long-form interviews with both Democratic and Republican campaign staffers. Using actual campaign strategists as the sample offers a rare behind the scene peak into the logic and thought that goes into deciding how and when to emphasize gender. Dittmar's methodological choices allow her to develop valuable insights into the beliefs strategists have about how voters think about gender and associated stereotypes, and how they develop campaign themes that address these beliefs. Overall, the analyses provide a rich and thorough investigation of the many, though not always straightforward, ways that gender affects strategy.

Dittmar's thorough and timely analyses offer three key insights into how gender affects campaign strategy. These findings have critical implications for campaign scholars as well as campaign practitioners. First, campaign practitioners believe that voters do, in fact, hold beliefs about female candidates that fit with gender stereotypes. For example, both Democratic and Republican consultants report that they believe voters perceive female candidates as emotional and compassionate. This finding is important because recent academic research suggests that voters may not actually hold these beliefs about female candidates (Deborah Jordan Brooks, *He Runs, She Runs,* 2013; Monica C. Schneider and Angela L. Bos, "Measuring Stereotypes of Female Politicians," *Political Psychology*, 2014). Nevertheless, these beliefs certainly shape how strategists develop central themes for a female candidate's campaign. If strategists believe that an association with emotionality is an obstacle for female candidates then they are more likely to present their candidate in a way that shows she is strong and authoritative. And, these choices made by practitioners certainly affect how voters use, or do not use, gender stereotypes in forming impressions of female candidates.

Second, electoral context affects the navigation of gender during a campaign. Electoral context refers to both the external political climate and the internal dynamics of a specific race. Campaigns do not take place in a vacuum, and contextual factors not only determine candidate strategy but voter receptivity to specific strategies. The analyses about the behavior of a female candidate's opponent, often male, are particularly insightful sections of the book. Perhaps most interestingly is that opponent gender matters not only in mixed gender races, but in female versus female races as well. The 2010 California Senate race, for example, featured Carly Fiorina challenging Barbara Boxer. Even in the context of a race with a likely incumbent victory, gender still factored into messaging especially as Fiorina tried to cut into Boxer's advantage with female voters. Gender matters, but the ways in which gender matters and how gender matters, depend on a host of contextual variables that may differ across time and across race.

Third, emphasizing candidate gender can work to either the detriment or benefit of female candidates. Dittmar examines how gender comes into play through issues, traits, appearance, family, qualifications, and negative advertising among other ways. Often the previous literature linking strategy to voter behaviors assumes that all the ways in which feminine stereotypes can come into play have an equal effect. In other words, there is an assumption that the effect of emphasizing feminine traits, such as being warm and compassionate, is equivalent to the effect of emphasizing feminine issues, such as equal pay or reproductive rights. However, the content of these stereotypic messages, and the effects of these messages are not equitable. Identifying how different components of campaign messages reinforce or counter feminine stereotypes offers a new theoretical lens through which to study gender stereotypes.

Dittmar's book, *Navigating Gendered Terrain*, is relevant for not only scholars of gender and campaign practitioners but also for scholars of political behavior, political psychology, and public opinion more broadly. Overall, Dittmar challenges the tempting notion among scholars, pundits, and the public that political campaigns and elections are gender neutral. Campaigns are far from gender neutral, but many strategists aim to neutralize or reduce the role of gender in the minds of voters. As Dittmar notes, "gender neutrality in electoral outcomes does not reflect gender neutral campaigns but instead results from gendered decision making well before Election Day (p. 156)." Recognizing that gender equity at the polls is often the product of a carefully constructed campaign process designed to minimize the role of gender in vote choice calculations opens up a host of new empirical questions for future work. Such questions include examining the effectiveness of candidate strategies at neutralizing gender, and the contexts that give rise to strategies that downplay or play up candidate gender. The rich and novel conclusions developed throughout Dittmar's text will certainly keep campaign scholars busy in the future.

**Women in Politics in the American City**. By Mirya R. Holman. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2015. 212p. $79.50.
doi:10.1017/S1537592716002309

— Beth Reingold, *Emory University*

Decades of research have revealed a clear link between women's descriptive representation—who our leaders are—and women's substantive representation—what our leaders do. In study after study, female officials are more likely than their male counterparts to act on behalf of women and women's interests. Except at the local level. Even though most female officeholders in the U.S. serve at the local level, our research has focused almost exclusively on national and state-level policymakers. And what little research that has been done suggests that local politics is

the last place one would find either significant attention to women's issues or significant effects of policymakers' gender identity. As dominant theories of urban politics would suggest, unfettered competition to attract and maintain wealthy residents and businesses, ever-growing federal and state mandates, and limited fiscal capacity all conspire to severely constrain any sort of policy innovation on behalf of women, children, or the poor and needy. Economic development overrules all else.

Mirya Holman's *Women in Politics in the American City* changes and challenges all that. We can no longer plead ignorance or readily concede that local politics is the exception to the women-represent-women rule. First, Holman reminds us of the long history of American women's activism and influence on a variety of "urban women's issues" concerning children and education, welfare and poverty, affordable housing, and violence against women. Then, by rallying a veritable treasure trove of original data, she shows how women holding local office in 21st century America carry on in this tradition. Surveys of mayors and councilmembers reveal that, even with controls for party and ideology, female leaders are far more likely than their male counterparts to forge strong ties with women's and women's issue groups; and those who do are more likely to pay close attention to women's issues. Content analysis of council meeting minutes demonstrates that cities led by female mayors do in fact devote more attention to women's issues and foster higher levels of citizen input on such issues, all else being equal. Detailed multivariate analysis of city budgets and employment records shows that local governments with more women in powerful positions allocate more money and workers to programs that address urban women's issues. In-depth interviews and qualitative case studies usefully supplement and illustrate all of these findings. Convincingly, Holman concludes that while business, taxes, and development remain central, gender—and women's representation in particular—matters in local politics. Thus, the fact that women still make up far fewer than half of our local government leaders remains a critical problem of American democracy.

The strength of Holman's argument lies primarily in the variety, quantity, and quality of data she collected and analyzed. Multiple and complementary samples and sampling strategies (e.g., 100 matched cities, 300 randomly selected cities, a time-series panel of eight cities in California and North Carolina) round out Holman's cleverly designed, rigorous, and robust multi-method approach. Most importantly, this wealth of data enables Holman to address just about every dimension of women's substantive representation imaginable. At the individual level, she is able to compare male and female leaders' group ties, policy priorities, and policy preferences. At the city level, she is able to examine the policymaking process from beginning to end: from the composition of policy agendas; to the participation of various individuals and community groups (and their subsequent evaluations of their local leaders); to the ultimate policy outcomes—allocations of money and jobs. At each step along the way, Holman provides multiple measures of responsiveness to women and urban women's issues (as well as business and development).

Yet Holman's contribution is not simply a thoroughly vetted and unexpected new "data point" demonstrating the impact of women in public office. Rather, her analysis is most interesting when she cautions against overly simplistic theories of descriptive and substantive representation and argues that "sheer numbers" of women in local office is often not enough (Karen Beckwith and Kimberly Cowell-Meyers, "Sheer Numbers: Critical Representation Thresholds and Women's Political Representation," *Perspectives on Politics* 5 [September 2007]: 553–65). First, Holman argues that gender alone does not distinguish city officials most likely to prioritize women's issues. It is a subset of female (or mostly female) mayors and councilmembers who have forged strong connections with women and women's-issue groups who are the most committed advocates. Second, Holman's city-level analysis reveals that the mere presence of women on the council rarely makes a difference on women's issues. But when women on the council join forces with a woman mayor—especially one able to wield power over the council, they can and often do make a difference. In short, women's substantive representation depends on a combination of women's presence, "gender consciousness" (p. 43), and power in office.

Unfortunately, the strengths of Holman's work may also contribute to and highlight some of the book's weaknesses. Perhaps in an attempt to squeeze so much data into such a short monograph, some important methodological and analytic details are left out or obscured. As a result, the clarity and power of the findings can suffer. And they suffer the most when Holman is making her most insightful arguments. How Holman identifies the "preferable descriptive representatives" (Suzanne Dovi, "Preferable Descriptive Representatives: Will Just Any Woman, Black, or Latino Do?" *American Political Science Review* 96 [2002]: 729–44), who are immersed in gender-conscious networks of community organizations and activists and are most likely to prioritize women's issues, is not clearly established. Nor is it entirely clear how large their ranks are or even whether (despite the label) men are included. Elsewhere, the regression results meant to test Holman's arguments about the interdependent effects of women on the council, women in the mayor's office, and the institutional power of the mayor are not well presented or interpreted. Novice readers (e.g., undergraduates) may find the discussion confusing; readers well versed in modeling and interpreting interaction effects may find it frustrating.



https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592716002309 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Finally, while Holman is quick to acknowledge that gender identity is not the only thing that matters in the politics of women's representation, her discussion of race, class, and intersectionality is quite limited. For example, Holman reports that female leaders were more likely to have "felt responsibility to represent racial groups, women, and the poor" (p. 34), but does not consider whether this might be because they were more racially or socioeconomically diverse than male leaders. In the all too brief section on "Dual Identities and the Role of Race and Gender" (pp. 62–63), Holman acknowledges that "it is often difficult to separate the effects of gender and race" on representational behavior, but then undertakes an analytic "attempt to separate the effects of race and gender" on policy discussions in city council meetings. Here and elsewhere, she identifies only "minority women" as possessing or grappling with "dual identities" of race and gender. Indeed, her attempt to analytically separate the effects of race and gender completely obscures the existence and impact of minority men (see Table 3.4). All this despite Holman's astute recognition that gender, race, and class overlap and intersect to define the very essence of urban women's issues. This alone should alert us all to the need for more and more sustained intersectional approaches to the study of identity and representation.

**Border Walls Gone Green: Nature and Anti-Immigrant Politics in America**. By John Hultgren. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2015. 248p. $94.50 cloth, $27.00 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592716002310

— Maiah Jaskoski, *Northern Arizona University*

John Hultgren's *Border Walls Gone Green: Nature and Anti-Immigrant Politics in America* examines the understudied convergence of anti-immigration activism and environmentalism, with special attention devoted to Mexico-U.S. migration. Using discourse analysis, Hultgren identifies different versions of "environmental restrictionism" that have existed since the late 19th century, as well as the contemporary "global environmental justice" perspective that opposes restrictionism. The definition of nature emerges as central in the book. The author finds that each discourse treats its respective definition as given, and from that foundation develops its respective, exclusionary conception of sovereignty. Hultgren's own "environmental political theory of migration," in contrast, moves past this approach, treating migrants as important activists within his envisioned U.S. environmental movement.

Early environmental restrictionists portrayed immigrants as a threat to the environment and to the white race. When World War II rendered such blatant eugenicist positions unacceptable, the new focus became "carrying capacity," or the idea that a particular space can support only a limited number of people. Restrictionists now claimed that an influx of immigrants from the developing world would bring environmental, social, and political—especially communist—challenges to American sovereignty.

Environmental restrictionism lives on in discourses employed by anti-immigration groups and by their alliances with environmentalists. "Ecological nativism" retains carrying capacity at its core, presenting overcrowding as a threat to the national wilderness and thus sovereignty. "Social nativists" rely on either interpretations of Christianity or social Darwinism to try to justify preventing non-white migrants from entering the country.

Hultgren devotes more attention to "ecocommunitarian restrictionism" than to nativism. Like ecological nativists, ecocommunitarians argue that immigration harms the environment by driving population growth. Yet they also identify neoliberalism as a culprit—the force behind "a flexible, mobile labor force with no sense of *place*" (p. 107). Ecocommunitarians conceive of "nature" as territorially located within nation-state boundaries, and they turn to the state to prevent immigration in the name of protecting nature.

For Hultgren, ecocommunitarianism has the potential to gain support among progressive environmentalists both because it is subtler than the other restrictionist discourses and because he believes that current criticisms of ecocommunitarianism rest on shaky ground. The global environmental justice community sees ecocommunitarians as racists who only pretend to care about the environment, whereas Hultgren thinks these restrictionists probably "care so much about a particular *nationalized* conception of nature that they view efforts to protect it as ethical regardless of the implications on marginalized immigrant populations" (pp. 133–134). Contrary to ecocommunitarians, global environmental justice enthusiasts argue that we should worry not about population size, but instead about over-consumption driven by capitalism, and that if we focus on these dynamics, we will see that the lifestyle of immigrants is ecologically low-impact and thus ecofriendly—that "immigrants live closer to nature" (p. 133). Hultgren notes however that this pattern of behavior lasts only "so long as this populace adheres to the consumptive practices of the lower socioeconomic echelon" (p. 134). Ultimately, as *Border Walls Gone Green* reveals, the global environmental justice discourse does not question the foundations of ecocommunitarianism. Starting from its definition of "nature," each view arrives at a particular conception of sovereignty that distinguishes between insiders and outsiders: "The ethos of sovereignty is being reconfigured in a more inclusive direction, but the constituent parts of sovereignty—the nation, the state, citizenship, liberal democracy, capitalism, and a vision of progress founded on a particularistic 'we'—remain intact" (p. 138).

Hultgren seeks to develop a "unified, revolutionary model of resistance" (p. 161) to counter these versions of