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story, the book is well written. It has no footnotes, no bibliography, and no appendices.

The bottom line, as Henry reports it, was that all of the Reagan operatives believed the president was unbeatable, and although the Democrats thought there were five ways they might be victorious, none of their options was probable. Almost everything went right for the President. Henry excellently sums up Reagan and his effect on America:

Reagan apparently had the gift of making people feel good about the country—and the even greater gift of making people feel good about the rich. He dispelled class resentments; he eased the pangs of conscience among those who have toward those who have not; he reconciled his countrymen to inequality, and absolved the prosperous of any hint of shame at making gaudy display of their riches. (p. 209)

As for the Democratic team, once it had silenced most of the Ferraro tax return business, it was beset by the Catholic bishops on the issue of abortion and doomed to a never-ending search for an issue or a theme that could make the Democratic challenge competitive. The first debate (presidential) became the “most influential moment of the campaign” (p. 244), because Reagan did not live up to media expectations, and his bumbling performance permitted journalists to discuss openly the issue of age and competence. The second (vice-presidential) and third (presidential) debates were judged on the basis of different media expectations. In the rematch with Mondale, Reagan won the “sound bite,” the best one-liner of the evening, and with it, reelection by a landslide. The people preferred Reagan’s “vision of America.”

Although Visions of America is atheoretical, it goes well beyond the standard “who, what, when, and how” of traditional journalism to treat “why” the 1984 election went the way it did. Accordingly, it is a welcome addition to the literature on one of the most complex political events we political scientists have the responsibility to explain.

Donald M. Freeman
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Moments of political crisis tend to provoke statesmen and theorists to reexamine the fundamental principles of a political community. So it appears that the recent “crisis” surrounding the influx of illegal aliens and refugees into this country, and the apparent loss of control over our borders, has stimulated a political response in the introduction of the Simpson-Rodino bill in Congress and an academic response as evidenced by these two brief books. These studies of the rights of aliens and the underlying premises of our immigration policy raise the broader question regarding the nature of citizenship itself. Indeed, as a nation with a long tradition of unrestricted immigration, America has seldom been forced to formulate any specific notion of citizenship other than at the time of its founding and during the recurrent struggle over the citizenship of its black population. With the imposition of the first immigration laws, the polity was forced to articulate a basis for inclusion into the political community for outsiders. While our native literature has told us what it means to be an “American,” our political theorists including the Founders have left us uncertain about what it means to be a citizen. Recent confrontations with the problem of illegal aliens and refugee groups suggest that we have yet to articulate a coherent theory of citizenship.

In Without Justice for All, Elizabeth Hull focuses her attention on the constitutional rights of aliens. This is a highly readable and informative account of U.S. immigration law and policy, with the central concern the political status afforded aliens—both resident aliens and those who have entered the country illegally. That political status and the protection of constitutional rights is considerably less for illegal aliens. Also legal resident aliens who have entered the country under the terms of the Immigration and Naturalization Act do not enjoy the same constitutional rights as citizens.
Even while the Constitution itself makes certain guarantees to all "persons," the question is whether Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights, due process, and equal protection attach to citizenship only, or are granted to any person legally under the jurisdiction of the U.S. government. The Supreme Court has consistently recognized some restrictions upon the rights of aliens (beyond the requirement of citizenship for holding high office specifically mentioned in the constitutional text). However, in *Graham v. Richardson* (1971) the Court recognized alienage as a "suspect" category, at least in terms of receiving state and social welfare benefits. The tone of Professor Hull's book suggests that she favors a broad movement in this policy direction. Indeed, one gets the impression that she opposes any attempt to distinguish between aliens—whether legal or illegal—and citizens, or to make any discriminations regarding who may enter and join the political community. The implication of such a view is much the same in the Court's holding in *Graham*—it "marks an important milestone in the devaluation of citizenship," as Schuck and Smith suggest (p. 107). Hull's book is a useful guide to understanding U.S. policy toward aliens; however, one may reject the author's attempt to sever the notion of constitutional rights from citizenship. In looking to evaluate the rights of aliens to those of citizens, it is to the Court that Hull inevitably turns: "This country's alien population would benefit significantly if the Supreme Court intervened more actively in its behalf" (p. 151). There is no doubt of such a benefit; the question is whether it is appropriate.

Schuck and Smith recognize the legitimacy and right of a polity to determine the terms of inclusion into its membership. The authors fruitfully spend much time explicating the notion of citizenship in liberal political thought and American legal theory. This effort generates a formulation of two distinct models of citizenship—one ascriptive and the other consensual. While the latter is viewed as more appropriate to a liberal polity, the authors suggest the historical prevalence of the ascriptive model in which the circumstances of one's birth determine citizenship. They outline an alternative approach incorporating a Lockean notion of "tacit consent" thereby emphasizing consensual elements even while recognizing birth as initially determinative.

This theoretical study of the historical origins of these different notions of citizenship and the extrapolation of a concept of citizenship from the U.S. Constitution, the 14th Amendment, and Court decisions is excellent. While the book as a whole is presented as a timely discussion of recent debate over immigration law and policy, its greater value lies in its contribution to understanding the theoretical underpinnings of citizenship and the basis for inclusion into the polity. The publisher offers this work as part of a paperback series designed to "bring subjects of keen current interest to readers as quickly as possible." This is appreciated; however, a topic as important as this deserves an even fuller treatment. One hopes the authors will provide it in the future.
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*To Serve the People: Congress and Constituency Service.* John R. Johannes. (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1984. Pp. xv + 294. $21.95, cloth; $10.95, paper.)

Appropriately enough, the very appearance of this review of *To Serve the People* results from "casework," the subject Johannes examines in this book. The publisher discovered that an original review copy had not reached the *Review*. Another was sent, and the regular process went forward—one small instance of rectifying an error or solving a problem, which is what most casework is all about.

Congressional casework is inescapably mundane, and perhaps the greatest virtue of *To Serve the People* is that Johannes never forgets this central truth. At the same time, casework is neither simple nor unimportant. Rather, it meshes, often seamlessly, with the remainder of congressional life—legislation, reelection, oversight, relations with the executive, and so on. In addition, casework bridges the district-Capitol Hill gulf. In that context, this book provides a useful supplement to Fenno's *Home Style* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1978) by demonstrating how members and staff divide their responsibilities and deal with their Hill and home constituencies.