

Security to increase the number of deportations of undocumented immigrants. Obama was able to transform these misgivings into a deep well of Latino support through the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the nomination of Sonia Sotomayor to the United States Supreme Court, and his support for legislative and administrative efforts to protect undocumented young people. The resulting surge in Latino support was evident in his 2012 election and is likely an enduring part of the political landscape.

The tension between these political expectations and the ability of the Republican congressional opposition to thwart the administration's legislative initiatives did create a number of political dilemmas for Obama. Although better bargaining skills may have helped, Molly Reynolds demonstrates that Republican legislative opposition and institutional gridlock made securing an effective legislative majority impossible. In response, Rudalevige argues that after the 2010 midterm elections the Obama administration relied to a greater degree on unilateral mechanisms to implement many of the measures necessary to deliver on the president's promises to his supporters. Although previous Republican presidents had used this approach, prior Democratic administrations had been more reluctant to do so (William F. West, "Presidential Leadership and Administrative Coordination: Examining the Theory of a Unified Executive," *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 2006). Sharece Thrower makes a convincing argument that, although some attempts were made to promote the reach of the Executive Office, these uses of executive power fell well short of what critics charged was happening and were often less expansive than those efforts of previous presidents. Although this method of policy making had some short-term successes, it also left many of these policies vulnerable to repeal by the incoming Trump administration.

One of the most daunting challenges facing editors is the dilemma of confronting an almost infinite number of world-altering events when covering an entire presidency and its legacy while possessing a finite amount of space. Even so, more space could have been used to cover the trade-off between the administration's usage of political capital during the first two years to enact the Affordable Care Act and its inability to mount a more concerted effort to fight for a more robust economic stimulus. On the one hand, as Joe Biden was famously overheard saying, the passage of the ACA was "a big f—ing deal" of historical importance. On the other hand, an inadequate stimulus that was seen to ignore the middle class may have arguably been a factor in the decline in white working-class support from 2008 to 2012. Still, Alyssa Julian and John Graham provide a useful summary of the domestic policy legacies of the Obama presidency, especially the challenges of implementing the ACA.

Julia Azari crafts a concise chapter that skillfully summarizes Obama's efforts at building the Democratic

Party in a country with both institutionally weaker parties and growing partisan polarization. She points to a number of instances, such as the shift in control of the political group, Organizing for America, from the Democratic Party to the White House, as examples of how Obama embraced the presidentialization of this organization. Azari also addresses the cost of this approach to other officeholders and to the party's electoral future.

Because of limited space, little material explicitly addresses Obama's long-term effect on the Republican Party, such as the electoral surge and eventual decline of the Tea Party, as well as the GOP's efforts to oppose the first African American president in a country with an increasingly diverse electorate. One can argue that, with the exception of Ronald Reagan, Obama had the greatest effect on an opposition party's future direction of any president since Franklin Roosevelt. Although some of the internal changes in the GOP were caused by the failures of the Bush administration, it can be argued that Obama had less of a long-term effect on his own party than he did on the opposition, especially as the Republican Party's electoral support seems to have shifted from its traditional upper-middle-class base to a party that ran better among the white working class, particularly in the 2018 midterm elections.

In many ways, scholars have fruitlessly searched for the next reconstructive presidential regime (Stephen Skowronek, *Presidential Leadership in Political Time: Reprise and Reappraisal*, 2008). Although Obama's presidency does not meet Skowronek's standards, his effect on reshaping the opposition party is certainly worthy of greater reflection. This volume presents a balanced and nuanced overview of the legacies of the Obama presidency. Even though Obama's presidency was not a reconstructive one, this volume demonstrates why it will be one whose accomplishments and failures will have an impact that will shape US politics for decades.

Rock of Ages: Subcultural Religious Identity and Public Opinion among Young Evangelicals. By Jeremiah J.

Castle. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2019. 236p. \$104.50 cloth, \$34.95 paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592719004730

— Ryan L. Claassen, *Kent State University*
rclaasse@kent.edu

Rock of Ages is the latest in Temple University Press's *Religious Engagement in Democratic Politics* series, edited by Paul A. Djupe. In it, Jeremiah J. Castle investigates one of the most pivotal groups in modern US politics, white evangelicals. Many have characterized the seemingly unprecedented level of support from white evangelicals as essential to Trump's 2016 victory. In a country where several major demographic trends favor the Democrats, the future of the Republican Party seems to be in the hands

of a constituency that is already turning out at high rates and showing exceptional loyalty. How long can the Republican Party count on a strategy of increasing its support among white evangelicals in a country that will soon no longer be majority white? *Rock of Ages* peers into the political future by examining evangelical youth.

The backdrop for Castle's study is punditry and scholarship highlighting liberal trends among young evangelicals, as well as speculation that these trends portend a political reversal. From the first page, he notes, "Writing for ABC News, Dan Harris (2008) claimed that young evangelicals were 'breaking from their parents and focusing on a broader range of issues than just abortion and gay marriage'" (p. 1). However, Castle notes that such assertions rest on relatively superficial analyses of young evangelicals. Although public opinion differences across generations of evangelicals have been identified, the causes and political consequences of those differences have heretofore been undertheorized and largely unexamined.

Castle's theory, "A Subcultural Theory of Public Opinion among Evangelicals" (the title of chap. 1), answers questions about whether young evangelicals are blazing a new political path and why. The theory is described thusly: "the evangelical subculture takes part in four processes that together give it the potential to exert a substantial influence on public opinion: building evangelical social group identity, promoting the distinctive beliefs of the subculture, discrediting certain aspects of mainstream culture, and delivering explicitly political messages" (p. 17).

Castle reviews the history of the evangelical movement, emphasizing events that contribute to evangelical distinctiveness via the four processes that he identifies. When it comes to post-Civil War history in the United States, he emphasizes distinctive cultural attitudes, such as opposition to teaching evolution and to legal abortion. Evangelical resistance to school integration receives much less attention.

Crucially, Castle goes on to emphasize that a subculture ensures its future by attending to the way youth are socialized. He also adds qualifications to more general subcultural theories by emphasizing that the evangelical subculture will have the greatest public opinion effects where the issues are core to the group's identity and among those most immersed in the subculture. For these extensions of subcultural theories, Castle draws on John Zaller's (1992) "Receive-Accept-Sample" model (*The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*, Cambridge University Press) and the idea that the sample of considerations that members of a subculture "draw" from when responding to survey questions will be most distinctive for the matters to which the subculture attends most and for those most committed to the religious community.

To test the subcultural theory, Castle assesses a wealth of public opinion data including the 2014 and 2007 Pew Religious Landscape Studies, the 2012 and 2016 Co-

operative Congressional Election Studies, and the General Social Survey time-series data. He also conducted 42 semistructured qualitative interviews in 2013 with evangelical students at five colleges to bring a mixed-methods analysis to bear on the causal mechanisms.

For students of religion and politics, *Rock of Ages* will surely be a definitive reference for comparing public opinion and political behavior of evangelical and non-evangelicals across age groups. Name the issue, attitude, or behavior, and you will find documentation of the relevant comparisons in this book.

To summarize, Castle finds evidence of distinctiveness among young evangelicals, but primarily for issues he categorizes as "Noncultural Issues." Thus he finds little evidence of daylight between younger and older evangelicals on abortion. The rift is more evident when it comes to attitudes about welfare and immigration. Attitudes about gay marriage are the most notable exception to this pattern (a cultural issue evincing an age-based rift). But according to Castle, "continued Republican identity and political conservatism of young evangelicals suggest that any issue changes do not seem to be affecting their overall political affiliations" (p. 68). Furthermore, when divided by level of commitment, Castle finds less change among high-commitment young evangelicals, again especially for key cultural issues. The subculture resists change on core issues, and resistance is most evident among those highly committed to the subculture.

If Jeremiah Castle's crystal ball is correct, it is unlikely young people will inspire a political reversal among evangelicals in the near term. The evangelical subculture is powerful and seems to be thwarting external change on matters that are important to evangelicals. These points are driven home in a very engaging set of rigorous analyses and very thoughtful discussions.

However, the critic might question which issues are important. My earlier note that Castle, when discussing the formation of the subculture, largely omits historical efforts among white evangelicals to resist school integration hints at the possibility that their core issues extend beyond the ones most linked with the culture wars. At this writing it appears that the political behavior of young evangelicals, like their abortion attitudes, is evidence of a subculture resisting trends in mainstream culture. However, as failed policies, such as family separations at the border, heighten the salience of immigration policy (an issue that is correlated with racial attitudes), which issues matter could change. If conservative racial policies are an important part of Republican loyalty among older evangelicals, the seeds of change may still be germinating in the noncultural issues that Castle analyzes. Likewise, as climate change looms larger, environmental issues might become more central.

I raise these points not as critical flaws in the book, but rather to highlight evidence of distinctiveness among

young evangelicals. And although more liberal views (compared to their coreligionist elders) on gay marriage, immigration, and the environment have not yet altered their political behavior radically, new historical events might alter the subculture. Just as happened with an evangelical political movement formed around the issue of abortion, new evangelical political movements might gain prominence around the humane treatment of immigrants or environmental stewardship or some other issue.

In *Rock of Ages* we have a very insightful analysis of the reasons why a political reversal among white evangelicals has not come to pass. However, having witnessed several important recent rifts within evangelicalism, scholars should continue to monitor this pivotal group of voters.

In Defense of Public Lands: The Case against Privatization and Transfer. By Steven Davis. Philadelphia: Temple

University Press, 2018. 294p. \$94.50 cloth, \$29.95 paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592719004134

— Tomas M. Koontz, *University of Washington Tacoma*
koontz31@uw.edu

Although public lands dominate the landscape in many parts of the United States and account for nearly one-third of the nation's land, they have never dominated political science discourse. In neighboring disciplines such as public administration, public lands and natural resource management organizations have been used to explore broader themes of power, communication, leadership, and control (for example, Herbert Kaufman's *The Forest Ranger*, 1960). Moreover, drawing largely on classical economic theory, a cadre of political scientists and economists have developed a veritable cottage industry publishing arguments for transferring federal public lands to state or private ownership. In this book, Steven Davis considers these privatization arguments and, one by one, carefully dismantles them in an engaging and thoughtful manner. In so doing he connects to a variety of threads running throughout political science scholarship.

Davis starts with an overview of the history and trends of public land ownership, focusing on the federal level. He provides concise but essential information about the major federal land-management agencies, and he convincingly demonstrates that calls for privatization are currently on federal and state policy agendas, including a laundry list of legislative proposals put forth since 2011. He next moves on to summarize classical economic arguments for privatization, drawing on prominent thought leaders in the libertarian/privatization camp; he provides enough detail to distinguish the nuances of their arguments, so as not to lump them all together. Rather than setting up a straw man, the author faithfully describes the pro-privatization arguments. These arguments center on the efficiency and productivity of the free market, which moves resources to their most economi-

cally valued uses without the heavy hand of a central controller (the government). They also highlight the problem of bureaucracy as lacking market discipline to ensure that lands are well tended and of the negative aspects of political conflict and litigation.

In the book's four middle chapters, Davis lays out his main arguments against privatization of public lands, including ecological, economic, political-democratic, and political-bureaucratic reasons. In the ecological realm, Davis points out that pro-privatization writers fail to provide systematic evidence to support their claim that private control yields better environmental outcomes. Instead they cherry-pick specific examples where public ownership led to ecological problems. He marshals evidence from numerous systematic studies supporting the argument that public lands perform better ecologically than private lands, along a variety of indicators such as less fragmentation, more suitable habitat, greater ecosystem stability, and greater proportion of land undergoing ecological restoration.

In the economic realm, Davis confronts arguments on their own terms. He asserts that pro-privatization arguments based on economic efficiency and highest valued uses fail to include many important nonmarket benefits. Here the author clearly describes key natural resource economic concepts including transaction costs, willingness to pay, multiplier effects, and externalities. The crux of this chapter is that economists often include in their calculations only commodity values and not other values such as ecosystem services. The sections on ecosystem services summarize the concept well, and the author shows that the challenges of creating markets for ecosystem services means there is a positive role for government in taking on the costs. Davis goes on to describe environmentalist critiques of cost-valuing ecosystem services; namely, that they encourage anthropocentrism and monetization of nature, which can divert us from moral and philosophical arguments for protecting nature. The author supports both views about valuing ecosystem services, arguing that we have a moral obligation to protect nature while also recognizing the monetary value that humans derive from it. Finally, Davis counters critics of spending government money on public lands by showing that such spending is dwarfed by funding allocated to other government services that we do not expect to generate revenue, including national defense, subsidies to farmers, education, and so on.

In the political-democratic realm, Davis emphasizes the importance of looking beyond individual preferences to construct the public good. He describes arguments from Mark Sagoff ("The Allocation and Distribution of Resources," in *Debating the Earth*, edited by John Dryzek and David Schlosberg, 2005) and Scott Lehmann (*Privatizing Public Land*, 1995) about the importance of collective values and claims that the government's main