analysis. The focus is required on this go-round to make the question tractable and the intellectual exercise a valuable one. Yet a more satisfying reconciliation of the conflicting expectations and consequences of participatory and deliberative democracy requires examining those personal networks as only one aspect of citizens' information environments. More specifically, how do citizens manage disagreement across different types of information contexts? While Mutz considers some of these alternatives in her concluding chapter, a more systematic consideration of how citizens' perceive, understand, and are affected by oppositional viewpoints as part of their complex, multilayered political and social lives would offer a stronger conclusion regarding the seemingly impossible tensions introduced by the requirements of deliberative and participatory democracy.

Jan E. Leighley
University of Arizona

The 50% American: Immigration and National Identity in an Age of Terror. By Stanley A. Renshon. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005. 273 pp.

Immigration Phobia and the Security Dilemma: Russia, Europe, and the United States. By Mikhail A. Alexseev. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 286 pp.

In the spring of 2006, thousands of illegal aliens, waving an array of foreign flags, staged marches in several U.S. cities, demanding that the United States grant them amnesty. The U.S. House had passed a broad enforcement-only bill based on a strategy of attrition—to tighten enforcement of immigration laws at the borders, ports of entry, the interior, the workplace, with state and local police doing routine duties. The U.S. Senate soon passed a bill complying with the marchers' demands, but the U.S. House of Representatives dug in its heels against legalization.

Also, the Senate, by a two-to-one vote, amended its immigration legislation making English the national language. Opinion polls showed overwhelming support for reducing immigration levels, solid opposition to amnesty, and 85% support for making English the official language of the United States. Meanwhile, intelligence agents in Great Britain, with the cooperation of U.S. and other Western security agencies, broke up an Islamist terrorist network and scheme—reminding the West of a continuing and serious security threat.

These occurrences illustrate the salience of the subjects of two recent books, *The 50% American* and *Immigration Phobia and the Security Dilemma*. While immigration to the United States, as well as to Europe, has increased and the

national origins of those immigrants have changed markedly, ties to nations themselves have weakened. For immigrants, ties to nations of origin have remained strong. Concepts such as citizenship, allegiance, and sovereignty have changed and been called into question by multiculturalists and globalists.

Adopting Theodore Roosevelt's famous phrase, *The 50% American* picks up the thread of inquiry that Harvard's Samuel Huntington has pursued about American identity. However, Stanley Renshon, a psychoanalyst and City University of New York political scientist, parts from Huntington's estimation of the national unity glue. "I agree with Samuel Huntington that our Anglo-Protestant culture is central to American national identity . . . ," Renshon writes. However, he believes American Christian culture, while foundational to national unity as it finds form in the American Creed, leaves room for moderate religions.

The real glue is the psychological force called patriotism. Renshon considers patriotism "the indispensable foundation of our attachments to each other and the institutions that form our national community" (p. xviii). Combined, the American Creed, individual psychological characteristics that facilitate attachment, and patriotism constitute an American national identity.

This fine scholarship, engagingly written and closely reasoned, notes the implications of mass immigration and the ability of more and more newcomers to retain their citizenship in the sending country. There is a threat to national identity as dual citizens seek to exercise rights in both countries. There also are serious ramifications of weak emotional attachments among a segment of citizens for national identity, national unity and survival, and national security in the age of terrorism.

The rise of dual citizenship poses significant challenges to a psychological, emotional attachment to the "national community, its institutions and practices, the people who constitute it, the psychology of its way of life, and the ideals for which it stands" (p. 59). The threats, Renshon says, come from several sources. Legal and illegal immigration to the United States has tripled in the past 35 years. Four-fifths of the immigrants arriving since 1961 come from dual-citizenship-allowing nations. Add the fact that most of the major sending countries—Mexico in particular—not only allow dual citizenship, they now aggressively encourage it. They also encourage the emotional attachment of their dual nationals. Renshon points to the ease of travel and communication in a shrinking world, which makes immigrants' ability to maintain such close home-country ties easier. Homegrown culture wars of the past several decades further eat away at the strength of national identity and national unity.

In terms of sustaining national community, *The 50% American* considers each of those factors, focusing on their psychological impact. For example, it is difficult enough for an individual to engage in one nation's civic life. Trying to split one's core political attachments with dual citizenship inevitably results in one's attempting to sustain two full involvements in two different cultures while maintaining equal loyalty and policing oneself against international conflicts of interest.

Beyond the severe psychological strains of "50% Americanism," Renshon compellingly cites the national security implications of having a large and growing segment of the population that holds weaker and weaker attachment to the nation at a time of increasing terrorist threat.

Immigration Phobia and the Security Dilemma is an ambitious work that ultimately falls short. Mikhail Alexseev, a political scientist at San Diego State University, and a Russian transplant and former journalist, brings together his exposure to and interest in three parts of the world: Russia, Europe, and the United States. *Immigration Phobia and the Security Dilemma* examines natives' perceptions of the impact of immigration on their nation and of the threat immigrants pose to their country.

"Security-dilemma theory" refers to "perceptual and behavioral implications of anarchy" (p. 33). Fear and hostility toward newcomers, fed by societal circumstances that indicate loss of control, order, and host-group status, mix with the natural "desire for self-preservation" (p. 33). This theory posits that the existence of migration can become associated with government impotence, or a sense of anarchy, if authorities seem unable to control the inflow. An escalating perception of migration's threat occurs, casting "uncertainty about the intention of migrants" and raising concerns whether foreigners harbor aggressive, subversive, or otherwise threatening motives in their migration. Natives' awareness of group differences builds as the foreign-born population increases. These distrustful perceptions create insecurity regarding the social and economic costs immigration imposes. As immigration goes on unchecked under these circumstances, a spiral effect results in policies to control migration and migrants' efforts to circumvent those controls. The "dilemma" occurs as a state's measures to increase security lead to less security.

The author examines public opinion data to gauge people's perspectives in three migration circumstances. First, the Russian Far East has experienced an influx of Chinese immigrants since the Cold War ended. Alexseev's security dilemma model accounted significantly for Russian threat perception and hostility toward Chinese immigrants. He suggests the perception of a government no longer able to enforce its borders, a concomitant spike in Chinese entry (legal and illegal) without corresponding Russian migration into China, stark differences in national demographic trends, and ambivalence toward the economic and cultural effects indicate that Russians exhibit "immigration phobia."

Second, in European Union nations, Europeans' "hostility" and threat perceptions are connected with immigration from the Middle East and Asia. This perspective has grown while nations have ceded sovereignty to the supranational EU and instances of fraud and abuse in the asylum program have risen. Public concerns relate, for example, to the failure of Muslim immigrants in France to assimilate. Alexseev finds a security-dilemma theory relationship at work, though his meanings of "assimilation" and "integration into the host countries" lack clarity.

Third, the U.S. case studied is the 1992 Los Angeles riots. Here, Alexseev takes his greatest leaps to try to fit this upheaval by black Americans against, among others, Korean immigrant merchants in South Central L.A. into his security-dilemma theory. The clear proximate cause of the 1992 riots was the not-guilty verdict in the case of white police officers beating African-American Rodney King. The analysis does not show that blacks in South Central L.A. would not have rioted anyway. The Koreans appear a target of opportunity, with whom the black community had poor relations already. In the survey data cited, whites and blacks alike expressed misgivings about illegal immigration, the main group of which is Mexican. Yet, whites did not riot, and Mexicans (the greater threat to blacks based on job competition, neighborhood crowding, etc.) do not appear to have been targeted by rioters.

Alexseev draws from a range of social scientific theory, including international relations and sociology, to underpin his theoretical framework. This is one of the contributions of the work. However, at the theoretical level and methodologically, *Immigration Phobia and the Security Dilemma* suffers from a number of shortcomings.

For one, the use of the term "phobia" is inapt. Rather than describing an individual's irrational fear, say, of the darkness or spiders, Alexseev misapplies it to groups. Certainly, phenomena of mass hysteria occur, but the cases which Alexseev labels "phobia" are neither. Illustrating a lack of precision, Alexseev does not differentiate between a survey respondent's (or other native of a host country's) inclination to act on "hostility" toward immigrants as a vigilante or through lawful processes. The latter would indicate rationality and self-control.

Other constructs are ill-defined or vague, at risk of discounting meaningful qualitative differences. For example, "ethnic 'fifth columns'" is raised in the context of host country fear arising from a growing foreign minority within its borders. More specificity and precision would take into account the real-world security threat of Islamists, for example, among immigrant communities. Actual "fifth columns" seek to destroy non-Islamic nations: Islamist terrorists taking hostage and massacring Chechen school children; "Londonistan" terrorists bombing the London subway; foreign-born terrorists attacking America on 9/11. Alexseev discounts these threats as exaggeration, though terrorism and criminal enterprises by nature pose asymmetric threats.

More generally, *Immigration Phobia and the Security Dilemma* seems to approach the research question with a point of view that colors some of its conclusions drawn. This book elevates macroeconomic gain above attachment to homeland. It fails to differentiate between immigrants' benign intent and harmful effects. It neglects the fact that many survey respondents in all three places, while expressing concerns about mass immigration and illegal immigration, act on those views solely through lawful means; yet Alexseev discounts law-abiding citizens' political action as "phobic" and irrational. National sovereignty and self-determination; the role of citizenship and national loyalty; legal, moral, and

normative considerations are discounted in the book's broader analysis. Therefore, the author ends up making the same argument as those advocating narcotics legalization. The only viable policy "solution" under security-dilemma theory becomes capitulation. But it is hard to see how such a course of action would not be perceived as anarchy and lead to extreme measures such as vigilante justice.

Whereas Alexseev attempts to spin a theory that supports commitment-free migration, Renshon shows readers the real-world ramifications of such human movement. Alexseev underestimates the costs to societies, as lived out through nation-states, and the psychological, political, and practical harm done human beings by undermining the very foundations that bind a people together into society. *Immigration Phobia* browbeats rational people into self-destruction, while *The 50% American* unveils the utter destructiveness of hedging one's deep patriotic commitment to one nation. The former book dresses up centrifugal behavior and attempts to justify transplantation or colonization. The latter book confirms that common beliefs matter and that people need ties that bind if civilization is to survive.

James R. Edwards, Jr.
Hudson Institute

Slipping the Surly Bonds: Reagan's *Challenger* Address. By Mary E. Stuckey. College Station: Texas A&M Press, 2006. 152 pp.

The Rhetorical Presidency of George H. W. Bush. Edited by Martin J. Medhurst. College Station: Texas A&M Press, 2006. 224 pp.

Though the two books reviewed here are divergent in focus they are close in thematic development. While the book on Reagan looks at one particular address, the edited volume on George H. W. Bush assesses a president's overall rhetorical enactments. Yet, both books follow a well-defined rhetorical path and as such contribute to the study of two presidencies as well as to the study of presidential rhetoric in general.

Mary E. Stuckey's book is part of an impressive collection of books in the Library of Presidential Rhetoric published by Texas A&M Press. The particular focus of Stuckey's book is on the address President Reagan delivered following the *Challenger* disaster on January 28, 1986. Stuckey meticulously researches the drafting of the address, the various influences on the construction of the address, and the several draft versions, all managed during one frantic day. The final speech was effective and eloquent in addressing the nation's psychological needs following a national disaster. Reagan understood his role as interpreter-in-chief in times of crisis and national distress.