

Occasionally this has entailed adults mobilizing children to engage in political action, such as during the 1960s civil rights movement. Primarily, however, Gash and Tichenor argue that young people are leveraged as verbal or visual symbols to advance a cause. Take the case of Ryan White, the teenager who contracted AIDS via a blood transfusion and was prohibited from attending his high school due to fears of transmission. His personal story helped shift the public narrative about AIDS away from victim-blaming gay men and intravenous drug users. Conversely, an innocent children narrative has also been deployed in opposition to LGBTQ rights policies, with opponents arguing that same-sex marriage or same-sex couple adoption will expose children to LGBTQ recruitment efforts. Gash and Tichenor also provide multiple examples of leveraging children in the domain of immigration. Nativists have long attempted to “other” the children of undocumented immigrants and propose policies denying rights and services to these children. More recently, migrant children separated from their families were, by policy design, collateral for the Trump administration’s restrictive border policies.

Finally, Gash and Tichenor profile many examples of children’s political agency, each chosen to exemplify a particular aspect of youth political engagement. Some youth movements emerge from adult organizations in order to pursue different policy aims or tactics. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee did this in the 1960s, just as Dreamer activists did so in 2010. Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School students’ gun reform activism and Greta Thunberg’s climate strikes are examples of teenagers springing into action because of adult inaction regarding pressing issues. Throughout their discussion of agency, Gash and Tichenor remind us that young activists succeed in capturing public attention for their causes in part because they defy adult expectations about children’s dependency, limited abilities, and political apathy.

Democracy’s Child is an important addition to a discipline that has devoted little attention to children. Furthermore, compared to existing political science scholarship, this book is notable for the breadth of its focus and contributions. Gash and Tichenor engage scholarly debates in political philosophy, public policy formation, political socialization, participation, and intersectionality. Their book is packed with informative case studies, historical and contemporary, from a wide range of policy areas. They incorporate fictional characters and works of literature as illustrative examples, and Gash and Tichenor’s writing is engaging. These strengths will make the book appealing to a wide audience of scholars and students. Much of it is relevant for courses focused on public policy making, whereas the chapter on children’s political agency would enhance political participation and social movement courses. Given the thought-provoking material on childhood as a societal construct, as

well as whether children should be considered full or partial democratic citizens, early chapters of this book would also be relevant for discussions regarding democratic theory, representation, and rights and liberties.

Gash and Tichenor’s book will be agenda-setting for research exploring children, governance, and democracy. Organizing relevant material into their three themes of public policy controlling children, adults leveraging children, and children as independent political actors will be a useful framework to guide research. Public policy scholars will undoubtedly identify many fruitful avenues to pursue within and across these topics, including analyses of our current political moment. Insights from *Democracy’s Child* should enrich socialization studies that explore the impact of laws, political discourse, and political engagement on adolescents and young adults.

The book also contributes to work that uses intersectional analyses. Gash and Tichenor identify many situations where childhood interacts with race, gender, and other identities to shape laws affecting our discourse surrounding children. Thoughtful intersectional approaches such as theirs will be necessary to analyze many current issues affecting young people, such as transgender policies, gun control, abortion, climate change, and parental involvement in their children’s education. At the same time, Gash and Tichenor’s book in its entirety presents a strong case for intersectional researchers to incorporate age more fully into their scholarship. Elevating childhood as an identity worth scholarly inquiry would be one indication that the discipline treats children seriously as democratic subjects, symbols, and actors.

Invisible Weapons: Infiltrating Resistance and Defeating Movements By Marcus Board Jr. New York: Oxford University Press, 2022. 266p. \$99.00 cloth, \$27.95 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592723001494

— Chaya Crowder , Loyola Marymount University
chaya.crowder@lmu.edu

In the aftermath of the George Floyd uprisings, the Movement for Black Lives is on record as the largest social movement in US History. Despite the intersectional nature of the movement’s leadership, there have been many differences in terms of who the mass public mobilizes around. The murders of Black men and boys including George Floyd, Trayvon Martin, Freddie Gray and others tend to lead to larger mobilizations than those of women like Rekia Boyd and Korryn Gaines. Marcus Board Jr.’s *Invisible Weapons* uses this asymmetric uptake as a starting point to examine the sources of anti-radicalism that exist within the mass public, in spite of the radical and intersectional nature of movement organizers and activists. Board begins his analysis with a comparison of protest responses to the murders of Freddie Gray and later Korryn Gaines in Baltimore. He notes that mass protests erupted in Baltimore and across the nation for a week following Gray’s murder. However, when

it came to the murder of Korryn Gaines, mass response never emerged. With this in mind, Board seeks to explore how we can explain this drop off in radical commitment.

Board offers his invisible weapons framework to help us make sense of why the mass public fails to fully embrace radicalism. He notes that the lack of mass response to state sanctioned murders is the result of targeted oppressions. Board defines three key components of the invisible weapons framework: (1) neglecting structural accountability; (2) elite agenda-setting; and (3) grassroots non-events. Neglecting structural accountability is characterized by an institutional lack of accountability and transparency by US governmental agencies and the police that provides cover for the injustices that are perpetuated. For example, Board notes that reporting police shootings and homicides is not mandatory. He argues that neglecting structural accountability is a passive form of systemic oppression, while elite agenda-setting is more active. He defines elite agenda-setting as “setting norms, standards, and social meaning that reinforce elitist hierarchies” (p. 14). As an example of this, he discusses Obama’s response to the Baltimore uprisings in the aftermath of the murder of Freddie Gray. Board notes that Obama deflected blame away from systems and structural oppression and instead condemned individual people and protestors for bad behavior. Lastly, Board’s final component is more amorphous as he looks at grassroots non-events, which is a lack of response to an injustice.

The central question that this book explores is “How are resistance movements and movement politics being infiltrated by anti-radicalism and co-opted into alignment with racial and gender oppressions?” (p. 7). To answer this question, Board focuses on the Movement for Black Lives and its relationship to the rise and fall of other radical movements. He argues that state oppressions at both the elite and at the grassroots levels work coercively to promote anti-radicalism. Board contends that movements end because of the intentional actions and inactions by the state.

Board grounds this text in the first chapter by detailing the roots of the Movement for Black Lives within queer anti-violence work and its simultaneous connection to neoliberalism’s role in the rise in mass incarceration. In Chapter 2, Board develops his theoretical argument of invisible weapons. This chapter uses Chinese and Asian American responses to the policed shooting of Akai Gurley to illustrate examples of the three components of the invisible weapons frameworks: agenda-setting power, structural accountability and grassroots engagement. This chapter underscores the ability of the invisible weapons framework to allow us to look beyond explicit actions and focus on broader contexts with regard to responsiveness and advocacy. Chapter 3 follows by offering an examination of mass belief systems. In particular, Board use quantitative data to examine differential feelings between Black, white

and Latine people with regard to notions of hard-work beliefs and feelings of efficacy. He demonstrates that, political efficacy has a strong influence on how people view the role of the government. Narratives surrounding hard-work and deservingness have lent themselves to a focus on personal responsibility and a deemphasize on structural accountability. Through this analysis Board illustrates how non-events and a lack of responsiveness to the needs of Black and Brown people leads to disempowerment, therefore shaping dominant power relationships.

Chapter 4 explores the implications of the influence of neglect on political agendas, by examining the job-seeking and aid-office behaviors of long-term unemployed SNAP recipients. This in-depth qualitative analysis offers an understanding of how contradictions within the system work to disengage recipients. On the one hand, when working with aid offices they are encouraged to confirm to established norms, on the other hand when it comes to job seeking interviewees are pushed to reject expectations and boundaries. Nevertheless, they still need more money to be financially secure. This chapter echoes the sentiments of the previous chapter, in that interviewees accept the bureaucratic hurdles set forth in order to obtain government assistance and place the responsibility on themselves to get better at navigating it instead of changing it. This is another example of how non-events or a lack of government action serve to deradicalize oppressed groups. Chapter 5, then, revisits the example of the Baltimore Uprisings from the Introduction. This chapter provides a more complete illustration of how the invisible weapons framework applies to the case of Baltimore. As a continuation of the previous chapter, Chapter 6 focuses on the intersectional pitfalls of mass response to state sanctioned killings through an examination of the case of Korryn Gaines. When it comes to the response to the murder of Freddie Gray and the relative silence surrounding the killing of Korryn Gaines, Board notes that “the political difference in the ways Gaines is understood, remembered, and advocated for are frankly staggering” (p. 184). Gender is the primary explanation for this differential response. This mass non-response to the murder of Black women perpetuates misogynoir- misogyny that directly affects Black women- and renders action in response to violence against Black women nonsensical. Finally, in the Conclusion Board offers hope by uplifting the work that organizers and activists are doing to combat these anti-radicalizing forces.

One of the most useful tools that this book provides is language to explain the multiple systemic components that strategically operate to suppress resistance. Board helps us make sense of why reasonable people who are ostensibly committed to justice stop resisting. He demonstrates that, in fact, there are multiple often seemingly invisible forces at work conspiring to suppress resistance. The function of neoliberalism is to emphasize personal responsibility and minimize structural accountability such that people accept

their position in society. Board argues that there are detrimental consequences for democracy when marginalized groups stop pushing for radical change.

In sum, *Invisible Weapons* develops a framework to understand how oppression is a weapon that operates relatively invisibly. Board demonstrates this through examination of multiple data sources including comparative analysis of Black, white and Latinx political participation and advocacy as well as interviews with long-term SNAP recipients and an in-depth case study analysis of the Baltimore Uprisings. Taken together, this data exposes the nature of dominant power relations and neglect, as well as resistance and co-optation. This book complements social movement scholarship that grapples with the question of why people participate in politics. By shedding light on the indirect ways that state actors suppress radicalism through neglect, agenda setting, and other forms of subversive action, Board not only renders these invisible weapons visible but makes them discernible and indisputable.

Persuasion in Parallel: How Information Changes

Minds about Politics. By Alexander Coppock. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2022. 216p. \$105.00 cloth, \$34.99 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592723001299

— Taylor N. Carlson , *Washington University in St. Louis*
tncarlson@wustl.edu

Persuasion is at the heart of politics. Candidates persuade the public to vote for them. Politicians persuade each other to vote a certain way on legislation. Voters persuade their friends to share their preferences. Yet, as important as persuasion is in American politics, we know relatively little about whether or when it is possible and how it works.

In *Persuasion in Parallel*, Alexander Coppock tries to persuade readers that persuasion is possible. He introduces the persuasion in parallel hypothesis, which states that “the treatment effect of persuasive information on target policy attitudes is small, positive, and durable for everyone” (p. 31). In other words, people modestly update their policy preferences in the direction of relevant information to which they are exposed. He uses the metaphor of parallel lines to represent the idea that although two groups of people might start with different preferences (i.e., different Y-intercepts), persuasive information causes them to update their preferences in the same direction by about the same amount (i.e., the same slope). Coppock’s argument pushes back against the notion that people hold so steadfastly to their priors that they resist contradictory information. At a time when public discourse centers on information—its quality, veracity, bias, and influence—Coppock shows that information matters. I expect a rich intellectual exchange to follow from this important book.

Persuasion in Parallel is an excellent book with much to praise. The book is refreshingly clear, with a coherent argument reinforced by effective visualizations and

empirical tests. Chapters 3 and 4 introduce the argument and research design and are a model of precision for scholars to emulate. The evidence presented in the empirical chapters is impressive, synthesizing results from 23 persuasion survey experiments, including original experiments, replications, and reanalyses (Table 4.2, p. 67). Coppock ambitiously uses a panel design to evaluate whether treatment effects are durable (chapter 6). His data strategy is precisely tailored to his argument, allowing for clean interpretations of the results. To analyze and present 23 experiments is an enormous undertaking, and the results are efficiently and effectively communicated (e.g., chapter 5).

Coppock provides convincing evidence that people update their attitudes in the direction of information. The straightforward argument speaks volumes in debates about voter competence, specifically challenging motivated reasoning accounts of information processing. The evidence tightly supports his argument, but there is room for more theoretical development around the persuasion in parallel hypothesis. Here I highlight four directions in which the persuasion in parallel hypothesis could be extended to enrich our understanding of persuasion.

First, Coppock repeatedly shows that persuasive information causes small changes in preferences in the direction of information, but there are few—if any—results where persuasive information causes people to cross the “midpoint,” such that they actually flip sides. Because voters are often faced with binary choices, nudging people’s attitudes in one direction or another might not be politically consequential if they do not ultimately vote differently. Coppock’s argument does not hinge on people completely flipping sides, but it will be important for future research to build on the foundation laid out in *Persuasion in Parallel* and examine the political implications of persuasive information. For instance, future work could extend the persuasion in parallel hypothesis to consider whether repeated exposure to persuasive information nudges people closer to flipping sides and whether people have a threshold for how much their opinions can change in response to persuasive information.

Second, one implication of the persuasion in parallel hypothesis is that understanding that people on the other side are capable of updating their preferences in the direction of information might soften the way we think about them (see pp. 1, 15, 16, 141). This potential implication is worth testing, particularly in the interpersonal contexts to which Coppock alludes. The rich literature on political discussion and persuasion within social networks might lead us to be skeptical that people would notice if they were able to slightly nudge their peers toward their side. Coppock is right that there could be important implications of the persuasion in parallel hypothesis for polarization, and future work should carefully engage with this idea.