

Given the potential importance of this book as a resource for researchers and for teachers, it is important to make note of the gender breakdown of the contributing authors. Out of 31 contributing scholars, only 3 are women. While the field of American politics, and legislative studies in particular, continues to have a gender imbalance in membership, it is not as stark as the numbers here would indicate (less than 10% female). As recent research shows, gender imbalances in citations (Daniel Maliniak, Ryan Powers, and Barbara F. Walter, "The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations" in *International Organization*, 2013) and in the construction of syllabi (Jeff D. Colgan, "Gender Bias in IR Graduate Education? New evidence from syllabi" in *PS: Politics and Political Science*, forthcoming) have important ramifications for the trajectory of our field and the success of underrepresented scholars. It is worrisome that a book that could easily be viewed as a "go to" guide for the state of the literature perpetuates this gender imbalance. Some efforts to note the expertise of female political scientists has been made in recent years (e.g., <http://womensoknowstuff.com>) but it is important that those working on edited volumes, conference organizers, and others pay attention to the gender balance (as well as race/ethnicity, among other underrepresented groups) when highlighting experts in the field.

Despite the notable strengths and contributions of this volume, it suffers from some of the common weaknesses of edited volumes as well. For instance, relatively few chapters offer new arguments or analyses that are not present in other published works of the contributing authors. There are, of course, some exceptions where chapters here appear to offer new arguments or original analyses (e.g., Chapter 11 on the policy consequences of polarization in the American states, and Chapter 12 on partisan media in the 2012 election cycle). A second weakness is that even when chapters address competing viewpoints on a topic (e.g., mass polarization or the role of the media), the chapters are rarely in conversation with each other, directly addressing the arguments and evidence of the other authors in this particular volume. Rather, each addresses past work in this vein, which sometimes leaves the authors speaking past each other rather than being in conversation with one another.

The People's News: Media, Politics, and the Demands of Capitalism. By Joseph E. Uscinski. New York: New York University Press, 2014. 195p. \$79.00 cloth, \$25.00 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592716003716

— Benjamin T. Toll, *Lake Superior State University*

In the 2014 movie *The Interview*, Dave Skylark (played by James Franco) states: "It's the first rule of journalism. You give the people what they want!" Unfortunately, as those who study the role of the news media in the political

process know, this quote from an otherwise forgettable movie is all too accurate about today's political news. In his book, Joseph E. Uscinski focuses on understanding the role of the capitalist market on the American news media's coverage of policy issues and how this ultimately detracts from the public's ability to learn about these issues. Through statistical and case study analysis, he shows that while the news media have the potential to impact great learning and deliberation regarding politics, due to market forces and the public's choices they fall short of their lofty potential. In short, *The People's News* provides a necessary explanation of just how thoroughly the free market impacts the type of news that we get, and how this harms us, even as Americans increasingly distrust the media for giving them what they want.

The main scholarly addition of this book is to disentangle the problem of supply and demand in political news. In other words, a primary question is whether scholars ought to blame the news media for the dearth of policy coverage, or if this blame should rest more on the shoulders of the American public. The answer according to Uscinski, is that even among the broadcast networks of ABC, CBS, and NBC, it is the audience's impact on news that drives it away from politically informative content.

The book begins with a discussion of the main theories regarding the news media in American politics. The first chapter looks at the structural market forces that permeate the news media and how these incentives need not be known to have an impact on how one covers politics. Yet the news media are given greater constitutional freedom and power, which should lead them to be above a pure-market based model. Hence, the media have an opportunity, and some would say an obligation, to provide more than just what the public wants to hear, but subsequent chapters of the book show this does not take place.

The second chapter begins with a summary of the history of media-effects research and moves into a broader discussion of agenda setting and its role in the literature. The most important component of this chapter is the attempt to disentangle the causal mechanism of agenda-setting research in American politics. Simply put, a correlation between what the public deems as being salient and what the news media put on television could be the result of either the public's interest in issues or the stations' privileging of some issues over others.

Using data from the Vanderbilt Media Archive, Uscinski looks at the coverage of the three main broadcast channels over the span of 1968–2010 to determine what type of issue coverage is driven by the public and what type of coverage is driven by the networks themselves. He finds that, over time, the audience is more likely to drive the content of news than the broadcast networks are to drive issue salience among the public. Yet there are instances in which the news media can drive what the public thinks is important.

5281
5282
5283
5284
5285
5286
5287
5288
5289
5290
5291
5292
5293
5294
5295
5296
5297
5298
5299
5300
5301
5302
5303
5304
5305
5306
5307
5308
5309
5310
5311
5312
5313
5314
5315
5316
5317
5318
5319
5320
5321
5322
5323
5324
5325
5326
5327
5328
5329
5330
5331
5332
5333
5334
5335
5336
5337
5338
5339
5340
5341
5342
5343
5344
5345
5346
5347
5348
5349
5350
5351
5352
5353
5354
5355
5356
5357
5358
5359
5360
5361
5362
5363
5364
5365
5366
5367
5368
5369
5370
5371
AUG
5372
5373
5374
5375
5376
5377
5378
5379
5380
5381
5382
5383
5384
5385
5386
5387
5388
5389
5390
5391
5392
5393
5394
5395
5396
5397
5398
5399
5400

5401	Thus, the third chapter is dedicated to explaining this	5461
5402	civic-minded journalism that can impact what the public	5462
5403	thinks about. Although there is growing evidence that	5463
5404	cable news networks provide ideological content to appeal	5464
5405	to a niche audience, Uscinski uses Chapter 3 to look at	5465
5406	the ways in which broadcast networks have changed over	5466
5407	time. The main conclusion of this chapter is that changes	5467
5408	in mass partisanship do influence news coverage for the	5468
5409	following three quarters. In short, it is not only cable	5469
5410	networks that respond to the partisan inclinations of the	5470
5411	AU7 American public.	5471
5412	The biggest strength of this book lies in the fourth	5472
5413	chapter, however. Usinski moves from looking purely at	5473
5414	broadcast networks and instead does case-study analysis	5474
5415	of the influence of audiences on cable networks' coverage.	5475
5416	First, he looks at how cable networks use unscientific polls	5476
5417	as a way of gauging what audiences want to hear about	5477
5418	specific issues. For instance, Fox News's Bill O'Reilly used	5478
5419	online polls to help him stay on the same side as his	5479
5420	audience over the shooting of Trayvon Martin by George	5480
5421	Zimmerman. Yet social media now also provide the	5481
5422	opportunity for cable networks to learn about audience	5482
5423	views and change how issues are covered. The example	5483
5424	provided to make this case deals with the primary victory	5484
5425	AU8 of Christine O'Donnell over Mike Castle. Shortly after	5485
5426	this upset by the Tea Party—backed candidate, Fox News	5486
5427	contributors Charles Krauthammer and Karl Rove called	5487
5428	the general election a lost seat. Quickly, the audience	5488
5429	AU9 started denouncing this tone of coverage, and the two	5489
5430	contributors started to backtrack and become more	5490
5431	positive toward O'Donnell. This chapter, more than any	5491
5432	other in this book, proves the real impact of the audience	5492
5433	on news in America today.	5493
5434	The author makes many interesting arguments, and his	5494
5435	book one of the few works to seriously try to explain the	5495
5436	causal flow between news coverage and what the public	5496
5437	thinks is salient. Usinski concludes with a discussion of	5497
5438	what the news should look like by offering seven changes	5498
5439	to the media landscape: 1) Limit sensationalism in	5499
5440	coverage; 2) provide more substantive and policy-oriented	5500
5441	coverage; 3) provide higher-quality commentators rather	5501
5442	than purely entertaining journalists; 4) displace the horse-	5502
5443	race coverage with discussions of policy; 5) ensure that	5503
5444	journalists are less focused on public interaction, as	5504
5445	discussed in Chapter 4; 6) draw a brighter line between	5505
5446	commentary and news; and 7) provide ideological parity in	5506
5447	coverage.	5507
5448	These suggestions are not surprising, yet they appear to	5508
5449	forget what the entirety of the book is about. Its very core	5509
5450	is about understanding the impact of the capitalist	5510
5451	consumer-driven market on news coverage, but all of	5511
5452	the solutions are aimed at what the news ought to change	5512
5453	about itself in order to provide better coverage for the	5513
5454	public. These suggestions cannot solve the problem as	5514
5455	long as one network remains interested in capitalism.	5515
5456		5516
5457		5517
5458		5518
5459		5519
5460		5520

Looking simply at the success of the Fox News Channel as consistently being the second-highest-rated cable network (only ESPN beats it), one can surmise that the solutions proffered by Usinski are not what the public wants. It certainly makes sense to try and fix problems with the way that the news is done, but with the focus of the book on market forces, these solutions are less than satisfactory.

While the solutions to the problems of journalism are lacking, Usinski nicely highlights what the problems are. This book would fit very nicely into discussions of agenda setting, the economic incentive to present polarized news, and how the public impacts news coverage. In all, *The People's News* is a solid contribution to our understanding of the news media, the public, and how we discuss politics in the United States.

Rich People's Movements: Grassroots Campaigns to Untax the One Percent. By Isaac Williams Martin. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. 304p. 31.95 cloth, 21.95 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592716003728

— Joe Kling, *St. Lawrence University*

In his book, Isaac Williams Martin traces the twentieth-century history of antitax movements. These movements sought to redistribute resources to the wealthy by repealing the Sixteenth Amendment, passed in 1913, and legitimizing a federal income tax, or by limiting congressional authority to set tax rates, or by seeking in some way to combine these two approaches. Martin's thesis is straightforward. "Since the early twentieth century," he writes, "a small but vocal minority of Americans has fomented nonviolent rebellions . . . to demand that government redistribute resources to the rich" (p. 1). He identifies these "nonviolent rebellions" as coming out of "the grassroots libertarian right" (p. xiv), and describes in meticulous detail how members of the business classes, beginning in the 1920s, used the organizing techniques of the populists and other Progressive protest groups to create movements for the benefit of the more privileged members of American society.

Rich People's Movements is organized as a set of case studies, beginning in the 1920s. From that point, Martin traces the emergence of a variety of antitax movements across the twentieth century that, he argues, eventually provide the ideological and policy basis for the Tea Party movement. The introductory chapter lays out the author's framework for understanding the basic character of these movements. He finds that policy threats, including acts of Congress that increased taxes on at least some of the wealthy, "were necessary to trigger mobilization on behalf of the rich" (p. 12). Advocates for the rich turned to grassroots tactics when, in times of crisis, the usual methods of lobbying, pressure-group activity, and other "familiar channels of political representation" (p. 14) failed