

the second instance, a rejection is made without explicit discussion of BIC.

My own research into the meaning of a BIC score found, on page 139 of the 1995 Raftery article, that a BIC difference of 0–2 indicates only weak evidence of any improvement in fit. A difference of 2–6 is considered positive evidence of an improvement, and a difference of 6–10 is considered strong evidence. Hence, the authors implicitly reject theoretical concerns in model selections, which directly contravenes the admonition in Raftery's 1995 article: "Statistical methods for model selection and accounting for model selection should be used only to address issues left unresolved by theory. Bayesian model selection is not an all-purpose panacea: strong theory, clear conceptualization and careful measurement remain vital for successful social research" (p. 157).

**America's Congress: Actions in the Public Sphere, James Madison through Newt Gingrich.** By David R. Mayhew. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000. 257p. \$30.00.

Sarah A. Binder, *George Washington University and The Brookings Institution*

*America's Congress* is a deceptively simple work. At its most basic, it is an exploration of the public moves of members of Congress over the course of American history. With a newly built database of 2,304 observations of members' publicly noted moves stretching back to 1789, Mayhew offers an innovative portrait of how and when American legislators have made their mark on the public record, as recorded by eminent historians of the middle to late twentieth century.

What makes this a deceptively simple work? Mayhew's aim and effect in writing *America's Congress* go far beyond his perceptive reading of the fascinating patterns uncovered. Instead, the book is really a call for a new way of studying Congress and legislative politics more generally. It is a commentary, Mayhew says, on political scientists' treatment of Congress, and it is an appeal to legislative scholars to rethink the dominant modes and methods by which they typically approach the task of explaining legislative behavior and outcomes. To understand how *America's Congress* makes this contribution, a more detailed exploration of Mayhew's mode and methods of inquiry is in order.

Mayhew explores the sorts of actions by members of Congress that "register in the collective public consciousness" (p. 10). He argues that by definition such actions should be considered consequential or at least potentially so, given their notice by politically aware citizens at the time. For Mayhew, these bits of publicly noticed action make up the stuff of public affairs, the central bits of political life in a democratic system. This approach to studying politics is akin, Mayhew states, to studying economics by exploring the public moves of Bill Gates and George Soros, a decidedly "supply-side account" (p. 25) of legislative politics not usually found in studies of Congress. It is an approach that encourages an historical perspective on Congress and its members, as Mayhew asks not only what sorts of public actions are undertaken by members but also in what mix and with what consequence for national politics and institutions over time. As he points out, scholars more typically rely on roll call votes to characterize members' historical modes of behavior, but such data fail to capture the richer mix of legislative behavior that occurs over time and that has a claim to being politically consequential.

The method for recording members' public moves bears a family resemblance to the well-known and pioneering method Mayhew used in *Divided We Govern* (1991) to

uncover landmark legislation enacted in the last half of the twentieth century. In *America's Congress*, he combs nearly forty general and era-specific histories of the United States written since 1950 to cull from their indices and texts which legislators have been noticed, when in their careers such notice takes place, and for what sorts of actions they are noticed. Mayhew appropriately showers readers with the richness of the mix of actions recorded, including Henry Clay's maneuvering to craft the Compromise of 1850, Preston Brooks's caning of Charles Sumner on the Senate floor in 1856, and Edward Kennedy's leadership of the fight against Robert Bork's nomination to the Supreme Court in 1987.

This is a methodological undertaking that will inspire awe in even the most hardy coder of legislative politics, and the result is an incredibly rich database that records in intricate detail the precursor moves to critical outcomes and junctures in America's national political life. Mayhew explicitly and honestly recognizes some of the drawbacks to his method, noting, for instance, some examples of conspicuously missing actions from the historical texts. The method may still generate some controversy, however. One might argue that legislators can make politically consequential moves without public or historical notice, and not all publicly noticed actions are necessarily consequential; such concerns could raise questions about the sorts of biases that may have worked their way into the data.

Any such weakness aside, Mayhew uncovers a treasure-trove of patterns in legislative life. One of the most striking observations is that less than half of members' public moves are directly related to passing legislation. "Taking stands" is an equally prominent mode of behavior and more often than not does not explicitly entail legislative action, such as the caning of Sumner for his antislavery views or former House Speaker Tip O'Neill's emergence as the chief Democratic spokesman against President Reagan and congressional Republicans in the 1980s. Such "oppositional" behavior is, Mayhew detects, a central mode of legislative life, a mode that comes predominantly from within the congressional majority party and that has been central to the formation of new parties throughout the course of American political life.

Mayhew's skillful reading of the data also leads him to important conclusions about the institutions of Congress and the presidency. The author draws a convincing portrait in chapter 4 that suggests the House, Senate, and presidency have become democratized over American history and at the same time have grown distinct and equal in influence and legitimacy. Mayhew's ability to detect and explain broad patterns in the evolution of the separation of powers is among the central and innovative contributions of this work.

Mayhew notes at the outset that the book is more an "exploration of the territory rather than a causal analysis" (p. 28). I think he understates the contribution of his work. By focusing on legislators' moves rather than, say, roll call votes, Mayhew makes a real theoretical innovation: He treats members of Congress as cue givers rather than cue takers. Taking gentle aim at legions of legislative scholars who have viewed legislators' policy preferences as exogenously given, Mayhew argues that legislative life is as much about opinion formation as it is about opinion expression (p. 18). That is why focusing on America's public sphere is such an important move theoretically: It forces students of American politics to look explicitly at the realm in which public opinion is molded and cast by legislators and political leaders. If members were simply cue takers, the public sphere would be unimportant. But if politics is also, as Mayhew argues, about the formation of public and elite preferences, then ignoring the sphere of

opinion formation comes at significant theoretical and analytical cost.

Each of Mayhew's books sets an incredibly high standard for the ones that follow. *Congress: The Electoral Connection* (1974) reoriented the study of Congress, and *Divided We Govern* (1991) transformed debates about the effect of divided government. Mayhew's theoretical ambitions in *America's Congress*, matched with his methodological and empirical contributions, have the potential to redefine once again how students of Congress go about the business of exploring and explaining legislative politics.

**Dividing Citizens: Gender and Federalism in New Deal Public Policy.** By Suzanne Mettler. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998. 239p. \$52.50 cloth, \$18.95 paper.

Virginia Sapiro, *University of Wisconsin, Madison*

*Dividing Citizens* is an important contribution both to the burgeoning literature on the historical development of the American state and citizenship and to the lively field of work on gender within that corpus. Like the best studies of this sort, Mettler's book ably demonstrates not only how the transforming institutions and practices affected women but also how gender norms and practices were built into the new structures, making gender a basic element of their architecture.

The author's main task is to explore how governmental institutions create and affect citizenship, especially social citizenship, and the degree to which this citizenship is gender based. Starting with the premise that citizenship "is fundamentally a relationship between citizens and government" (p. 8), Mettler believes that it is imperative to explore "how public policies and institutional arrangements organize the citizenry and shape the meaning and character of citizenship" (p. 9). She emphasizes three means by which institutions and policy do this: defining membership of the citizenry, for example, through naturalization and immigration; shaping participation, for example, by underscoring their existence as either rights bearing or dependent; and incorporation, "the manner and extent to which people are included, consolidated, and organized as members of the political community" (p. 9).

Mettler takes as her framework the period of dramatic state reorganization that characterized the New Deal. Following in part the urging of Judith Shklar that we look at incorporation and standing in the polity, especially of those who are marginal to it, Mettler considers the effect of policy and institutional change on "social citizenship." She focuses on the formation and implementation of three policies: old age insurance and assistance, unemployment insurance and aid to dependent children, and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

The author's conclusion, in its briefest form, is that through these New Deal policies as they were both developed and implemented, men—white men in particular—were increasingly incorporated into a national citizenship, whereas men of marginalized races and women were linked to the national polity in a much more fragmented and contingent relationship because they were the subjects of public policies that bolstered administrative autonomy for individual states in the federal system. Mettler's policy history recounts a story of the New Deal struggle against the national allergy to substantive rights and its expansion of social citizenship. It demonstrates the degree to which white men were the major beneficiaries of social citizenship at the national level; women

and nonwhite men were substantially left behind in the world of the sick chicken.

Mettler argues that these gender and race differences resulted only partly and occasionally from the conscious will of the primary policy agents to treat people differently on the basis of gender or race. Indeed, the differences were only partly and occasionally caused by nonconscious sexist and racist assumptions embedded in policy deliberation. Instead, she points to the unanticipated consequences of institutional arrangements and political imperatives that shaped policy-making. Of course, although racist or sexist outcomes may not have been anticipated or intended, policy agents certainly tended to tolerate them once they appeared.

Mettler works with two contingent conceptions of citizenship incorporation. The first might be called citizenship categorization, the result of such policies as inheritance, immigration, and naturalization. The second, social citizenship, leads us to ask, assuming one is categorically defined as a citizen, about the nature of the relationship between the citizen and the polity in terms of rights, duties, and welfare. Social citizenship defines the basic quality of life guaranteed to members of the polity. Clearly, polities differ among themselves and across time in the degree to which any notion of social citizenship is embedded in their political culture or public policy. T. H. Marshall's work likely would not have been written by an American.

The book's focus on the effect of these New Deal policy struggles and decisions on the gender- and race-based development of social citizenship is a fascinating and important story that goes beyond the notion of the "two tracks" of welfare so ubiquitous in the gender and state literature. The particular federalism of these policies did not just place different requirements and thus provision outcomes on women and men; it created different versions of social citizenship.

A third and crucial conception of citizenship is touched on by Mettler with tantalizing brevity. This is the more classic question of political citizenship, the active, deliberative component whereby citizens stand as the ultimate source of authority and will in a democracy. She is, of course, primarily interested in the effect of the New Deal on social citizenship, but she also recognizes the possible influence of categorical and social citizenship on the political.

It is conventional to consider the consequences of political citizenship for social citizenship, for example, by asking how citizens use their political rights to pursue policies in their interest. But we can explore the consequences of how people are socially incorporated into the polity for how they are constructed as political citizens. Indeed, some New Deal institutional arrangements explicitly created active and deliberative roles for political citizens, notably in agricultural policymaking and implementation. Social citizenship must affect the political interests on which we might act; it must shape our relationship to the political system, our orientations toward it, our perceptions of it, our assessment of what options for activity and influence are open to us. Surely, it must in some way shape those aspects of our political subjectivity—identity, consciousness, attitudes, perceptions—that help determine whether and how we are active as citizens and whether and how others will accept our activity as citizens.

Suzanne Mettler's attention to the consequences of state development for citizenship marks a unique contribution. It also points to a very slight weakness, but one that renders this book no less valuable in understanding American political development. Lucky for us: *Dividing Citizens* is a benchmark