

Matthews's arguments dovetail nicely with the tenets of critical race theory, which simultaneously point to the permanence of racism and white supremacy but also shine a light on potential transformation leverage points. For example, according to critical race theory, small gains in racial justice are possible when they overlap with the interests of the powerful. The language of implicit bias and unconscious racism may provide an opening narrative that can strategically engage providers and policymakers to listen, reflect, and act in the service of racial justice. The Biased Care Model provides a model for necessary intersectional knowledge projects that examine how implicit bias and unconscious racism may be experienced and manifested differently depending on the particular configuration of structural race-gender-class inequality at play in a given local municipality or rural.

Finally, the policy prescriptions allude to a way forward for cultivating synergies by stakeholder groups, including social scientists, providers, lawyers, and policymakers, as well as patients, to work together to eradicate implicit bias dovetails nicely with community-based participatory research methods in public health and potentially research practice partnerships in education, criminal justice, and other policy arenas.

*Just Medicine* is necessary reading for all who envision a society in which health equity is a moral imperative. I would place Matthew's contributions on the scale of Michelle Alexander's transformational book, *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in a Time of Colorblindness* (2010). Matthew not only documents the problem of color-blind racism but also provides solution-oriented road maps for a way forward. These contributions are transformational for interdisciplinary race scholars as well as for health practitioners, policymakers, and patients who have a vested interest in changing the status quo of paralysis in the elimination of unconscious racism in health care.

NANCY LÓPEZ

*University of New Mexico*

**The Missing American Jury: Restoring the Fundamental Constitutional Role of the Criminal, Civil, and Grand Juries** by Suja A. Thomas. New York, Cambridge University Press, 2016. 262 pp. Paper, \$34.99.

This is a bold book. Suja A. Thomas urges that the jury—criminal, civil, and grand—be recognized as a fourth “branch” (p. 5). She asserts that procedures that have contributed to the reduction of the jury's power—including summary judgment and state prosecution without grand juries—are unconstitutional. And, as a Plan B if her constitutional arguments do not prevail, she proposes

big changes that include informing juries about sentence exposure, presenting juries with any charges that were offered in plea bargaining, and requiring that juries justify their verdicts.

She backs up her boldness, not only with extensive research documenting “a common history of diminution of power” (p. 89) but also with thoughtful explications of the harm done to the jury and, as a result, to society. The jury is a decider of fates, and Thomas tells a powerful story of how *its* fate has been shaped: at various times and in various ways it has been championed, protected, and powerful, but it is now disfavored and disparaged as useless, and is perhaps all but useless, with its power transferred to branches that *it* was supposed to check.

Thomas is careful to include plenty for those who might resist such a bold vision. You do not need to find the jury’s diminution unconstitutional to find it regrettable, for example. In one fascinating chapter, she surveys various countries—including Japan, Iran, Russia, and Ghana—with the aim of demonstrating the widespread embrace of lay decision-making. Thomas is right that this common thread is compelling, and that the differences are, too, since we learn that none of the norms that we may associate with the jury is universal: out there in the world, juries can be nonunanimous, can consider sentencing and appeals, can review decisions not to charge, can comprise a mix of lay people and professionals, can be forbidden from deliberating, can be required to undergo training, and can be selected in very different ways—and on the basis of more rigorous criteria—than our own. This survey may lead us to fall in love all over again with our own version, or to contemplate other visions; either way, the section provides useful material for those who study and teach the jury.

If there were room for anything more in this ambitious book, I would have loved to hear more about the complications in the powerful story of a jury that is lost and should be re-found. First, I wondered about just how lost it is. Of course, as Thomas states, the vast bulk of convictions are obtained not at trial but through guilty pleas. Thomas persuasively demonstrates the flaws in that arrangement, particularly in light of the fact that what Blackstone described as the “strong and two-fold barrier” (p. 160) of grand and petit jury is so often missing. But is it the case that the jury exercises “almost no authority” (p. 147), plays “almost no role” (p. 2), and “fails to check any governmental actors”? (p. 25). I was curious, for example, about rates of jury acquittal and about the ability of the jury’s anticipated verdict to shape outcomes—and even prompt dismissals—pretrial. Second, while Thomas includes among the reasons to favor juries over judges the fact that juries are freed from some of the incentives and biases that influence judges and that juries are drawn from a more diverse

pool, I would have liked to hear her thoughts on concerns about biases in jury selection and decision-making.

Thomas promises her readers more work to come on her provocative proposals regarding jury and plea-bargaining reform. We await it eagerly.

ANNA ROBERTS

*Seattle University School of Law*

**Messengers of the Right: Conservative Media and the Transformation of American Politics** by Nicole Hemmer. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016. 336 pp. \$34.95.

Today we casually link conservative media names and institutions such as Rush Limbaugh, Bill O'Reilly, Sean Hannity, and Fox News with successful politicians from Ronald Reagan to Newt Gingrich to Donald Trump. Nicole Hemmer demonstrates that assuming conservative media and conservative politicians have always had a close relationship is a misperception. This is the story of the first generation of conservative media. The time frame is primarily the late 1940s through the 1950s. Some of the names and institutions that are discussed and appear throughout are well known, such as William F. Buckley Jr., the founding editor of *National Review* and the conservative activist group the John Birch Society. But Hemmer's focus is on the lesser known but equally transformative figures of the period: Clarence Manion, creator of the radio program the *Manion Forum*, who has been credited as one of the founders of talk radio, and Henry Regnery and William Rusher, publishers of the magazines *Human Events* and *National Review*, respectively.

Each of the three was initially active in GOP politics, but eventually they found themselves on the outside looking in. For example, in 1953 at the start of Dwight D. Eisenhower administration, Manion was appointed chairman of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a highly regarded position. But Manion wanted the secretary of labor position and expected to eventually receive a U.S. Supreme Court nomination. Instead he was gone within six months after he repeatedly disagreed with Eisenhower publicly. For each of the three, choosing media activism rather than a career in institutional partisan politics would prove fortuitous. Conservative media activists did face real barriers during this period because their politics were considered too radical by the mainstream. As *Messengers* demonstrates throughout, by working outside the system, their contribution as conservative media activists to the conservative political cause would be profound.

Conservative media activists in general, and especially Regnery's magazine *Human Events*, believed that the left controlled the institutions: media,