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/S0034670507000678 Published online by Cambridge University Press

regulate tribal entities. Rand and Light's analysis of both the concept of sovereignty and the history of federal "Indian law" shows how clearly tribal sovereignty has been compromised by the IGRA. They do not only reiterate indigenous complaints. Rather, they reconceptualize sovereignty in a unique and helpful manner, drawing on both classical political theory and indigenous worldviews articulated by scholars like Oren Lyons and Rebecca Tsosie. They write, "Although our discussion and analysis of the law and politics of tribal gaming is [*sic*] founded upon the legal doctrine of tribal sovereignty, we do not accept that the legal doctrine provides the only feasible definition of sovereignty for Native people—far from it" (25). Rand and Light argue provocatively that tribal sovereignty is best understood as a practice of self-determination—a richer, fuller, more grounded set of practices than claims to sovereignty have thus far made manifest.

After analyzing compromises of tribal sovereignty, Rand and Light go on to explain the additional compromises embodied in the IGRA—legal compromises among federal, state, and local officials, and political compromises brokered by members of Congress in an attempt to respond to the Supreme Court decisions enabling gaming on tribal lands. Their treatment of these topics is rich in previously unpublished data and very helpful even to those with extensive knowledge of the IGRA and tribal gaming politics in general.

The first three chapters of the book, which detail these compromises and include both a history of tribal-federal relations and a primer on varying conceptions of sovereignty and self-determination, will be useful for those with little background in these topics. The centerpiece of the book, however, is the second section, which proposes to assess the success of Indian gaming. The fourth chapter of the book, "Is Anyone Winning?" may be of most interest to those who want a fair and detailed analysis of the various impacts that gaming has on multiple constituencies. Rand and Light's treatment of previous impact studies is detailed, thorough, and fair. They take pains to parse out the effects that gaming has on tribal members, local communities, state coffers, and the federal government—and to show the political and economic trade-offs these entities must make in order to come to compact agreements.

The fifth chapter, which examines two very different approaches to tribal gaming and to the compromises such gaming enterprises entail, is an interesting blend of cultural studies, political science, and economics. The authors marshal evidence from a wide variety of sources to contextualize and compare the gaming enterprises operated by the Sioux and the Pequot tribes—and, importantly, to contextualize and compare the non-Indian response to these enterprises. Their work in this chapter draws on and contributes to literature in anthropology, rhetoric, sociolegal studies, and political science.

Rand and Light's approach, which is explicitly normative, may well give traditional political scientists pause. Yet their case for the necessity of such a normative approach is persuasive. They write in their introduction, "We

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670507000678 Published online by Cambridge University Press

believe that a definition of tribal sovereignty that incorporates the perspectives of indigenous nations is necessary for fair and mutually respectful intergovernmental relations and sound public policy" (24). Though they recognize and respect scholarly work that argues that current Indian gaming compacts "replicat[e] old and damaging political battles between states and tribes" (151), they are optimistic that "Indian gaming also carries equal potential for transcending the adversarial, zero-sum struggles between states and tribes" (151). In their conclusion, as they begin to imagine an "informed law and policy" regarding tribal gaming, they call for a "compromise among sovereigns"—for a policy that takes seriously not only indigenous understandings of sovereignty, but also state and local needs vis-à-vis gaming development and increased trends towards federal devolution.

The resulting suggestions call for compromise among all three sovereign entities; however, they are grounded in the firm acknowledgment that tribal gaming is both here to stay and a legitimate economic and governmental activity. Specifically, Rand and Light advocate sharing of information and congressional funding of fact-finding activities regarding socioeconomic impacts of gaming; an attitude of mutual respect in the compact process; and the identification of common goals among state, federal, tribal, and local jurisdictions upon which further compromise can be reached. Their suggestions are both pragmatic and hopeful.

The research presented in *Indian Gaming and Tribal Sovereignty: The Casino Compromise* is rigorous and analytically sound. It would be in the best interest of tribal and state entities to take notice of this work. It would also benefit political scientists and academics in other disciplines not traditionally concerned with "Indian issues" to take note. Such work sheds light on empirical issues of federalism and intergovernmental relations, as well as normative issues like fairness and justice.

–Renee Ann Cramer

POISON WEEDS

Marie Gottschalk: *The Prison and the Gallows: The Politics of Mass Incarceration in America* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. xiii, 451. $75.00. $28.99, paper.)

DOI: 10.1017/S003467050700068X

Marie Gottschalk has written an unusually important book, and a very good book it is. She begins from the stunning fact—one about which most Americans are in denial—that the United States imprisons both a larger proportion of its residents—citizens and others—and a larger number of such residents than any other society, present or past, in human history. And this is a recent phenomenon. In 1974 about 100 residents per 100,000 of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S003467050700068 Published online by Cambridge University Press