

The second set of chapters focuses especially on Bush's political personality, the organization of the White House, and the uses to which intelligence was put, especially in the run-up to the war in Iraq. The critiques are familiar—a president of notable certainty in his beliefs and unwillingness to consider second thoughts, a White House organized for action rather than review, and selective uses of intelligence designed to bolster preconceived ideas rather than to reassess them.

Among the third set of chapters, Blinder's stands out as an innovative effort to reexamine the power of presidents to rhetorically frame issues and prime audiences by "going public," as Bush did so successfully in the run-up to the midterm election of 2002, invoking anxiety among the public and thus pressuring congressional Democrats to vote on a war resolution. Blinder might have noted that such priming by Bush was only partially responsible for the submission of congressional Democrats, many of whom were chastened by their previous opposition to the 1991 Gulf War, and who thus felt compelled to support Bush's Iraq War in order for Democrats to regain credibility as a party "strong" on national security. In a similar vein, Kumar's chapter analyzes the Bush administration's vaunted communications team, arguing that while it was effective in putting out the president's message, it was ill-equipped to play defense and to adjust to adverse situations.

In the final section, Jones invites us to view possibilities for presidential leadership from the vantage point of Congress rather than the president. From this perspective, while Bush no doubt succeeded in mobilizing a compliant Republican Congress to accomplish much during his first term, the Senate's nonmajoritarian rules often impeded Bush's presidential appointments and his policy agenda, as it earlier had that of Newt Gingrich's Contract with America. And during his second term, Bush's misreading of his political resources, and his pressing of issues that lacked consensus even within his own party, led to more pronounced congressional constraints on presidential power, culminating in a change of party control in 2006. Ross also highlights the limits of Bush's power. Detailing the fecklessness of his efforts to alter Social Security in the aftermath of his 2004 reelection, Ross claims that Bush had little, if any, chance to make an appreciable dent in a program that had much popular support and indeed represented an entrenched "policy regime."

Each of these three books, in its own fashion, deals with the interplay of history, political context, and presidential personality. Surely, from the vantage point of political science, the political context of a presidency must be regarded as primary. At the same time, presidential leadership styles interact with these settings and sometimes influence them, rather than merely being determined by them. Leadership styles, among other things, powerfully dictate how presidents decide. And how presidents make decisions is likely the single most important aspect of the

presidency. Furthermore, given the role of presidents in U.S. politics and the preeminent role of America in the politics of the world, the question of U.S. presidential leadership styles is sure to remain a topic of great interest far beyond the confines of the study of American politics.

**A Nation of Emigrants: How Mexico Manages Its Migration.** By David Fitzgerald. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009. 234p. \$55.00 cloth, \$21.95 paper.

**Citizenship Across Borders: The Political Transnationalism of *El Migrante*.** By Michael Peter Smith and Matt Bakker. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008. 242p. \$59.95 cloth, \$19.95 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592709990971

— Ronald Schmidt, Sr., *California State University, Long Beach*

International migration is increasingly recognized as posing a host of challenges to traditional understandings of political life. Both of these books provide solid information, as well as insightful analysis, on partially overlapping aspects of this complex and multifaceted subject. Both are well worth reading, even though both books do operate within the constraints of an ethnographic approach to social science, which limits our ability to gauge the wider significance of the research subjects' experiences.

The focus of Michael Peter Smith and Matt Bakker's *Citizenship Across Borders* is on the emerging phenomenon of "transnational citizenship" among Mexican emigrants living in the United States. The narrative and analysis are based on in-depth case studies—drawn from transnational ethnographic fieldwork in both California and several Mexican states—of five Mexican emigrants living in California (and, sometimes, back in Mexico) who have developed active political roles in both countries and in relation to both countries' political institutions.

The analysis is both deeply thoughtful and rich with insight, in part because of the complex and nuanced—yet tightly integrated—theoretical and empirical frames that structure the work. The book also benefits from a mature and extensive understanding of the histories and politics of both countries, as well as of the neoliberal project of globalization that has played such an important role in both countries (separately and in relationship) in recent decades. The result is an unusually valuable work that weaves together, and articulates clearly, the micropolitics and macropolitics in an evolving and dynamic transnational setting. The book's complexity, however, makes any effort to summarize it in the space available here seem deeply problematic.

In brief, nevertheless, Smith and Bakker situate their subjects' political lives in relation to four distinct but overlapping contexts—political-economic, historical, sociocultural, and institutional—that inform and constrain their exercises of citizenship in both the United States and Mexico. The titles of the book's four parts convey some sense

of the subject matters explored. Part I (“Setting the Stage”) contains chapters situating the book in relation to the scholarly discourse on transnational citizenship and the Mexican state’s evolving policy discourse on emigrants (from oppositional and disparaging to solicitous and supportive). Part II (“The Politics of Transnational Community Development”) contains two chapters focused on the case study subjects’ efforts to provide material help (via remittances) to their communities of origin through hometown associations (HTAs) based in several parts of California, and working in conjunction with the policies of two Mexican states (Guanajuato and Jalisco) that aim to channel these remittances away from family-centered support and traditional community development toward neoliberal investment projects aimed at integrating these communities into the global economy. This part of the analysis contains nuanced discussions of the evolving party competition emerging in Mexico at both the state and federal levels, and its interactions with the micropolitics of transnational citizenship in a context of neoliberal globalization.

Part III (“*El Migrante* as Transnational Citizen”) begins with an in-depth case study of the convoluted but ultimately successful efforts of a northern California rancher and entrepreneur—a naturalized U.S. citizen—to gain election as the municipal president in his hometown of Jerez, Zacatecas, and later to higher office. Another chapter contains several in-depth case studies examining and interpreting the legal and political struggles to create “institutional spaces” for transnational citizenship in both the United States and Mexico. Part IV (“Two Faces of Transnational Citizenship: Migrant Activists Recross the Border”) finally contains a chapter exploring the participation of these transnational citizens in *U.S. politics*, and a concluding chapter that deftly summarizes and interprets the meaning of the complex and multifaceted stories that make up the book, as well as their implications for the future of politics in both countries.

The primary finding of the book, I think, is that both nationalists (U.S. and Mexican) and “postnationalists” are wrong in their assessments of transnational citizenship. Rather than undermining national loyalties or moving “beyond” national loyalties, the subjects studied in this book have found ways to be engaged *political agents* in two countries, caring enough about the countries’ politics and collective well-being to devote considerable resources to them through political action. As noted, this book is very well done, and makes an important contribution to the literatures of U.S. immigrant incorporation and transnational citizenship studies. My one criticism here is that the book would have benefited from a more developed concept of citizenship. The phrase at the heart of this work is *transnational citizenship*, and the first word in this phrase receives considerable conceptual development and theoretical attention, while the latter word—*citizenship*—is underdeveloped conceptually and contextually.

David Fitzgerald’s *A Nation of Emigrants* is organized around a different central question: How has the Mexican state attempted to “manage” its migration, most of which has involved a long-term pattern of emigration to the United States? The theoretical focus of the book is state building, and the author wants to contribute to the contemporary discourse on whether the Westphalian nation-state system is in decline. His answer to this question is a resounding “No!”—a response to which I return later.

Organized into seven chapters, Fitzgerald’s book provides the theoretical orientation noted: a history of the evolution of Mexico’s policies toward emigrants, an institutional analysis of the (substantial) impact of Mexico’s federal system on its efforts to manage migration, an analysis of both domestic and U.S.-based HTAs in Mexico’s efforts to manage its emigrants, and a thoughtful discussion of the ambivalence of Mexico’s elites toward its emigrants. The conclusion provides a useful summary of the various policy instruments that Mexican leaders have used in their efforts to manage emigration. The fieldwork was centered mainly in the Arandas area of the state of Jalisco.

The book makes two important contributions for U.S. scholars interested in the political implications of Mexican migration. First, its Mexican point of view provides a useful counterbalance to the massive literature on immigration that treats this subject only from the viewpoint of the United States. And second, Fitzgerald includes an interesting chapter on the Mexican Roman Catholic Church’s efforts to manage Mexican emigration to the United States, claiming that Mexican political elites have come to emulate these efforts in recent decades. The key insight here is that the church discovered earlier than did state agents that it is impossible to stop Mexican migration to the North, and that they would do better by trying to minister to emigrants living in the United States through the development of organizational, financial, and ideological ties designed to maintain their loyalty and commitment to Mexico, despite their physical absence. Politically, this leads Fitzgerald to suggest that Mexico has subsequently developed a kind of “citizenship a la carte” for its U.S.-based emigrants, as a way of trying to encourage and manage their ongoing relationship with their home country.

Despite the wealth of good information and insight, this book does have some weaknesses. Most important, its analysis of the larger theoretical question in respect to which the book is framed is both weak and unconvincing. As noted, Fitzgerald wants it to contribute to the discussion of the viability of the Westphalian nation-state in an era of globalization and massive migration. His conclusion claims that “the Westphalian system of nation-states is not in decline. In fact, it is so robust even when confronted by mass international migration that it has shaped a new social contract between emigrants and their home country that I call citizenship a la carte” (p. 154).

The central problem with the analysis purporting to support this assertion is that Fitzgerald seems to describe as an empirical model what is, in fact, a Weberian *ideal-type*. The “Westphalian system of nation-states,” describing a world divided into separate territories controlled by *sovereign states* that exercise independent *national* wills in relation to each other, has never existed in the real world. Thus, to say that this system continues to be “robust” is to claim to answer the wrong question. The book provides a great deal of good information in response to a better question, which is about how political elites attempt to build such (Westphalian) states by trying to maintain control of their territories and the people who “belong” to them, in part by trying to construct and maintain a sense of national identity in a population that will view those elites as best suited to lead them. Fitzgerald provides countless examples of the challenges to Mexico’s political elites as they have tried—mostly unsuccessfully—to manage emigration in the face of incomplete domestic control over their own territory (via, e.g., rebellion, the operation of the country’s federal system), but even more so in the face of the hegemonic power of the United States. The book would have been more nuanced, and accurate, had the author framed his state-building theoretical analysis in this constructivist way, rather than in terms of whether the actions of a given (relatively weak) state in fact demonstrate the robustness of the Westphalian system of nation-states.

Even this revision would leave an unduly narrow focus, however, in that it views political agency as primarily belonging to state agents, while the rest of the population is a “mass” to be managed. In part, this may derive from Fitzgerald’s Weberian assumption that politics can be understood exclusively in terms of domination. This unstated assumption leaves him free to focus on elites’ efforts to control and manage their populations, both domestic and emigrant. But, with few exceptions, it also leads him to mostly ignore the perspectives, and the real voices, of those who are on the receiving end of these managerial efforts. What is lost in such a narrow perspective is made evident by a reading of the Smith and Bakker book.

**Government by Contract: Outsourcing and American Democracy.** Edited by Jody Freeman and Martha Minow.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009. 552p. \$49.95.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592709991459

— Trevor L. Brown, *The Ohio State University*

The pace and scale of public sector contracting, at least at the federal level in the United States, has significantly increased and expanded at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Government by Contract*, an edited volume of essays on the use of exchanges between government agencies and private firms, nonprofits, or public organizations to provide public services, charts this growth and explores the

evolution of an increasingly complex service delivery landscape. The editors—Jody Freeman and Martha Minow—have brought together an impressive group of scholars (some with practitioner experience) to wrestle with the challenges posed by the expansion of outsourcing. The result is both timely and weighty. Given that the current Obama administration has placed federal contracting reform at the top of its management agenda, the opportunity is presented for this volume to contribute to an ongoing dialogue about how best to deliver public services.

Public sector contract reformers would be well served to read this book, not because it provides answers to vexing technical questions (e.g., are fixed price contracts preferable to cost-plus?) but because, in total, the contributors frame important trade-offs around the fundamental choices in contracted service delivery. On the one side are public law concerns about transparency, accountability, and fairness under contracted service delivery. On the other side are performance considerations—contracting may lower costs, improve performance, and speed service delivery. These two perspectives are not mutually exclusive (nor are they exhaustive—there are other concerns in contracted service delivery), but in many cases, efforts to address public law concerns may diminish performance or vice versa.

At its core, the volume is born of a public law critique of the current state of affairs in government service delivery. Many of the contributors are legal scholars concerned that contracting’s recent rapid growth, in large part driven by the expansion of defense contracting through the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, has come at the expense of inherent democratic values. In their opening chapter Freeman and Minow summarize this apprehension: “The primary concern, voiced in recent years by critics in public policy circles and in academia, is that the ubiquity of governance-by-private-contractors strikingly outstrips our legal and political capacities of oversight meant to ensure that the contractors’ execution of these governmental functions complies with democratic norms” (p. 2).

At the same time that the editors highlight the public law critique, they are to be credited with opening the debate to those whose concerns are perhaps more prosaic, but no less important. Some of the authors focus more on the programmatic goals of contracting—the trinity of cost efficiency, improved performance and innovation, and faster, more flexible service delivery. Freeman and Minow do more than simply bring together scholars with opposing viewpoints. They provide a structure that effectively guides the reader through the important trade-offs between public law considerations and contracting’s programmatic goals. Unlike some edited volumes that utilize a particular conceptual framework to outline each contribution and bring coherency to the project, this volume benefits from the sequential structuring of the contributions. Freeman and Minow’s overarching impact is on the effective organization of the volume.