A Nation of Immigrants. By Susan F. Martin. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 344p. $85.00 cloth, $28.99 paper.

Americans in Waiting: The Lost Story of Immigration and Citizenship in the United States. By Hiroshi Motomura. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. 256p. $24.99.
doi:10.1017/S1537592711003306

— Rodney E. Hero, *University of California, Berkeley*

Immigration's enduring importance as both a defining feature of, and policy concern in, American politics and society is apparent in a host of ways. One such manifestation is the large volume of research on the topic, scholarship to which political scientists and (political) sociologists have been substantial contributors. Political scientists have examined immigration issues from an array of vantage points including, but not limited to, public policy, American political development, international relations, race/ethnicity, and political theory—and numerous variations and intersections thereof. Several other disciplines have likewise given much attention and provided significant insights on immigration policies' many social and political dimensions. Alone and taken together, the books reviewed here, *A Nation of Immigrants* by Susan F. Martin and *Americans in Waiting* by Hiroshi Motomura, provide compelling accounts of American immigration policy that should be of interest to social scientists and many others.

Despite the large body of existing scholarship, both books add to our understanding with unique framing and empirical angles on a range of questions. Although the two differ in a number of ways, they broadly share some thematic similarities and empirical approaches. Each provides an overarching conceptual framework, and each framework has three categories, which in turn guide and are woven through historical accounts. While distinctive, the core concepts across the two books seem to me to be rather compatible and reflect roughly similar theoretical dispositions and normative stances. Both authors are careful to emphasize that there is frequent blending and ebb and flow of the three viewpoints they delineate; and each author is clearly inclined toward one of the three perspectives they identify as the more socially desirable. Structured chronologically to a great degree, and covering some overlapping ground, the starting (and end) points differ in each book, and the organization, degree of emphasis on, and the specific focus across and within, eras and events varies, as we would certainly expect. Moreover, both consider a wide range of policies and policy dimensions and specific issues therein. Both are methodical, even meticulous, and both bring a balance of "the forest and the trees" as they seek to explain the remarkably complex and intricate issues entailed in American immigration policy(ies) and its evolution. Interesting as well is that both authors mention that their own family history has been shaped by American immigration policy, which appears to inform and enrich their expositions.

Martin's historical starting point is the early colonial period; she argues (roughly similar to Lawrence H. Fuchs, *The American Kaleidoscope: Race, Ethnicity and the Civic Culture,* 1990) that the forms and development of three original colonies each established and embodied "models," or archetypes, of orientations and attitudes toward the reception of immigrants, with major consequence for how the immigrants were treated. The three colonies and associated models emerged in Virginia, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania and have resonated in American views and dispositions ever since. Hence, the colonial and preconstitutional period had profound implications by infusing different sets of ideas in their formative periods, and Martin extends the argument, demonstrating how all three views have influenced American immigration policy to varying degrees across and within historical periods. The Virginia model reflected economic and social relations characterized by force and hierarchy as seen in the use of slaves, convict laborers, and indentured servants, who were perceived by dominant groups "as supplying expendable and exploitable labor" (p. 3). That orientation was echoed in, for example, the "*bracero*' guest worker" program, among several other policies. On the other hand, Massachusetts represented a model of a colony established for "coreligionists who shared Puritan theology and values,"; a tendency was to "welcome the true believer but to exclude, and in certain cases, expel or even kill those whose views challenged the conventional wisdom" (p. 3). Exclusion or the treatment of immigrants on the basis of their beliefs and ideology, such as the "red scare," are later manifestations of that model. While the establishment of Pennsylvania was also motivated by religion, there was an openness to "new ideas about religious tolerance and diversity" that made this colony pluralistic and "one of the most diverse in religion, language and culture" (p. 3). The 1965 to early 1990s period in American immigration history is a leading latter-day example of the Pennsylvania model.

Martin commences with a detailed discussion of the "founding" and the "peopling" of each of the three colonies, along with descriptions of numerous specific events and developments that reinforced or otherwise shaped the prevailing dispositions (Chapters 2, 3, and 4). From that foundation, she analyzes eight major periods of American history through the lens of immigration history (Chapters 5–12), devoting a chapter to each era; she ends with the very recent past (approximately 2009–10). These chapters begin, and conclude, with the author noting the nature and extent of the influence of the ideas associated with the three models in each period. At times I thought these summary comments and claims were too brief and wished they had been developed and justified further; they certainly seem plausible but some elaboration would have been useful. Martin effectively uses the three models as analytical devices and also considers their normative implications. She also makes clear her own preference for the Pennsylvania model because she considers it most supportive of American values of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592711003306 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pluralism. Her concluding chapter "looks ahead" and, as part of that focus, "sets out an agenda for restoring the Pennsylvania model," which is favored because it underscores the treatment of "newcomers as presumptive citizens" (pp. 287–8). Martin's reference to immigrants as "presumptive citizens" and as "proto-citizens" (p. 219) is strikingly similar to core concepts in Motomura's analysis.

In his intellectually creative and thoughtful book, Motomura argues that there have been several schools of thought about immigration. The leading one from the founding through much of the nineteenth century, though less influential and often overshadowed in later periods, is the idea of "immigration as transition," that is, treating lawful immigrants as "future" or "intending citizens," as "Americans in waiting as if they would eventually become citizens [which] thus confers on immigrants a *presumed equality*" (pp. 8–9; original emphasis)—though not full equality until citizenship is actually attained. Immigration as transition has been substantially eclipsed by two other perspectives, "immigration as contract" and "immigration as affiliation." The core idea of the former is a kind of legalistic, exchange orientation, "a set of expectations and understandings that newcomers have of their new country, and their new country has of newcomers." But this lacks perspective and substantive depth and, furthermore, "it is a model of *unequal justice* that turns not on conferring equality itself, but on giving notice and protecting expectations" (p. 10; original emphasis). Immigration as affiliation stresses that "the treatment of lawful immigrants and other non-citizens should depend on the ties they have formed in this country." By being in the country longer and becoming more enmeshed in the "fabric of American life an '*earned*' equality is or can be achieved" (pp. 10–1; original emphasis).

Immigration as transition was predominant in the period during which there were relatively few federal (national) government laws. Notably, the decline of "immigration as transition" as the prevailing outlook coincided roughly with the changing composition of immigrants, such as when Chinese and southern and eastern European immigration increased. Motomura delineates and assesses the influences of the several ideas over time, with emphasis on the emergence of immigration as contract and as affiliation, primarily as those are revealed in legal decisions. A large number of court cases are examined, and he highlights the reasoning expressed in majority and dissenting opinions in terms of their rationale as those are grounded in, and also further, one or another school of thought. Discussing one case often requires also discussing others because decisions frequently refer to previous decisions as precedent or, alternatively, distinguish precedent. Also frequently evident in these cases is federal courts reviewing state policies and court decisions. There is, thus, acknowledgment of the role of federalism in this policy arena, which is also implicit in Martin's discussion of the several models that originated in the colonies, and the states.

Motomura considers each of the schools of thought with regard to a host of policy questions. For example, the implications of what immigration as transition means for matters such as access to public education, welfare, and health policies (and in comparison with the other perspectives) are extensively explored. He thus provides a thorough consideration of political, practical, and normative implications of each tradition. The author's various insights are compelling, and one wishes that he would have extended them further to (at least) speculate on the implications (if any) of his ideas for undocumented or "illegal" immigration, although this is understandably beyond the purview of his already wide-ranging inquiry.

Much as Martin expresses her preference for the Pennsylvania model, Motomura clearly comes down on the side immigration as transition. Both of their preferred visions have similar impulses and understandings of "equality." Though they arrive at broadly similar conclusions, and travel somewhat similar paths, the differences along the way are sufficiently distinctive that both warrant reading. And Martin's and Motomura's analyses dovetail nicely with and complement other major works on American immigration policy.

Daniel J. Tichenor's (2002) important book, *Dividing Lines,* with its categorization of perspectives on immigration as resulting from more "expansive" or "restrictive" views of a) the *admissions* of immigrants and b) the *treatment* or privileges granted (or not) to immigrants once they are admitted, is interesting to compare and contrast with Martin's and Motomura's concepts and categories. Tichenor's categories of "cosmopolitan," "nationalist egalitarian," "free market expansionists," and "classic exclusion" convey ideas that readers might consider in order to see how, how much, and why the analyses of Tichenor, Martin, and Motomura "match up" and/or stand in juxtaposition to one another, and facilitate our ability to make sense of immigration policy.

Other scholarship in American political research also comes to mind in reading these several studies. The "multiple theoretical traditions" thesis, describing the (three) traditions of liberalism, civic republicanism, and hierarchy or (racial and class) inequality (see, e.g., Rogers M. Smith, *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History,* 1997) are suggested in both the Martin and Motomura accounts, though more directly so in the latter. Similarly, Martin's three "model" colonies very closely parallel Daniel Elazar's (*American Federalism: A View from the States,* 1966) "political culture" thesis of the American states. The Virginia model, and the southern states in general, is "traditionalistic"; Massachusetts is (or at least was) "moralistic," as are the upper New England states; and Pennsylvania (and the "middle colonies," later states) are "individualistic." Seen in this way, various ideas about

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592711003306 Published online by Cambridge University Press

immigration policy are part and parcel, or a subset, of American ideas more generally, as further influenced by evolving domestic interest configurations and shaped by the institutional structure of the American political system, as well as international factors. This is hardly surprising. (Neither of the two books under review references the multiple traditions thesis or political culture arguments.)

Yet Motomura's and Martin's well-crafted, innovative works offer unique perspectives for interpreting immigration in both historical and contemporary circumstances. At the same time, one wonders whether these and other conceptual frameworks and categories developed to this point can be directly or simply applied or extended to, and are adequate for fully understanding, newer, pressing issues, such as, say, illegal immigration, and as additional social forces, such as the ostensible implications of globalization, become more powerful.

In *Brown*'s Wake: Legacies of America's Educational Landmark. By Martha Minow. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010. 320p. $24.95.
doi:10.1017/S1537592711003318

— Gerald Rosenberg, *University of Chicago*

This book explores the challenges facing the United States in the twenty-first century in providing all public school students with equal opportunity to learn and succeed in life. In the heart of her book, Martha Minow explores the empirical evidence and debates over providing equal opportunity in public school education to a variety of groups. Chapter 2 explores the challenges to equal opportunity presented by immigrants, English-language learners, girls, and boys. In Chapter 3 she explores issues of disability, sexual orientation, religion, and economic class, while Chapter 4 examines the experiences of American Indians and Native Hawaiians, as well as debates about group rights. Chapter 5 examines the issue of school choice programs. There is also an introduction and three additional chapters. The introductory chapter focuses on the history of school desegregation litigation, starting with the founding of the NAACP and the changing goals of Civil Rights activists. Chapter 6 reviews literature on the benefits of diverse schools, and Chapter 7, which briefly examines similar debates about inclusivity in South Africa, Northern Ireland, and the Czech Republic, concludes the book.

An underlying theme in each of the chapters is "the struggle over whether equality is to be realized through integrated or separate settings" (p. 33). For each group of students, Minow explores the continuing tension between efforts to make students feel more comfortable and learn more effectively in schools separated by race, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and so on, and efforts to mak mainstream schools more accepting of and comfortable for students of diverse backgrounds. Sensitive to a variety of historical conditions and experiences, as well as present discrimination, Minow does not take a single position. While her preference is for inclusion (given historical experience), she repeats that "treating people the same who are different is not equal treatment" (p. 78). For example, in a particularly interesting discussion of single-sex education, she concludes that "[a]lthough it may help some students, single-sex education seems only acceptable when pursued on a voluntary basis; otherwise, it is too redolent of historic practices of exclusion" (p. 66). Similarly, in Chapter 4 on American Indians, Native Hawaiians, and group rights, the author asks, "[A]re distinct individuals or groups the proper unit of analysis and protection in the pursuit of equality?" (p. 96). Her answer is cautious: "Because of its association with state-backed discrimination, any government educational policy that separates students by identity . . . should be scoured for evidence that it actually promotes equal opportunity for each individual to have real success in life" (p. 108). This nuanced approach characterizes the book. Indeed, the epigraph of Chapter 4, from psychologist Mike Cole, can be seen as a summary of Minow's hesitancy to take a bright-line position on separate versus integrated settings: "People are not only exploited and oppressed in similar ways, they are exploited and oppressed in different and specific ways" (p. 96). Thus, her historically grounded concerns with separate schooling, combined with her sensitivity to empirical evidence, leave her open to the idea of separate schooling in some situations.

This is not to say that Minow lacks passion. The book is really about "enhancing social integration through schooling" (p. 139). She argues that integrated schools (along many dimensions) make important contributions to students' growth: "Besides boosting creativity, friendships, social and political equality, and real opportunities for academic excellence, inclusive schools can increase social capital" (p. 159). The crucial question for Minow is how best to accomplish these outcomes. It is interesting that she points to the schools run by the Defense Department for the children of military personnel around the world as promising examples (pp. 153–5). But she realizes the uniqueness of military culture. The challenge she sees is in organizing schools to create and support a more inclusive society. As she puts it, "[a]t stake is nothing less than the character of the society and the polity a generation hence" (p. 187).

It should be clear from this description that *In Brown's Wake* is more descriptive than prescriptive. It is thoughtful and nondogmatic, presenting a balanced consideration of evidence and arguments, rather than a brief for one approach. Although it is based entirely on secondary literature, it is thoroughly researched. Indeed, more than one-third of the book (106 pages) is taken up by the endnotes. Minow has no axe to grind other than her deep concern that the United States is failing to provide equal educational opportunity to all of its young people. Her

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592711003306 Published online by Cambridge University Press