

responds to the presidency unconsciously and emotionally, through what she terms “the logic of presidentialism” (p. 5), elevating the office to an undeserved status, and that this construct prevents individuals from recognizing the potential power of their own actions.

This book is strident and rhetorical in its tone. It proceeds from an overtly and unabashedly communitarian philosophy, holding that people should take responsibility for government decisions, especially in a system that professes to be “*by the people and for the people*” (p. 222, italics in original); that we have fallen far from that mark; and that we hold the possibility of reform in our own hands, if only we can recognize and mobilize the will to pursue it.

Nelson builds her argument by discussing in separate chapters (1) how we have mythologized presidents into superheroes, (2) how we have “shrunk” citizenship solely to the quadrennial act of voting, (3) how presidents have used wartime as the excuse to increase their powers well beyond what the Framers intended, (4) how the unitary executive and its use of unilateral “power tools” originated in a corporate model (p. 145), i.e., president as CEO, and (5) how the remedy for an overly powerful presidency must come from the people through “reimagining democracy as an open system” (p. 183), using the organizing and networking potential of technology and new forms of political empowerment.

Although Nelson makes reference to notable political science research, such as the work of Cronin, Genovese, Barber, Mayer, Kelley, Miroff, Neustadt, and Pious, there is other relevant scholarship that is overlooked, such as Greenstein, Rudalevige, Healy, and Savage. More significantly, however, there are no citations in a work that quotes extensively and that builds its argument from history and politics. It makes for unsatisfying reading, at least, to a political scientist, who has the reasonable expectation of appropriate citations. But that may be a consequence, perhaps, of approaching political arguments from a different discipline, that of American studies (still, it leaves one a bit suspicious when the author acknowledges that the book is dedicated to her mentor “who talked me out of a political science major” [p. 225]).

Both books, then, are critical of the current presidency, and both authors yearn for a return to an office whose occupant understands that it is only one part of a larger, more complex governmental system that expects compliance with constitutional principles. Matheson offers a more conventional route, suggesting simply that a president act with a respect for constitutionalism and for the principles of separation of powers and checks and balances, while Nelson promotes a more aggressive approach, arousing a civic engagement to employ activist tactics to advocate for a more direct form of self-government. The first strategy seems overly tame and insufficiently imaginative, and the second seems unduly idealistic. Both books appear to have

been completed just prior to the beginning of the Obama presidency. Neither author is likely to be satisfied completely with the changes that have come with this new administration, but one wonders if each might see some sliver of movement closer to each one’s vision.

Native Vote: American Indians, the Voting Rights Act, and the Right to Vote. By Daniel McCool, Susan M. Olson, and Jennifer L. Robinson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 246p. \$84.00 cloth, \$25.99 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592709990788

— Kevin Bruyneel, *Babson College*

Most scholarship on American Indian politics focuses on tribal sovereignty and its relationship to U.S. Indian policy. As a consequence, there are few studies that examine the direct participation of American Indians in U.S. electoral politics. In their book, Daniel McCool, Susan Olson, and Jennifer Robinson take on this task by analyzing the effort to secure American Indian voting rights, especially following the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act (VRA). In so doing, the authors make a vital contribution to the emerging political science scholarship on modern American Indian politics. Those who work in the fields of U.S. race and ethnicity politics and U.S. public law will also find *Native Vote* an important addition to their reading lists.

The book focuses more on the abridgment than the denial of the right to vote, but the authors do address the latter in Chapter 1. The 1924 Indian Citizenship Act made U.S. citizens of all Indians in the country, although by that time almost two-thirds had already become citizens. Leading up to 1924, however, the effort to gain citizenship and suffrage was not aided by calling upon the Constitutional guarantees of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. In *Elk v. Wilkins* (1884), the Supreme Court declared that the Fourteenth Amendment did not apply to Indians. And the authors note that the Fifteenth Amendment “had virtually no impact on the right of Indians to vote” (p. 5). We see here a theme that persists throughout the book: the complexity of U.S. race and ethnicity politics, in which American Indian and African American political struggles are both distinct and deeply intertwined. For example, as with African Americans, it was at the state level that American Indians felt the direct brunt of the effort to deny them the right to vote. Also, measures first created to address African American political inequality and disenfranchisement, such as the post-Civil War constitutional amendments and the VRA, have been utilized by American Indians, to mixed but improved results over time. In this way, the authors show the value of placing American Indian politics into the wider context and history of race and ethnicity politics in the United States.

Chapters 2 and 3 trace the development of the VRA and the range of Indian voting rights cases brought forth

since 1965. In looking at the cases, one sees that the most prevalent means of abridging American Indian voting rights are vote dilution, specifically via at-large electoral systems in multimember districts, and language barriers. The authors make it easy to track this abridgement by supplying a comprehensive table that chronologically lists and breaks down the legal issues, actors, case citations, and outcomes of all 74 Indian voting rights suits brought to this point in time (pp. 48–67). What becomes clear by this part of the book is the centrality of the courts to Indian voting rights politics. It is for this reason that I recommend the study to U.S. public law scholars, whether or not they have an immediate interest in American Indian or race and ethnicity politics, as they would likely have more disciplinary interest in the research and focus of the book than might those who study, say, social movements, political culture, or political behavior.

Chapters 4–6 are case studies of VRA litigations concerning, respectively, Navajos in Utah, the Assiniboine and Gros Ventre tribes of the Fort Belknap Reservation in Montana, and Lakota Sioux in South Dakota. Each chapter follows the same structure, providing historical background, the contemporary context, the details of the case, and finally the decision itself, which in each instance finds in favor of Indian voting rights. Read together, these cases demonstrate the variety of issues and resolutions that can be pursued through VRA litigation. What is also valuable here, especially for teaching, is that each chapter is a self-contained case, as all references to concepts and criteria mentioned in previous chapters are restated concisely and clearly. If I had one quibble, it is that while I appreciate the authors' aim of exploring the range of successful applications of the VRA, it would have been an interesting contrast to examine a case in which the decision went against Indian voting rights.

Although the book is not a study of the behavior of American Indian voters in U.S. elections, the final chapters argue that advances stemming from VRA litigation have been, in this regard, “profound for American Indians” (p. 173). Chapter 7 notes the rise in American Indian voter registration and turnout, the election of Indian representatives in newly created single-member districts, and the positive impact these representatives have had on public policy and Indian political efficacy. Finally, Chapter 8 traces the increasing bipartisan attention accorded “the Indian vote” in recent U.S. elections, noting that while American Indians tend to vote Democratic, they are not strongly identified with the party.

Taken as a whole, then, the authors' verdict is a positive one: American Indians are becoming more active and influential in U.S. elections, and thus “there are reasons for optimism” as it concerns their socioeconomic and political future (p. 194). The authors have done the research and work to make a case for this optimism and, while I highly recommend this book, I also recommend that teach-

ers and scholars place it into direct conversation with studies that look at the politics of tribal sovereignty. I am sure the authors would agree, as they take note of the fact that some American Indian political actors see a tension between participating in U.S. elections and maintaining their political commitment to tribal sovereignty. I agree with the authors that this is likely a false choice. American Indians have strong claims to both full participation in U.S. politics and the right to tribal sovereignty, and the two can work hand in hand, provided sovereignty remains the political priority for tribes. To this end, McCool, Olson, and Robinson's important study widens our vision of the complicated terrain of American Indian politics, as well as that of U.S. race and ethnicity politics. As such, *Native Vote* is sure to become required reading in these fields, and will be a welcome addition to many syllabi; I know it will be on mine.

The Problem of Jobs: Liberalism, Race, and Deindustrialization in Philadelphia. By Guian A. McKee. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008. 400p. \$39.00. doi:10.1017/S1537592709991290

— John Krinsky, *The City College of New York*

Optimism is the liberal's credo. Guian A. McKee's *The Problem of Jobs* is an exhaustively researched exposition of industrial retention, job training, job creation, and affirmative action efforts in postwar Philadelphia. It argues that, in spite of the enormous obstacles faced by liberals in and outside of city government, Philadelphians managed to come up with programs that mitigated the harmful effects of deindustrialization from the 1950s through the early 1980s. Yet these programs were not as effective as they might have been because liberals tended to treat the problems of economic and job development as distinct from that of racial justice. In showing concretely where these projects were and were not joined together, McKee ultimately comes down on the side of optimism and a defense of moderate liberalism, concluding that joining economic development and racial justice *is* possible within the framework of a globalizing capitalism. McKee—consistent with the current political moment—sees liberalism's hope in addressing persistent urban problems as resting on liberals' being motivated by a more activist left, but also being able to craft pragmatic solutions within the constraints of a conservative political culture.

The Problem of Jobs takes up six case studies in which liberals tried to develop jobs and to open up existing jobs to African Americans, from the victory of liberal Democratic reformers in 1951 through the 1980s: (1) the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation (PIDC), which, beginning in the 1950s, used federally tax-exempt municipal bonds to subsidize the redevelopment of factories in an effort to retain industry; (2) the civil rights leader Rev. Leon Sullivan's use of selective boycotts to force