experiential core of college, or what happens in the years between entering and exiting college.

As Weiss's approach is primarily criminological and her focus is on party pathologies, readers will have to look elsewhere for persuasive arguments about the social functions of partying and its many noncriminal aspects. Sexuality is discussed in terms of unwanted sex (assault and rape). Hooking up and other casual sexual activity—fundamental to other scholars' accounts of college partying—barely get a mention. Besides discussing some unsurprising findings related to differences in men and women's drinking habits (men on average drink more than women and get in fights more often when drunk), Weiss's analysis mostly avoids gender. PU is racially homogeneous (overwhelmingly white), and quantitative data, according to Weiss, do not hint at any role social class may play in PU's party subcultures. Whether based on limitations in data or analytical oversight, these omissions will frustrate those who intuitively or empirically know campus social life to be diverse, both shaped by and productive of inequalities. Nonetheless, Weiss makes a convincing case that the type of partying found at PU can be found at schools across the country, mostly for the worse.

Whose Rights? Counterterrorism and the Dark Side of American Public Opinion. By Clem Brooks and Jeff Manza. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2013. Pp. xiv+188. $29.95 (paper).

Jennifer L. Merolla
Claremont Graduate University

In *Whose Rights? Counterterrorism and the Dark Side of American Public Opinion*, Clem Brooks and Jeff Manza tackle the puzzle of why there is such high support for counterterrorism measures in a context in which the threat of international terrorism on U.S. soil has diminished. While prior scholars have examined public opinion in this domain (e.g., Darren Davis, *Negative Liberty* [Russell Sage Foundation, 2007]), Brooks and Manza evaluate opinions on a wider range of counterterrorism measures and illuminate the types of policies that generate the most support and opposition, as well as the factors that drive opinions. One important goal of the book is to understand just how malleable opinion is on different measures. In short, the authors find, "The attitudes and beliefs of Americans have a dark side, a willingness to suppress otherwise strong support for civil rights and liberties in the name of national crisis and perceived threats" (p. 8).

The authors consider several theories that may explain opinions on counterterrorism measures, the first being the threat-priming hypothesis, which holds that priming threat makes individuals more supportive of such policies. Even though scholars have found support for this hypothesis (e.g., Jennifer L. Merolla and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister, *Democracy at Risk*

[University of Chicago Press, 2009]), Brooks and Manza test if it still works many years after 9/11 and with a shift to a Democratic administration. The authors also explore whether opinions have become more polarized along partisan lines over time. They also consider how the target of policies affects opinions (e.g., Donald Kinder and Cindy Kam, *Us against Them* [University of Chicago Press, 2009]), with the expectation that individuals will be more supportive of policies that target noncitizens. Finally, they argue that people become more supportive of policies once they are already in place. The lack of a single unifying argument makes it difficult at times to get the main takeaways of the book. However, given the complexity of opinions, it is more realistic to consider the interplay of several theories that may explain counterterrorism opinions, and this approach sheds more light on the conditions under which counterterrorism opinions are more or less malleable.

The authors rely on an impressive array of original surveys conducted with nationally representative samples in 2007, 2009, and 2010. They look at opinions on policies such as national security agency surveillance, the Military Commissions Act, the USA PATRIOT Act, targeted assassinations, security versus rights trade-offs, indefinite detention, airport security checks for Muslims, ethnic profiling, waterboarding, and torture. Seven of these 10 items get fairly wide public support, while the ones that generate lower support are waterboarding and torture. What is most remarkable is that opinions have remained stable over time, even though the threat of terrorism has diminished and the presidency has shifted from a Republican administration that played up the threat of terrorism to a Democratic administration.

After showing basic trends in opinion, the authors turn to survey experiments to test the different theories outlined above. All of the survey experiments are very minor manipulations in question wording, which is a departure from other work in this area and likely poses a more difficult test case for the hypotheses being advanced. The authors also test whether the treatment effects vary depending on worry about terrorism, partisanship, authoritarian attitudes, education, race, and religion. The authors make a convincing case for why some of these factors may moderate reaction to the treatments, for example in the case of partisanship, but there is little argument provided for why responses might vary based on sociodemographic characteristics.

The authors find very strong support for the threat-priming hypothesis for airport security and rights violation measures, though not for torture. Furthermore, individuals are not only responsive to past plots, but hypothetical future threats, though this latter finding was only tested in one of the three experiments. The authors also find that individuals are more supportive of rights violations and military commissions that target foreign nationals rather than Americans. However, target priming has no effects on support for torture. Finally, in an even more novel experiment, Brooks and Manza show that individuals who first read that surveillance is authorized by an act of Congress are even more supportive of NSA surveil-

lance. However, they do not find similar effects on diminished support for waterboarding among those exposed to information that Barack Obama issued an order to stop coercive interrogation procedures. The mixed findings for the policy feedback experiments suggest much more careful theorizing needs to be done, but this marks an important starting point for future scholarship. One striking revelation is that across all of these experiments there is little evidence of partisan polarization, even though we are in an era of high polarization.

In summary, the authors demonstrate that many counterterrorism opinions are fairly malleable and can be changed with priming the threat environment, the target groups being considered, as well as references to policy change. These findings imply that elites are in a position to maintain high levels of public support, even in the absence of real threats. The authors point to several factors that could potentially lead to more dramatic drops in support for counterterrorism measures. Educated elites might start questioning the various programs, party elites might begin to polarize on the issue, or, the public might start to think of themselves as targets of these policies. Partisan polarization on these issues seems unlikely in the near future, since Democrats do not want to be painted as weak on national security. We are, however, beginning to see some shifts in reduced support for counterterrorism measures with the recent prominence of the NSA domestic surveillance of U.S. citizens in the news. There may, therefore, be more positive developments on the horizon, at least from a rights-based perspective. The book provides much fodder for future work in this domain and is necessary reading for those who seek to understand public reactions to terrorist threats.

Amigas y Amantes: Sexually Nonconforming Latinas Negotiate Family. By Katie L. Acosta. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv+167. $24.95 (paper).

Lorena Garcia
University of Illinois, Chicago

Research on LGBTQ individuals' negotiation of their sexual identities within their families of origin has made known some of the challenges they encounter and their strategies for addressing them. Significant among those challenges is often the inability or refusal of their biological families to accept and respect their sexual identities as well as their same-sex relationships, to which LGBTQ individuals sometimes respond by partially or completely breaking from birth families to create families of choice for themselves. But since this finding is based mostly upon studies of white gay men and lesbians, some scholars have questioned whether this pattern is found among all LGBTQ groups. Katie Acosta disrupts the commonly held assumption that all LGBTQ individuals and couples are disconnected from their families of origin in her book, *Amigas y Amantes: Sexually Non-*