

tendencies Kull identifies, there are cross-national differences that it would be instructive to interrogate. Even more, it would be valuable to know something about the demographic distribution and determinants of key attitudes. Are there important generational differences, for example, or does education make people more or less likely to hold particular attitudes toward the United States.

Kull's final chapter takes up the question of how Americans should think about and respond to Muslim anger. His thoughts are constructive and in the right direction, including the suggestions that America "look for subtle opportunities to differentiate U.S. national interests from those of Israel" (p. 213), and that American leaders "lace diplomatic communications with references to the rights of Muslim people to democracy and self-determination" (p. 215) and make statements "affirming that Middle Eastern nations have a sovereign right to the oil on their territory" (p. 216).

Perhaps more cannot be asked of Kull, but these are timid prescriptions that are unlikely to make much difference. Americans need to ask themselves whether the complaints fueling Muslim anger are real or imagined; and to the extent that they are indeed real, even if exaggerated in the imagination of some Muslims, the debate that Kull's study calls us to have is not only about how best to communicate with Muslims but also, and much more, about the nature and implications of our policies in the Muslim world.

MARK TESSLER
University of Michigan

Justices and Journalists: The U.S. Supreme Court and the Media by
Richard Davis. New York, Cambridge University Press, 2011. 264 pp. \$28.99.

Book deals, speaking events, and television appearances are increasingly common for U.S. Supreme Court justices. More so than ever before, the justices appear to be part of the mainstream media environment. Why do justices "go public"? Has the relationship between justices and the media changed over time? If so, what are the implications of these changes for the Supreme Court? These are among the questions that Richard Davis tackles. The result is an in-depth account of the evolving relationship between the Supreme Court justices and the media.

Davis's central argument is that justices engage in strategic external relations to retain institutional and individual influence. An extensive historical analysis offers evidence of such strategic relations throughout the Court's history. Beginning with the first session of the U.S. Supreme Court, Davis offers an overview of justices' awareness of press coverage and their attempts to influence this coverage and public opinion. In addition to providing general evidence of strategic behavior, the historical analysis offers insight into how this behavior has varied across justices. For example, Davis focuses on justices' professional backgrounds prior to joining the Court to help understand variation in their relations with the media.

In addition to highlighting heterogeneity across justices, the historical analysis documents changes across time. Of particular interest is the recent rise in justices going public. Davis offers numerous potential factors for the increase in strategic external relations, such as more-controversial judicial selection processes, decisions of the Court, changes in journalism, the celebrity culture of American society, and the role of television. To more fully document and explain these changes, Davis turns to a content analysis of all *New York Times* and *NBC Nightly News* stories about the Supreme Court justices from 1968 to 2007. Consistent with expectations, *The New York Times* included more stories about Supreme Court justices between 1998 and 2007 than in any of the previous three decades. Additionally, since 1998, a higher proportion of *New York Times* stories focused on personal stories, as opposed to case-related stories. The patterns for *NBC Nightly News* appear more complex, but we again see systematic differences across decades.

The content analysis reflects an impressive collection of data. I suspect, and hope, that future research will carry this effort even farther. The current analysis focuses on changes across decades. Given the hypotheses being tested, this is a reasonable strategy. Nevertheless, it would be even more informative to see the data plotted annually. Additionally, reporting patterns for other political institutions would add further context to changes in the media environment. For example, as the frequency of stories about Supreme Court justices has decreased on *NBC Nightly News*, has the number of stories about members of Congress and the president also decreased, or have these increased at the expense of stories about Supreme Court justices? Of course, these types of analyses are beyond the scope of the book, and this is not meant as a criticism. Rather, I hope they illustrate how the data presented offer a strong foundation for moving forward with Supreme Court research.

The strategic argument presented in *Justices and Journalists* will be of interest to a wide audience. By some accounts, Supreme Court justices have little incentive to behave strategically. The justices benefit from life tenure, and the Court enjoys relatively high levels of diffuse public support. Furthermore, this diffuse support is thought to emerge, in part, because of the insulated and apolitical nature of the Court. Considering this perspective, Davis's argument and evidence of external strategic relations will clearly influence scholarly debates about the relationship between the Supreme Court justices, public opinion, and the media.

PETER K. ENNS
Cornell University

Vote Thieves: Illegal Immigration, Redistricting, and Presidential Elections
by Orlando J. Rodriguez. Dulles, VA, Potomac Books, 2011. 192 pp. \$26.95.

The United States is a nation of immigrants. During the postwar years of the twentieth century, one of the most notable population trends was the phenomenal