Overall, this book makes a valuable addition to the literature on conservation policy history by providing a richly detailed parallel history of the key legal cases, arguments, and court decisions by which state and federal conservation policy was ultimately—although with some continuing challenges—confirmed as legal and constitutional. To Smith's credit, her writing makes arguments that are sometimes dense and arcane to nonlawyers interesting and worth the effort to follow.

Any broad history such as this one unavoidably leaves out some details that one might wish for. This seemed most evident to me in the chapters on pollution-control policies. For example, Smith does not discuss the judicial decisions in the late nineteenth century that essentially overruled the common-law rights of riparian property owners to water "undiminished in quantity and quality" and substituted a philosophy that industrial pollution had become widely accepted as a necessary cost of "progress"—there by necessitating later statutory solutions to this problem in the form of federal pollution-control regulations. And in discussing the history of federal power to protect public health from water pollution (pp. 215–19) and the transformation of the Marine Hospital Service into the US Public Health Service in 1912, she notes its scientific mission but misses its important early exercise of its authority to regulate drinking water quality on interstate carriers such as trains and ships—an important extension of the Commerce Clause—which in turn compelled the many local stops along their routes to provide safe drinking water to them. This was one of the most significant early antecedents of the regulatory authority of the modern Environmental Protection Agency.

One could make a similar point about Smith's discussion of federal irrigation policy, which she dates to the 1894 Carey Act: it overlooks the important history of the federal irrigation surveys in the late 1880s and associated reservations of federal lands from claims (to prevent speculation), which placed the head of the US Geological Service in the controversial role of arbiter of the entire federal lands system; it also led to the 1981 forest reserves rider, a key turning point in the relationship between rights to claim federal lands as private property and the authority of the federal government to withhold them from such claims.

A smaller quibble is Smith's claim that both public health professionals and sanitary engineers were united in their acceptance of the "miasma" ("filth") theory of disease causation as late as 1900 (p. 184). This theory was scientifically disproven in the 1880s by Koch, Pasteur, and others, and by the 1890s sanitary engineers had begun to introduce drinking water treatments such as mechanical and sand filtration—yet continued to argue that the treatment of water supplies was more cost effective than the treatment of wastewater, because "running water purifies itself" and "the solution to pollution is dilution" (leaving downstream communities more vulnerable to water contamination). Public health professionals, meanwhile, had shifted their attention from miasmas and environmental cleanup to laboratory-based "new public health" priorities based on bacteriological science.

One broader issue that I would question is Smith's reference to these policies as instances of "green government." She makes a thought-provoking point about the successful use of arguments favoring protection of forest ecosystems for their benefits to streamflow and water supply, and of birds for their control of agricultural insect pests, describing these as early arguments for protecting what today would be called "ecosystem services." This seems to me a valuable reminder that not all these arguments are new. To refer generally to this era as an advance of "green government," however, seems to me a bit too casual. Progressive policies were sometimes "green" in the sense of protecting natural species and ecosystems, and certainly they were improvements over previous unregulated exploitation—yet most were instances of government-led economic development, with major (and often not green) transformative impacts on the environment.

With these mild criticisms, however, this is an otherwise valuable book.

Disrespectful Democracy: The Psychology of Political Incivility

Incivility. By Emily Sydnor. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019. 256p. $90.00 cloth, $30.00 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592720001565

— Nathan P. Kalmoe, *Louisiana State University*
nkalmoe@lsu.edu

Politics is rife with conflict, because groups differing in power collectively decide who gets what. But *levels* of conflict in those processes vary greatly, as do manifestations of that conflict in communication. Disagreement often spills over into uncivil tones—including name-calling, insults, obscenities, and finger-pointing—and our contentious politics feels more uncivil by the day. How do variations in political incivility shape who dives into politics and who is inclined to stay out of the fray?

Emily Sydnor's *Disrespectful Democracy* provides persuasive answers to these questions that hinge on interactions between messages and audience traits. Most crucially, she shows that the democratic implications of incivility vary dramatically depending on citizens' orientations toward conflict in everyday life, in ways that attract some citizens while repelling others. Her refreshing argument touts conflict tolerance as a key (but unequally distributed) resource for citizens. "Citizens with a conflict-approaching orientation, who enjoy conflict, can navigate political media and certain political activities in a way their conflict-avoiding counterparts do not," she writes (p. 6). Sydnor also recognizes that incivility's normative hue depends on its context. She leverages surveys, experiments, content analysis, and engaging illustrations to document uncivil content differences and then investigates their consequences for mass political engagement, participation, and news consumption.

Sydnor begins by showing that the stable tendency to approach or avoid interpersonal conflict differs across individuals, and she finds that a conflict-approaching orientation is lower (on average) among more educated people, women, and racial and ethnic minorities. Thus, differences in conflict traits map unevenly across groups, with more conflict *avoidance* among groups that have been historically excluded from power. Sydnor's surveys also indicate more interest in politics among conflict-approaching individuals.

Next, Sydnor reports results from two experiments with real video clips—civil and uncivil—drawn from politics and entertainment. Incivility evokes positive or negative emotional reactions in citizens depending on their conflict orientation. Conflict-avoiding people feel more anger, anxiety, and disgust in response to incivility, whereas conflict-approaching people report more amusement and entertainment.

The book's content analysis shows that political news sources vary in levels of incivility and conflict. That raises the potential for selective exposure among audiences and real differences in the amount of conflict exposure given that choice. Sydnor finds substantially more uncivil language in partisan cable news (~80% of segments) compared to CNN (68%), while network news segments were much lower than both types (~ 50%). Internet news and talk radio fall on the high-conflict side, whereas newspapers and social media are generally lower in conflict (despite the latter's harsher reputation).

Sydnor then shows how conflict orientation guides political news choices and information-seeking across these news sources. Her surveys indicate substantial net differences in news consumption by conflict orientation for internet and radio news as high-conflict sources, along with lower levels of overall news consumption and a preference for network TV news among conflict-avoiding people. (Those net differences seem to work through differences in political interest that correspond with the conflict orientation.) Sydnor's results provide more evidence that news outlets value conflict to attract audiences, although that audience-building strategy has limits that depend on personality traits. Despite the aversion that incivility causes in conflict-avoidant people, Sydnor paradoxically finds that they seek out and consume *more* uncivil content when exposed to it, like other anxiety-producing spectacles we cannot look away from. In contrast, conflict-seeking people in the experiments subsequently chose to watch less uncivil content.

The final empirical chapter—and arguably the most important one in the book—presents the conditional consequences of incivility on political participation and expression. Some types of political participation expose people to more conflict than others. Sydnor finds conflict-approaching traits correspond with higher political participation in high-conflict activities like online commenting, persuading others, and protest. Conflict-approaching individuals are substantially likelier to use incivility themselves, but that tendency is multiplied when they are exposed to uncivil messages in Sydnor's experiments, similar to other recent studies in which norm-breaking communication encourages more of the same.

The book concludes with a constructive discussion of how to partially close political engagement and participation gaps among citizens averse to conflict. Sydnor recommends teaching conflict-averse citizens how to better manage the negative emotions associated with political conflict and encourages efforts to work through those emotions with political practice.

The book's biggest contribution comes from expanding the scope of incivility effects to include political engagement, participation, and news consumption. Readers familiar with Diana Mutz's (*In-Your-Face Politics: The Consequences of Uncivil Media*, 2015) research on televised incivility will appreciate Sydnor's participatory extension beyond Mutz's tests on political trust, candidate evaluation, and views of political opposition. The books complement each other well.

Disrespectful Democracy is particularly adept at clarifying the underlying psychology of incivility effects. Sydnor focuses on the mediating role of emotions in politics and highlights the importance of personality traits applied in everyday interpersonal life that similarly guide citizens when they happen to encounter politics (or try to avoid it). In doing so, the book reaffirms the value of modeling interactions between political contexts and individual-level traits that guide political behavior. Put differently, mass politics occasionally calls dynamics from everyday interactions into the political domain, rather than drawing out some alternative form of interpretation, reasoning, and action. Sydnor finds similar audience reactions to uncivil entertainment and politics, which reinforces that view.

Trait-based conflict reactions and their unevenness across social groups drive home broader implications for democratic practice. Sydnor also adds evidence on conflicted politics in the new media realm, including observational evidence of news-seeking in the new media environment with internet, social media, and partisan news joining the fray.

Sydnor's view of conflict orientation as a resource also resonates with Davin Phoenix's (*The Anger Gap: How Race Shapes Emotion in Politics*, 2019) representation of the racial anger gap in politics and the conditional mobilizing role of that emotion in black political participation. Sydnor's findings on racial differences in conflict orientation and its unique role in protest participation speak to

Phoenix's analysis of anger inhibition among black folks (due to whites policing those expressions) and his evidence that anger among black citizens tends to mobilize extra-systemic participation like protest, while enthusiasm mobilizes systemic acts like voting. Both books are attentive to the implications of these emotion-related gaps for political equality.

From a normative perspective, *Disrespectful Democracy* is refreshingly sanguine about incivility (in some forms), much more so than most scholarly works and mainstream political commentary. Sydnor, however, is careful to note what conditions must apply and to acknowledge its harms. Much of the distinction, she says, rests in power—whether incivility is used by the powerful to demean (or police) the disempowered or by the disempowered to challenge and call attention to the obscene actions of the powerful. A blanket rejection of incivility and a uniformly civil discourse will not solve our problems, she argues.

Disrespectful Democracy is well suited for undergraduate and graduate teaching and research in American political behavior and mass communication, and it is written engagingly for general interest readers too. Sydnor succeeds in illuminating the uneven consequences of political conflict on citizens' involvement in American democracy at a time when conflict in politics feels like it has reached a fever pitch. Yet she also challenges us to think differently about conflict and incivility while proposing ways for practitioners to reduce participatory inequities that arise when politics becomes more contentious.

Neighborhood Defenders: Participatory Politics and America's Housing Crisis. By Katherine Levine Einstein, David M. Glick, and Maxwell Palmer. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020. 211p. $89.99 cloth, $29.99 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592720001802

— Clayton Nall, *University of California, Santa Barbara*
nall@ucsb.edu

Why is it so difficult to build dense housing in the United States? Economically thriving regions rarely supply enough housing to keep pace with local demand. What housing does get built is rarely the multi-unit housing most in demand by lower- and middle-income families. Does the blame lie with voters' overall preferences against building more housing, or with biased local institutions that give disproportionate power to a narrow group of fervent housing opponents? In *Neighborhood Defenders*, Katherine Levine Einstein, David M. Glick, and Maxwell Palmer argue strongly that structure dominates agency: local institutions allow housing opponents to insert themselves into discretionary local housing approval processes and block local development. Such housing opponents are, on average, older, whiter, richer, and more likely to be homeowners than other voters. And they capture local institutions nominally designed to allow "small-d" democratic input in local land-use planning.

This story of local land-use policy seems familiar at first glance. What distinguishes the success of "neighborhood defenders" described in this book from stereotypical "not in my backyard" (NIMBY) activity? The authors argue that local antidevelopment activism succeeds as a function of two intersecting factors. The first is the level of local political engagement, particularly among opponents. The second is the extent of local land-use regulations. High-participation, high-regulation environments often deter developers from even attempting housing projects, as they anticipate that their proposals will bog down in dilatory action. Projects that do see the light of day undergo multiple challenges and modifications. Ceteris paribus, the residents of high-SES, high-participation communities are better equipped to capture institutions in this way. In response, developers turn to low-SES, low-engagement communities, especially if such communities lack access to regulatory and legal remedies (p. 43).

In support of their claims, the authors present a mix of case study examples and quantitative analyses demonstrating how local activists exploit institutions to block housing approvals. Integrating remarkable data from public meetings, local land-use regulations, and housing permits in Massachusetts, they show that local land-use regulations and participatory processes give "neighborhood defenders" the means to delay and impede housing development projects.

One of the book's greatest strengths is its account of how antidevelopment campaigners exploit every trick in the book to oppose housing in their neighborhoods. For example, Einstein and coauthors recall the 11-year effort by the Archdiocese of Boston to develop a mixed-income housing project at St. Aidan's Parish in affluent Brookline (pp. 44–51). Local opponents, dominated by longtime homeowners, pulled on every available regulatory and legal lever, from zoning board meetings to legal appeals to the Vatican! Although the opponents failed to stop the project entirely, their intervention served to shrink it and reduce the number of low-income housing units. Housing development advocates and those immersed in legal aspects of land-use regulation will find such an account familiar. (See, for example, land-use lawyer Richard Babcock's entertaining critique of local land-use politics in his 1967 book *The Zoning Game.*)

This book improves on previous practice-oriented case studies by integrating them with modern social science. After telling the story of St. Aidan's Parish, the authors turn to the abundance of quantitative data in their own backyard, including the Massachusetts Housing Regulation Database and original, painstakingly collected data drawn from local meeting minutes and public comments.