

but only partially answered core questions asked by each subfield” (p. 160).

My only quibble with the book is that Lapinski is not as careful in integrating the literatures that he is trying to unite as he is in developing his measures and tests. I suspect that he would admit as much; in fact, he almost does: “My ideas for improving congressional studies are all about introducing better measures of political preferences and legislative productivity” (p. 159). While he is certainly justified in focusing his attention on these issues, a more thoughtful integration of the existing studies that have incorporated policy areas into the analysis would have pushed policy back into the Congress subfield more quickly.

I can appreciate that he does not want to get into the minutiae of the polarization debate, but his implicit assertion that the polarization topic begins and ends with Nolan McCarty, Keith Poole, and Howard Rosenthal’s (2006) good book, *Polarized America*, mischaracterizes the subfield. Barbara Sinclair, Steve Smith, and Frances Lee have greatly contributed to this literature in the exact way that he advocates, and yet they go unmentioned. Lee, in particular, explicitly considered the substance of policy in her polarization analysis and yet her important book is not in the bibliography.

Without first getting the lay of the land from Howard Rosenthal, Keith Poole, Keith Krehbiel, Mat McCubbins, Gary Cox, Dave Rohde, and John Aldrich, Lapinski’s study would not have been possible. These scholars have analyzed the broad contours of congressional lawmaking. None of them would suggest that the big picture is as focused as it needs to be. But without first getting it set, it would be impossible for a finer tuned focus to provide the necessary nuance to clarify the big picture. To get the most from his study, Lapinski should have built in a more rigorous way upon those that came before. One additional example on this dimension showcases my concern. Frank Baumgartner and Bryan Jones introduced a massive coding scheme for legislation that involves 19 major topic codes and 225 subtopic codes. This coding scheme has been employed around the world. Rather than engaging the work that Baumgartner and Jones have already provided political science, Lapinski asserts that their codes are time dependent and, thus, unsuitable for his purposes. He does not provide any evidence or even an argument for why his assertion is valid. Baumgartner and Jones argue that the beauty of their coding categories is that they are not time dependent and there is no reason that Lapinski offers to contradict that widely held opinion. Furthermore, Lapinski’s own coding scheme could not easily be implemented in countries other than the United States, something that Baumgartner and Jones’s has already accomplished. Given the centrality of his coding scheme to his entire enterprise, Lapinski needed to engage more explicitly the work of those who

came before him in order to contextualize and understand the contributions he is trying to make, especially given that he sees his data set as a major contribution of his entire enterprise.

These criticisms do not detract from the purpose of Lapinski’s book. They only suggest that the execution was not as complete as it could have been; but then, what opening word of a new—or reintroduced—topic ever is?

The Politics of Belonging: Race, Public Opinion, and Immigration. By Natalie Masuoka and Jane Junn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013. 254p. \$27.50.
doi:10.1017/S1537592714003673

— Jennifer L. Merolla, *Claremont Graduate University*

Most of our political science models of U.S. public opinion are structured on understandings of white public opinion. Perhaps this makes sense given that whites have been the dominant racial group for much of the nation’s history. However, issues of race have been present since the nation’s founding. Furthermore, given that the United States is an increasingly diverse society, it is all the more imperative to understand the factors that shape public opinion across different groups in society. In *The Politics of Belonging*, Natalie Masuoka and Jane Junn do just that, shining an important light on the way that one’s position in the American racial hierarchy affects public opinion differentially across groups on the issue of immigration.

According to the authors’ Racial Prism of Group Identity Model (RPGI), “Groups lower in the racial order experience more constraint as a function of their position of relative powerlessness and the negative stereotypes associated with their race. A person’s position in the American racial hierarchy thus creates systematic variation in group identity and sense of belonging, which in turn influence attitudes on immigration” (p. 2). Masuoka and Junn characterize the shape of the American racial hierarchy with whites on top, African Americans on the bottom, and Latinos and Asians in between, with Asians closer to whites. One’s position in the racial hierarchy affects two aspects of identity that, they argue, are particularly relevant for immigration attitudes: *group* identity, conceived of as a sense of linked fate with one’s group, and conceptions of American *national* identity. According to their theory, whites with a strong sense of linked fate will be more likely to support exclusionary policies on immigration, since they want to preserve their status at the top of the racial hierarchy. However, minorities with a strong sense of linked fate will be less supportive of such policies, since they are more attuned to the marginalization of different groups in U.S. society. All groups with a strong sense of American identity will hold more restrictive attitudes. The authors contend that these features will also impact susceptibility to political communication strategies, whereby whites, as the dominant group, will be more

influenced by political communication that paints immigrants in a negative light than will minorities.

The theoretical arguments advanced by Masuoka and Junn mark an original and important contribution to an understanding of immigration policy attitudes. Existing work has looked at a wide range of individual-level factors that influence opinions in this domain, including race and ethnicity. However, as the authors rightfully point out, scholars have tended to include only dummy variables to control for race, with whites as the baseline category, which tells us whether opinions on immigration differ between whites and non-whites but does not get to the more important question of why opinions might differ across groups. With this in mind, Masuoka and Junn offer a compelling argument for some of the factors that may be particularly relevant in shaping attitudes in this domain. Furthermore, they provide a methodological approach for testing these relationships, which they label a comparative relational analysis approach; it entails estimating separate regression models for the four main groups that they treat in the text. This approach is appropriate for testing the arguments they advance and is one that more scholars should be using, especially in circumstances when one expects the effects of different factors on opinions to vary across groups.

The first three empirical chapters elaborate on the development of the American racial hierarchy—how this hierarchy affects group stereotypes as well as one's sense of belonging to the nation and one's group. After taking the reader through the history of belonging in the American polity, the authors show that whites hold the most negative stereotypes toward minorities and positive stereotypes toward their own group, while minorities hold lower positive in-group stereotypes and more negative stereotypes of their own group. The authors then connect one's position in the American racial hierarchy to one's sense of belonging. They argue that whites should be the most likely to see themselves as typical Americans and be less concerned with enforcing boundaries with respect to American identity; African Americans may enforce more rigid boundaries while recognizing that they are not typical; and Latinos and Asians may see more porous boundaries while recognizing that they are not typical. The results from an analysis of survey data largely confirm these arguments, but the size of the differences between groups is not substantively large, though we may not expect large differences for American identity. Given that minorities are more peripheral members of the American polity, Masuoka and Junn argue that blacks should have the strongest sense of linked fate to their own group and that it should be most consequential for the formation of their opinions on issues related to race, followed by Latinos, Asians, and, lastly, whites. Their findings again largely confirm their arguments, except for Latinos, for whom the

results are more mixed, though there is not much discussion as to why this is the case.

The authors then connect the shape of the American racial hierarchy and sense of belonging to immigration attitudes using survey data. As expected, the authors find that across all four groups, those with a strong sense of American identity prefer to have fewer immigrants entering the United States. Linked fate also works according to expectations, with whites high in linked fate preferring fewer immigrants and Asians, blacks, and Latinos high in linked fate showing less restrictionist preferences. The authors find that the effects of American identification are robust to two other measures of immigration policy attitudes; however, the effects of linked fate are more inconsistent for African Americans, Asians, and whites, though they are consistent with expectations for Latinos. While I very much like what the authors do in this chapter, it would have benefited from more discussion of why linked fate works so well for Latinos but seems to have less consistent effects for Asians and African Americans across the three policy issues, especially given that linked fate was weakest among Latinos in the earlier chapter and did not always structure racial opinions. Furthermore, given that the authors argue for the primacy of these measures of identity for understanding attitudes on immigration, it would have been useful to provide more discussion of the size of the substantive effects of identity relative to other predictors in the model.

In the last empirical chapter, the authors test their arguments related to susceptibility to political communication on immigration. They argue that the illegal/legal immigrant distinction should matter the most to whites who seek to uphold norms and their position in the racial hierarchy; African Americans should be least affected, while raising the illegal frame may activate in-group identity among Latinos, making them even more supportive of progressive immigration policies. Using data from the 2006 Pew Immigration Survey, Masuoka and Junn show that blacks and Latinos see less of a distinction between legal and illegal immigration than whites, as expected, and Latinos hold the least restrictive attitudes. They claim that these findings provide some preliminary support for their arguments, though they acknowledge that the tests related to the illegal/legal distinction are not causal. It would have helped to have more discussion of how these analyses link back to susceptibility to elite communication. That is, how do these survey questions proxy for elite communication?

The second half of the chapter reports on a priming experiment in which the authors varied whether a segment about immigration had no picture, a picture of a Latino immigrant, or a picture of an Asian immigrant. As expected, they only see less restrictive attitudes emerge among whites across conditions, while African Americans come to hold

less restrictive attitudes when exposed to a picture of either group; however, they find no differences across conditions for Asians or Latinos. To better test their arguments, it may have been worth incorporating a condition with a white immigrant (Ted Brader, Nicholas A. Valentino, and Elizabeth Suhay, "What Triggers Public Opposition to Immigration? Anxiety Group Cues and Immigration Threat," *American Journal of Political Science* 52:4 [Sep. 2008]: 959–78), testing whether the conditions activate ethnocentrism as they argue (Donald Kinder and Cindy Kam, *Us Against Them: Ethnocentric Foundation of American Opinion*, 2009), and presenting a negative stereotype of both groups, which might have been more effective in activating in-group identity among Asians and Latinos. I found the design of the empirical tests less convincing in this chapter compared to those in other chapters, but the authors have laid out a convincing argument for future research to tackle.

In sum, Masuoka and Junn provide a rich theoretical story of how one's position in the American racial hierarchy influences one's sense of belonging, which in turn affects opinions on immigration policy. The text deftly weaves together the development of the argument, with support backed up with empirics. The book is a must-read for anyone interested in understanding opinions on immigration, but the contribution goes well beyond that. As the authors argue: "While racial patterns in opinion are not present for all issues, for those with clear racial undertones such as immigration policy, position in the racial hierarchy is the key feature to explain differences in opinion" (p. 5). Future scholars can apply the RPGI model in order to understand a wide range of issues in the American polity.

Crowded Orbits: Conflict and Cooperation in Space.

By James Clay Moltz. New York: Columbia University Press, 2014. 240p. \$30.00.

doi:10.1017/S1537592714003685

— William Bianco, *Indiana University*

Crowded Orbits asks a fundamental and far-reaching question: will national, international, and commercial efforts to explore and exploit outer space, beginning with Earth orbit and extending to the solar system and beyond, be marked by cooperation or conflict? Space is a commons, owned by no one; yet it is also an increasingly valuable location for a range of military and commercial activities. Moreover, if proponents are to be believed, the seemingly limitless vistas beyond Earth's atmosphere will become an increasingly scarce and contested resource over the next few decades, as everything from orbital "slots" to metal-rich asteroids become valuable assets in limited supply, and as military forces expand into space for surveillance, communication, and to position defensive and offensive systems.

To address these questions, Clay Moltz offers three useful perspectives. First, he gives a lucid summary of the unique characteristics of the space environment, including a primer on orbital mechanics. Second, Moltz gives a short but complete history of the various national, commercial, and military space programs, from Sputnik to the International Space Station. Third, Moltz describes current and proposed technologies, including launch vehicles, satellite platforms, and crewed spacecraft. In a word, *Crowded Orbits* gives the reader context – what resources does space offer, how have nations, corporations and other groups tried to tap these possibilities, and how might these efforts evolve in the near term? Throughout the book, Moltz does a superb job of translating complicated concepts, technologies and jargon into explanations that will make sense to the nonspecialist reader.

The underlying argument of *Crowded Orbits* is that space exploration affords many opportunities for cooperation, but that this outcome is in no way inevitable. Just as on Earth, actors sometimes face strong incentives to free ride. In other cases, the apparent benefits of cooperation may in fact not exist, as interests are opposed rather than complementary. And even when cooperative outcomes have been achieved, these results can be vulnerable to shifts in technology, national interests, or the emergence of new actors. In this sense, while there are clear differences in the nature of interactions on Earth and in outer space, it is also clear that theories developed to explain behavior in one venue retain their explanatory power when moved to the other.

One of the notable strengths of Moltz' book is its grounding in substance. For example, the benefits of cooperation are illustrated by a discussion of the mechanisms used to allocate the limited number of orbital slots for geosynchronous communications satellites. The response to the increasing threat posed by orbital debris illustrates the difficulty of establishing new rules and norms in the absence of a hegemon. Finally, the development of anti-satellite weapons (and the vulnerability of virtually all orbital systems to these weapons) neatly captures the problem that some nations or non-state actors may face strong incentives to disrupt norms and rules that govern space activities – incentives that grow larger, moreover, as the need for and benefits of these institutions increase, and as the technology for launching attacks against targets in orbit becomes more widely available.

A second strength of the book is its thoughtful use of historical events to illuminate contemporary problems. For example, the various UN treaties that prohibit nations from stationing nuclear weapons in space or that govern the return of astronauts and spacecraft to the nation that launched them demonstrate that there is nothing fundamental to activities in space that limit international agreements. Similarly, Moltz's account of the development of the International Space Station