Byrnes's study brings together a traditional concern with the political dimension of the disputes over religion central to French history with a more recent historiography that emphasizes the evolution of belief and practice as worthy of scrutiny in their own right. Like many other scholars these days, he uses the category of identity, and the process of identity-formation, to organize his thoughts and evidence, but does so without recourse to the jargon that sometimes gets in the way in such work. Some questions can be raised in response to Byrnes's categories and periodization. For example, I am not convinced that defense and détente deserve to be distinguished so clearly by period, as argued by Byrnes. There were voices advocating détente well before the end of the century and the *union sacrée*. And I believe there was more religious antagonism involved in the massive demonstrations against the Savary educational reforms in 1984, which Byrnes sees as inspired by political and economic motives. The trajectory he presents is, nonetheless, plausible. Much more important than this chronological skeleton is the flesh and bone with which he clothes it, allowing us to see some of the intellectual commitment and emotional passion that fueled religious/political debate. Byrnes makes no effort to draw comparisons with contemporary disputes in which religious communities oppose the secular impulses supported, at least in part, by modern states. But anyone interested in such issues would profit by reading this erudite and well-crafted volume.

–Thomas Kselman

THE COURSE OF EMPIRE

Paul T. McCartney: *Power and Progress: American National Identity, the War of 1898, and the Rise of American Imperialism* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006. Pp. x, 278.)

DOI: 10.1017/S0034670507000666

For more than one hundred years, Americans have viewed themselves and the role their nation plays in the world from a particular mindset. This worldview features a strong belief in the uniqueness and destiny of the country that is guided by providence and is strengthened by such factors as race, geography, history, and ability. This culturally constructed ideology, which is referred to here as "mission," manifests itself particularly in foreign policy, as the United States interacts with other countries. It is McCartney's intention to understand the origins of this ideology, which he traces to 1898 and the Spanish-American War, and to connect it with the culture that created it and gave it meaning. Understanding the American belief system in 1898 will go a long way, McCartney contends, in understanding American foreign policy behavior in both the last and current centuries.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670507000666 Published online by Cambridge University Press

McCartney organizes most of his chapters around two episodes of the era of the war with Spain. The first is the decision to go to war, and the second is the debate over annexing the Philippines at the conclusion of the conflict. In the national dialogue that surrounded these events, from presidential speeches and Congressional debates to reflections by leaders of public opinion, McCartney identifies a cultural milieu that led thinkers to see war and expansion as logical and historical progressions of the nation's past. From the founding of the colonies through the annexation of Texas and the Mexican cession, America's history had been one of continuous war waged in the name of freedom coupled with geographic expansion and conquest. Public officials and private citizens alike conformed to this thinking in 1898, though as McCartney expresses, not without dissent.

With chapter titles such as "Culture, National Identity, and American Mission" and "American Cultural Constructs in the 1890s," it is clear where McCartney focuses his attention. He argues convincingly that American foreign policy priorities were a result of a belief system that incorporated many diverse ancestries, from Puritan theology to Enlightenment philosophy to Darwinian evolutionary theories. Regarding the first, McCartney observes that by the time of the war with Spain, "the belief that God had created the United States because he had a plan for the country as part of the unfolding of divine history was so entrenched in the American psyche" that Americans only disagreed on what role they themselves should play (71). The American mission was not questioned, only the most effective way of carrying it out. That so many leaders of the time believed this is demonstrated through exhaustive quotations from President McKinley, members of Congress, and others. The avalanche of testimony provided is, to borrow McCartney's word, "numbing." The decision to go to war with Spain and the decision to annex the Philippines were both made within this moral universe.

Of particular interest to readers is McCartney's portrayal of the president himself. William McKinley is an enigmatic figure, and historians have struggled to understand his thinking and motivations. The traditional McKinley is a follower, sheepish, unsure of himself and therefore willing to let Congress and public opinion guide him through difficult decisions. Never willing to stray too far from the safety of consensus, he gives the nation what it wants. The revised McKinley is a visionary. He understands America's greatness even before the people themselves or their congressional leaders do. He knows the direction in which the country should move and steers the ship of state in that direction. Having achieved the objective, the country sees the end result as what it wanted all along. Perhaps not surprisingly, McCartney's president is somewhere in between. He is no dupe, but does work within the limits of public opinion. Much like Franklin Roosevelt, McKinley guided the masses from their midst, not standing above them. He gauged the mood of the country and then worked to promote his agenda, never placing himself on the fringe of opinion.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670507000666 Published online by Cambridge University Press

McCartney's analysis is convincing, his logic persuasive. His abundance of primary-source evidence solidifies a powerful argument. The reader feels compelled to accept the thesis. The overall approach to the subject, however, one may or may not find discomforting. There is no question by the end of the introduction, and the feeling is verified throughout the text, that McCartney is critical of his subject. His conclusion is condemnation for the ideology he so forcefully expounds and censure for the men who forged the policies he despises. One of the most frequently recurring words in the book is the adjective "arrogant." McCartney uses it to characterize the political and military leaders of 1898, the philosophers and thinkers who advocated American expansion, the public in general, and the policies they collectively produced. In several instances, he draws comparisons to recent events, arguing that the same arrogance persists into present foreign policy decision making. The choice is certainly his to make, but it raises some questions. For instance, speaking of whether the Filipinos could be acculturated to adopt American culture and institutions, McCartney laments that "no one ever considered accommodating cultural diversity as a worthwhile, possible goal, and certainly no one believed it to be required under American norms" (237). Since cultural diversity is a priority of late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century American civilization, are we not also guilty of cultural "arrogance" when we insist that those of the past should conform to our norms? Elsewhere, McCartney observes that lands "the United States did not colonize would not become independent but would become, instead, the colonies of some other power—*that* was the reality facing American policy makers in 1898–99" (197). While he denounces the decision to annex the Philippines, he does not offer an alternative that would have been better for the Filipinos or for the United States. In fact, he later admits that "American rule in its new colonies was far superior in every respect to Spain's—a fact that seems to have been forgotten both by the scholarly critics of American imperialism and by the conquered peoples themselves" (276). Finally, the author adheres to the belief that the American government works for all humanity. McCartney argues that "the fate of other peoples independent of any consideration of the national interest, whether defined materially or morally, has never been central to U.S. foreign policy" (108). Should it? The Filipinos in 1898 did not vote for the president or members of Congress. There is no Constitutional directive to consider what is best for non-Americans. Insisting that the American government work to achieve what is best for foreign peoples is to perpetuate the very "arrogance" that McCartney condemns.

These are minor points. McCartney has produced a solid piece of scholarship that is thoroughly researched and meticulously argued. His thesis that the nation's brush with imperialism was a product of an American missionary worldview stands unimpeachable. It is vital for anyone wanting to understand American foreign policy in the twentieth century or modern times to understand the period analyzed in this book. The author is certainly correct

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670507000666 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that 1898 was a major turning point in America's relations with the rest of the world. The more we know about it the better, and this book brings us much closer to an accurate understanding.

–Barak Cook

COMPROMISE AMONG SOVEREIGNS

Steven Andrew Light and Kathryn R. L. Rand: *Indian Gaming and Tribal Sovereignty: The Casino Compromise* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2005. Pp. ix, 240. $22.95.)

DOI: 10.1017/S0034670507000678

With a few notable exceptions (David Wilkins and Dale Mason, in particular), political scientists have not written about American Indian tribal politics, economics, or law. This neglect may be because American Indians are not easy to categorize. Potential scholars might well ask, Are American Indians interest groups, racial groups, or something else altogether? Where do and should tribal governments fit in the matrix of federalism? The neglect of political scientists might also be because of long-standing beliefs that American Indians are relics of the past and, therefore, best studied by historians; or that they are culturally completely different from the rest of the United States and are best studied by anthropologists.

Whatever the reason for the lack of study within the field of political science, the neglect is detrimental to the discipline. Not only does studying American Indian politics do service to tribes and indigenous people by shedding light on relevant policy issues, it also helps the discipline understand and learn about issues of federalism, racial and ethnic politics, small-scale government, economics of sustainability, implementation of voting rights provisions, and much more.

Happily, Steven Andrew Light and Kathryn R. L. Rand have made a significant contribution to the political science literature. *Indian Gaming and Tribal Sovereignty: The Casino Compromise* takes tribal understandings and points of view seriously, while inviting political scientists to learn more about the important and complex phenomena of tribal casino operations and tribal-state-federal relations in the age of casino gaming.

The book is structured to educate the uninitiated reader in the history of tribal-federal-state relations, to introduce the provisions of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (IGRA), and to analyze the act's impact. Throughout, the authors show that nearly every aspect of the IGRA embodies compromise. As many indigenous scholars have pointed out, tribes have compromised their inherent sovereignty in order to be parties to tribal-state casino compacts under the IGRA. Prior to the IGRA, tribal-state compacts were unheard of; it was the federal government's responsibility to treat and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670507000666 Published online by Cambridge University Press