

The kind of project explored in *Creating Human Nature* requires a scholar to have the courage to take the intellectual risks inherent in developing an interdisciplinary normative analysis that yields some practical prescriptions for an area of scientific research where there still remains much uncertainty. And yet, at the same time, such an intellectual undertaking also requires a scholar to possess the requisite amount of intellectual humility to see the limits of what normative political theory can contribute to these complex issues. Gregg should be commended for his innovative efforts; his book will, I hope, inspire others in the field of political theory to devote more attention to these pressing issues.

Research Methods in Deliberative Democracy. Edited by Selen A. Ercan, Hans Asenbaum, Nicole Curato, and Ricardo F. Mendonça. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022. 508p. \$145.00 cloth, \$40.00 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592723001366

— Anna Drake , University of Waterloo
amdrake@uwaterloo.ca

Research Methods in Deliberative Democracy is an ambitious book and one that fills an important gap in its large and varied field. The first of its kind to gather a comprehensive overview of different methodological approaches to the theory, practice, and examination of deliberative democracy, this collection has broad appeal. For those new to deliberative democracy, the book provides an impressive overview of the many different ways we can study and measure it, setting out the state of the field and highlighting the wide range of ways a person can “do” deliberative democracy. The book is also of great value to those who have been working in the field for decades. While the chapters are short, and aim to introduce the reader to a particular way of studying (part of) deliberative democracy, the content is rich. Chapters offer both the methodological insight one would expect from such a book, along with rich discussions of the limitations—and room for improvement—of the individual approaches, particularly as they fit into the larger field of study. To this end, while we might find that “deliberative democracy is a contested field of study” (Graham Smith, p. v), these contestations are set out in collaborative and generative ways.

In their opening chapter, the editors note that “the book aims to practice what deliberative democracy preaches: enabling reflection and advancing critical engagement across different perspectives” (p. 1). This is no small task. In starting this conversation (p. 19) the editors hope the dialogue inspired by reading these various methodological approaches together will encourage readers “to engage across different methods and approaches and contribute to the development of deliberative democracy as an innovative, reflexive, and inclusive field of study” (p. 1). Many of the components necessary for this are thoughtfully set out in the subsequent 500+ pages. Importantly, the

volume examines both the ways that individual methods can make these contributions, as well as the connecting points and overlaps between different approaches. Contributors reference other chapters and highlight ways that the field might grow from these interactions. Having these 30+ methodological approaches in one place and presented in this generative way is important for those of us who study our “own” areas of deliberative democracy, and who would benefit from an up-to-date overview of these specializations and the connections between them. The editors do an impressive job curating these approaches.

The book is divided into four main sections: theorizing (pp. 27-79), measuring (pp. 83-262), exploring (pp. 265-419), and enacting (pp. 423-475) deliberation. While there is considerably more space devoted to the empirical methodological sections in the middle, the sections on theory and enactment play a crucial role in the book’s broader purpose. There are rich entries in these bookend sections that provide crucial context for the more technical discussions. The editors note the “important and sometimes inevitable overlap” between the four categories and helpfully set out core questions that each approach aims to answer (p. 8). There is an additional breakdown of the research methods in deliberative democracy identifying the ways scholars engage in the four approaches (p. 11). Having a core overview of the different emphases that particular methods—theoretical, empirical, and action-oriented—focus on is a useful resource as we collectively aim to deepen our understanding and evaluation of deliberative democracy.

While the book itself is consistently strong, there are some stand-out chapters. One of these is Simone Chambers’ contribution, “Methods of Theorizing.” Chambers sets out an excellent typology of theory in the deliberative democratic context. Noting “five very broad ways” to understand normative theory, Chambers sets out a rich and concise overview of different approaches, drawing important connections and highlighting the strengths and flaws crucial for further advancement of deliberative theory. Chambers extends this analysis to work undertaken by people who “are not ‘normative theorists,’” and in doing so underscores one of the main takeaways of the book: that the interaction between normative and empirical work, when we do it well, only serves to deepen both areas and strengthen deliberative democracy. This chapter is an excellent choice to start the “Theorizing Deliberation” section. It nicely sets up the frame of reference for the collection as readers encounter specific lessons from each methodology and can think through these implications in light of the broader interplay and bridging work between normative theory and empirical work: something the editors stress in their opening chapter.

The collection wraps up with a concluding chapter penned by Jane Mansbridge. Asking how we can find

“workable approaches to the legitimacy deficits of current democracies” (p. 480), Mansbridge revisits lessons from the preceding chapters in light of a reflection on deliberative theory, deliberative citizen forums, and deliberative systems—the three major “turns” in deliberative democracy. On this latter point, Mansbridge notes that most assessments of deliberative components (the object of most of the chapters in this book) examine “the qualities of their *process*” and she emphasizes that we “should judge the deliberative system as a *whole* on its *outcomes*” (p. 489). This brings us back to core questions set out at the beginning of the book. It also draws our attention to the ways our understandings of power influence—to more and less visible extents—the investigative questions underpinning each research approach and the ways these overlap—or don’t, as the case may be. It is here where the field of deliberative democracy has the most work remaining.

In her insightful chapter “Grounded Normative Theory,” Genevieve Fuji Johnson warns that “as the field of deliberative democracy has advanced, it has run the risk of cooptation by systems and institutions of domination” (p. 52). We should not underestimate the danger this poses to deliberative democracy. We are, as Johnson notes, “stuck in status quo norms related to whiteness, masculinity, heterosexuality, ableism, and capitalism” and “much of deliberative democracy seems only to further reify these systems and institutions” (p. 52). Getting out of this requires a substantial amount of work. The conversations encouraged by the editors (and contributors) are an important part of that, but the book still falls into some of these traps. While there are discussions of anti-Black racism, colonialism, and other forms of oppression in a number of chapters, many of the contributions—and much of deliberative democratic work more broadly—evades them. Multiple chapters reference “gender” as a category of inclusion/study when the correct term is “sex.” This may seem nitpicky, but given the degree of sexism and anti-trans hatred in the world, we should be doing this correctly (here empirical scholars would benefit from reading Amanda Bittner and Elizabeth Goodyear-Grant’s “Sex Isn’t Gender: Reforming Concepts and Measurements in the Study of Public Opinion,” *Political Behaviour* 39[4]: 1019-1041). More interaction and engagement with the work coming out of anti-colonial, anti-racist, and feminist scholarship would aid deliberative democracy in the conversations we need to have in addressing these problems.

Overall, this is an important and very useful book that will bring together a wide range of deliberative democratic scholars, and will engage—and encourage interaction between—those engaging in normative and empirical work. The editors do a wonderful job facilitating this important conversation and have provided us with a great resource of the different types of work that, together, make up a rich understanding of deliberative democracy.

The Return of Resentment: The Rise and Decline and Rise Again of a Political Emotion. By Robert A. Schneider.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2023. 297p. \$29.00 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592723001354

— Christian F. Rostbøll , *University of Copenhagen*
cr@ifs.ku.dk

Since the 2016 election of Donald Trump and the Brexit referendum, political scientists, historians, and other commentators have tried to understand what happened. In the many explanations, references to “resentment” have appeared repeatedly. The term has been employed to describe the shared emotion of followers of populist politicians and as a kind of politics. However, oftentimes it has not been sufficiently clear what resentment is and which role it plays in politics. To answer these questions, Robert A. Schneider provides an impressive historical survey of the ebbs and rises in both the intellectual history of the concept and of the actual emotion in politics.

Schneider is concerned that the use of “resentment” in contemporary academic and public discourse is vague and merely negative. To give the term a definite meaning, it is important to distinguish it from related emotions such as anger, rage, and fear. To go beyond its negative connotations, Schneider argues that we should note that resentment is not independent of reflection and people’s experiences. Moreover, it is a central argument of the book that “resentment is a condition of modernity” (p. 15). The modern principle of equality provides a promise to people and when reality fails to meet their normative expectations, resentment follows.

The motivation for *The Return of Resentment* is contemporary American politics and the book provides “a history of the present” (p. 16). By providing a historical perspective on resentment, the book’s hope is to lift readers out of their current ideological assumptions and biases. By reviewing the ideas of eighteenth-century thinkers like Joseph Butler and Adam Smith, Schneider shows that resentment has not always been seen as a pathology but can have a positive side as a sentiment that responds to moral injury and protects people against injustice.

The book alternates between chapters on changes in the intellectual uses of the concept and examples of historical events, upheavals, and movements characterized by resentment. The intellectual history begins with Butler, Smith, and David Hume and ends with a discussion of contemporary analyses of the populist politics of resentment. In between there is a review of Nietzsche, who is depicted as the philosopher who raised resentment (or *ressentiment*) “to a foundational feature of a whole swath of human history” (p. 80). “After him, resentment could never be looked upon as it had been before” (p. 61).

Schneider’s intellectual history includes an exciting discussion of what he calls “the resentment paradigm,” which is the mid-twentieth century approach to rightwing