

It was this report, skillfully orchestrated by the White House, that led to the army-McCarthy hearings and ultimately to the Wisconsin senator's undoing. As McCarthy withered before the television cameras, Ike maneuvered to prolong the hearings until the damage to McCarthy was complete.

The anti-McCarthy campaign had its ignoble side. White House advisers and allies, including McCarthy's nemesis, Joseph N. Welch, of "have you no sense of decency" fame, fanned rumors that Roy Cohn and G. David Schine were engaged in a sexual relationship. Their tactics—fair and foul—prevailed in the end.

Two caveats. Nichols notes that many of McCarthy critics never appreciated the subtlety of Eisenhower's strategy. That is true and helps explain why Ike was perceived for so long as ducking the McCarthy challenge. But there are times in Nichols's account when Ike's hand is so hidden that it is visible only to the author. More important, although Nichols leaves no doubt that Ike contributed to McCarthy's demise, he goes too far in suggesting that Ike destroyed both McCarthy and his methods. McCarthyism survived the army-McCarthy hearings. It survived the Senate's subsequent condemnation of McCarthy. McCarthyism even outlived McCarthy himself (who died in 1957), resurfacing for deployment against civil rights and anti-Vietnam War activists during the 1960s and early 1970s.

PATRICK MANEY  
*Boston College*

**Islamophobia and Racism in America** by Erik Love. New York, New York University Press, 2017. 272 pp. Paper, \$28.00.

Islamophobic discrimination against those perceived to be Muslim might be more severe than it has been in years. In the year leading up to the 2016 U.S. presidential election—during which candidate Donald Trump called for "a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States"—the Federal Bureau of Investigation reported the highest number of hate crimes against Muslims since 2001. Yet Islamophobia has affected not only those who follow the Islamic religion but also those who have been *mistaken* for Muslims because of their appearance. Indeed, the first person killed in a hate crime targeting Muslims shortly after 11 September 2001 was a Sikh American. Erik Love, in his excellent book *Islamophobia and Racism in America*, argues that in order to fully address the problem of Islamophobia, advocates must expand their understanding of it beyond religious and ethnic frameworks—race must be part of the analysis.

Love explains that race operates at the very core of Islamophobia. He provides a detailed and historically contextualized review of the ways in which

Islamophobia has collectively affected Arab, Muslim, Sikh, and South Asian Americans throughout the country's history. While this socially constructed racial category of people does not have an agreed-upon name (Love settles on "Middle Eastern Americans"), Love suggests that this amalgamation exists in material ways in the imagination of the American public and within U.S. institutions.

Having established that race is a key operational component of Islamophobia, the central question of *Islamophobia and Racism in America* is addressed in the second half of the book—whether, strategically, Middle Eastern American advocates should use racism to describe Islamophobia. Love's informative and nuanced profiles of six of the largest Arab, Muslim, Sikh, and South Asian American advocacy organizations explore the calculated choices and challenges that lie between race-conscious and race-neutral strategies to confront Islamophobia. Framing the trajectory of these organizations within the larger American political context, Love explains that this choice is complicated by conservatives who, in the decades since the 1960s civil rights movement, have successfully stigmatized calls for special protections for racialized groups as "reverse racism" (p. 145).

Unfortunately, Love is only able to assess the success of one of the two strategies: he finds that all six of the organizations in his sample ultimately pursued a race-neutral advocacy approach, a choice he indirectly criticizes as having prevented durable coalitions among Arab, Muslim, Sikh, and South Asian American organizations. He says that while these various organizations have been successful in confronting a number of discrete policies and working with government agencies, Islamophobia continues to expand and may be worse today than ever before (p. 198). Love primarily points to 1960s black civil rights organizations as key examples of successful race-conscious advocacy (though, disappointingly, he does not discuss the strategies or contributions of any Black *Muslim* organizations). However, without a case of a Middle Eastern American group pursuing a race-based strategy, it is difficult to determine whether such a group would be more effective in today's political context, especially given the low level of self-identification among those assigned to the Middle Eastern American racial category.

*Islamophobia and Racism in America* importantly and rightly frames Islamophobia in the larger context of race in American society and politics, offering an important foundation for future studies. Love offers a thoughtful and well-written account of the complicated issues facing Middle Eastern American communities and advocacy organizations, taking the time to learn both the official and unofficial narratives of these organizations. *Islamophobia and Racism in America* makes an important contribution to the fields of race

and politics, and it is an essential read for scholars, advocates, and policy-makers alike.

RACHEL GILLUM  
*Stanford University*

**The Enigma of Presidential Power: Parties, Policies and Strategic Uses of Unilateral Action** by Fang-Yi Chiou and Lawrence S. Rothenberg. New York, Cambridge University Press, 2017. 234 pp. Paper, \$29.99.

How powerful are presidents in exercising their unilateral authorities? For the past several decades, both academic researchers and political observers have noted the importance of executive directives such as executive orders to a president's policy agenda and have sought to understand the underlying processes that define these presidential decisions. Yet one puzzle remains, especially in relation to executive unilateral authority: why are there "instances where the chief executive can brandish unilateral action as a weapon," and yet "there are other times where the President comes across as extremely sensitive to the preferences of those in the majority in Congress the legislative parties to which they belong" (p. 178). Along with another recently published book on the unilateral presidency, Michelle Belco and Brandon Rottinghaus's *The Dual Executive: Unilateral Orders in a Separated System*, Fang-Yi Chiou and Lawrence S. Rothenberg's attempt to address what they called the "enigma of presidential power" represents some of the latest thinking on the nature of presidential power generally and the determinants of unilateral actions specifically.

Most impressively, Chiou and Rothenberg combine formal theoretical modeling with rigorous empirical methods to tackle a particular thorny question that has eluded presidency scholars for so long. After assessing the current body of knowledge on presidential power—especially its weaknesses—in Chapter 1, Chiou and Rothenberg proceed in Chapter 2 to develop three competing formal models, each with substantially different implications for how unilateral actions work: the *unilateralism* model, the *chamber-compliance* model, and the *partisan-compliance* model. In Chapter 3, the authors use an innovative approach to measure the significance of each executive orders from 1947 to 2003. Aside from their concluding chapter, the remaining chapters consist of the authors methodically testing each systematic component/implications of their models, including testing which of the three models best characterizes the issuing of significant executive orders, differences across policy areas, and whether unilateral power is different in foreign versus domestic policies (that is, the two-presidency thesis).