for greater clarity and consistency notwithstanding, the editors also recognize, indeed expected, that the chapter authors would begin with “different assumptions,” use different definitions of key terms, and “engage with different methods and types of evidence” (p. 20). Illustrating this point, not only is the major dependent variable, incorporation, itself used with respect to different dimensions and has different connotations and applications, but also several other terms are used along with “incorporation” and sometimes instead of it.; Among the terms used are “inclusion,” “integration,” and “assimilation.” Similarly, the specific meanings and boundaries of (the) “political” diverge in various chapters. I would add that with some frequency, the definition and understanding of immigrant, political, and incorporation appear somewhat interconnected, perhaps even interdependent. For example, in several instances in various chapters, the notion of political seems difficult to entirely separate or disentangle without also giving attention to that of one of the other key terms, say, “incorporation.” The essays have rather different mixes of analytical focus: Across, and sometimes within, chapters they are informed by and/or are linked to different countries, although useful comparisons are often discussed; to different immigrant (and racial/ethnic)

groups; and to different aspects of politics and public policies. Such complications aside, overall, the 18 chapters, along with the Introduction and Conclusion, comprise a set of erudite commentaries and (relatively) “big picture” thought pieces, each identifying and probing significant dimensions in informative, illuminating, and often compelling ways.

In part because the large number of chapters are brimming with ideas and insights, it can be challenging to keep track of the many and somewhat distinct questions posed, the claims made, the evidence being put forth, and overall conclusions drawn. But a nice and helpful feature is that virtually all of the chapters include one or more figures, diagrams, and/or other visual presentations that summarize and depict the core concepts and clusters of variables and their presumed interactions and interrelationships. When taken together, these simplify and fruitfully augment the arguments being advanced probably as much as is feasible. In any case, the depictions serve the important purposes of specifying and elaborating the models and stimulating thinking.

As is typical if not inevitable in such a volume, many more questions are raised than are answered. Yet in the posing, pursuing, and proffering of answers, an abundance of insights emerge. This ambitious project is wide-ranging and comprehensive, if not exhaustive, in presenting the theoretical, empirical, and normative puzzles concerning immigration and the approaches that have been, and might be, used to address them. This is hardly to say that the reader will agree or be satisfied with many or even most of the specific definitions of terms, their applications across and/or within chapters, whether some dimensions of politics are overlooked and/or defined and treated as one might deem appropriate, or even “if [all] the ‘right’ questions” are being asked. That would be much too much to ask, especially given the nature of the issues at hand. Thus, if *Outsiders No More?* does not begin to bring closure on the topic(s), as the authors acknowledge, they do not necessarily intend to accomplish that goal. But the intellectual adventure identified by this set of authors suggests myriad paths that might be fruitfully followed. As such, the volume imparts thoughtful guidance, if not a compass, for research directions other scholars may ultimately wish to pursue. Reading it is well worth the trip.

**The Wartime President: Executive Influence and the Nationalizing Politics of Threat.** By William G. Howell,

Saul P. Jackman, and Jon C. Rogowski. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013. 368p. \$90.00 cloth, \$30.00 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592714002382

— Stephen Benedict Dyson, *University of Connecticut.*

William Howell, Saul Jackman, and Jon Rogowski give us an important study of the domestic politics of war in

the United States. Their thesis is that war increases the leverage that the executive has in bargaining over policy with the legislature, thereby shifting national policy toward the president's preferences. The mechanism is the increased prioritization of national over local outcomes by members of Congress during wartime.

After a brief review of existing arguments on presidential power, the authors lay out the theoretical core of *The Wartime President*, the "Policy Priority Model." This is a formal model of the resources and preferences of the executive and the legislative branches, positing that the default focus of the president is on national outcomes, and each congressperson on local outcomes. In peacetime, this can lead to divergence in policy preferences between the two branches of government and a stymied executive. In wartime, by contrast, members of Congress are more likely to think in terms of the good of the nation, to take account of patriotic surges in public opinion, and to defer to the expertise advantage that the president has in understanding what is best for the nation as a whole. The executive is more likely to get their way.

The authors conceptualize the influence of war as a continuous rather than a dichotomous variable: some wars will work more to the president's advantage than others. Howell, Jackman, and Rogowski develop a set of criteria for ascertaining the nationalizing influence of five modern wars, arguing that World War II and the Afghanistan/Iraq wars (treated by the authors as a single conflict) had the most nationalizing effect, whereas Korea, Vietnam, and the first Persian Gulf War had less.

Through careful empirical analysis (reflecting what must have been herculean labors), the authors find their predictions to be mostly borne out. They examine spending and voting patterns in the Congress across the five wars. In World War II and Afghanistan, Congress was significantly more likely to grant the president's requests in the budget and to vote in a way consistent with the president's ideology. Once the wars ended, Congress reasserted its independence. In Korea, Vietnam, and the first Persian Gulf War, the picture is much less clear, findings which are consistent with the authors' hypotheses.

Subsequent chapters explore these dynamics through case study analysis, including an admirably frank discussion of cases where the predictions of the model are at odds with the evidence, such as George W. Bush's failed efforts to reform social security despite the model's suggestion that he should have had great leverage over Congress due to the nationalizing effect of the post-9/11 wars.

I find the book to have considerable strengths. It offers a genuinely novel way to think about the wartime presidency. The authors offer a plausible argument and convincing data on the manner and extent to which presidents benefit domestically, and not just on foreign policy, from war.

The book is also praiseworthy in the diversity of its methods. Formal modeling and data analysis are combined

with qualitative investigations, and so the book is at the leading edge of the move toward multimethod triangulation in political science, as well as fitting in with the modern information-resources-bargaining paradigm that dominates the study of American political institutions.

I see some problems with the argument, though. The initial review of the literature on presidential power struck me as a little thin, confined to the mid-twentieth-century works of Edward Corwin, Clinton Rossiter, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (the authors suggest that little work of consequence has been done since then). Richard Neustadt's treatise on presidential power goes unmentioned, which seems an unfortunate omission given Neustadt's stress on the resources that presidents have in a situation whereby separated institutions share powers.

With regard to the policy priority model itself, scholars of different orientations will react to it very differently. To those favorably disposed toward formal theory, the model is a welcome advance and will, I suspect, become the centerpiece of an important research program. The authors ably state the view of formal theorists that far too often in political science, assertions are made without proper elaboration of the logic underlying them. Thus, most studies of the presidency are viewed by the authors as atheoretical, by which they mean not based upon formal models.

The retort of nonformal theorists is that these models necessitate unrealistic simplifying assumptions and result in predictions that we could have reached through the application of common sense. This camp, I suspect, will question some of the underpinnings of the model: All presidents are assumed to be more expert on national policy than all members of Congress; and presidential ideology is rendered as a simple matter of Democrats being liberal and Republicans being conservative.

Although the central causal mechanism of the book—the shift from a local to a national focus by members of Congress—is plausible, it is mostly discussed in the aggregate and observed indirectly, rather than demonstrated in specific cases of legislators' thinking. I would have welcomed an in-depth account of the reasoning of a member of the legislative branch concerning the way the model posits as a verification of the micro-foundations of the argument.

Finally, I found it questionable to code Afghanistan and Iraq as a single case. This seems counterintuitive given the very different dynamics and levels of public and congressional support for both of these wars, and the roller-coastering fortunes of the United States—and the presidents—over the course of these long conflicts.

Caveats aside, though, Howell, Jackman, and Rogowski have produced a major work of theory and empirical analysis. The implications of their model extend, as they acknowledge, far beyond the wartime presidency and

offer a general theory of presidential power in relation to Congress. An analysis of the Obama presidency using this framework, undertaken by the authors or by others working from their framework, would be fascinating and important. The book is likely to become an important reference point for those working on interbranch bargaining in the U.S. political system.

**Courthouse Democracy and Minority Rights: Same-Sex Marriage in the States.** By Robert J. Hume. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 230p. \$85.00.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592714002394

— Adam Joyce, *The New School*

In 2008, same-sex marriage was legalized by the high courts of California and Connecticut, but California voters soon amended their constitution to define marriage as solely a bond between a man and a woman. The Connecticut ruling has endured. Given this difference, Robert J. Hume seeks to explain why some state court decisions achieve greater impact than others. Hume develops a theoretical framework and employs rigorous tests to bolster his central argument: The more democratic a state's court and constitutional systems are, the less likely judges will be to expand minority rights. While readers may quibble with aspects of the author's theory or quantitative analysis, the book's main shortcomings concern larger issues. *Courthouse Democracy and Minority Rights* often does not leverage history to reinforce findings, and it does not systematically examine how state courts affect national struggles to expand rights. Still, the book should be of interest to graduate students and scholars researching lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender issues, minority rights, public law, and political change.

Hume argues that the levels of democratization in states profoundly influence the impact of policy development by the judiciary. Put simply, the more influence the public has over the retention of judges or the amendment of state constitutions, the less likely that courts will rule for minorities or that such rulings will survive. He separates the process into three stages: initiation, when litigants press cases and courts rule; legitimation, when the public weighs the rulings; and endurance, when opponents may try to undo decisions. This division reflects the complexity of the process, and it allows Hume to test whether different variables affect each phase differently.

Two general flaws may distract the reader. One is that while the subtitle labels same-sex marriage an issue of minority rights, Hume most often refers to it as "morality policy," comparable to abortion. While minority rights and morality policy overlap, they are not the same, and he should have made an explicit argument for the kind of issue that he believes marriage equality to be. In addition, he devotes nearly 20% of the book to recounting the fight

for marriage equality in the United States, but he does not relate it to his theory. This narrative is interesting, but the historical information could have been used more analytically, to further test his important findings.

In the most thorough chapter, Hume determines factors central to the initiation of judge-led policy. He first compares the 12 states whose high courts have decided marriage cases, focusing on the permissiveness of judicial institutions—those where judges are relatively insulated from voters and whose constitutions are older and include equal-rights amendments—and the liberalism of the state's political environment. All courts in permissive and liberal states ruled for same-sex marriage or civil unions, while only some in states with semipermissive institutions and moderate political cultures did so. Courts in conservative states or those with restrictive features ruled against.

In another test, Hume identifies the key variables influencing whether activists introduce cases into a state judiciary and whether judges rule for same-sex marriage. He shows that the ideology of a state's residents and its institutions, and the reputation and the ideology of the high court, correlate with the introduction of lawsuits. However, resident and institutional ideologies do not correlate with rulings in favor of marriage equality. Instead, such positive decisions are driven not only by the court's ideology and reputation but also by whether residents are prevented from voting for judges. Unfortunately, these tests exclude most states—those that have had no marriage cases. While there are questions as to how effectively we can study nondecisions, it would be useful to identify factors that are likely to deter potential litigants. This could be done with a combination of quantitative data and activists' interviews or memoirs. Still, the findings back up Hume's overall argument.

The author does provide one finding that is both illuminating and contrary to his state-level focus. The first court decisions were made by unelected judges, while states with elected judges received cases later—and in those states, the first three courts to get cases ruled against equality, while the next two ruled in favor. But he does not integrate the implications of this apparent cross-state influence into his theoretical framework.

The two succeeding chapters demonstrate that different combinations of these variables are in play during the legitimation and endurance phases. To demonstrate the effect of democratization on legitimation, Hume creates a series of tests, including a survey experiment, to measure people's trust in state institutions. His most important finding is that residents of states where voters elect judges are less likely to accept court rulings on morality policies than are those of states where judges are more insulated. Residents who elect the judiciary see judges as no better than other politicians.

One weakness of the argument is that Hume's tests on legitimation are hypothetical, excluding people from states