between individual identity politics and institutional discourses is made even stronger by the richness of her data. As a qualitative researcher I am particularly struck by both the breadth and depth of this data, as well as the way in which Sue presents the narratives. Her ability to move beyond surface-level conversations regarding race and color and the detail in which she presents her participants speaks to the methodological excellence of this work.

Just Who Loses? Vol. 2 of *Discrimination in the United States*. By Samuel Roundfield Lucas. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2013. Pp. xviii+ 350. $85.00.

Kevin Stainback
Purdue University

Research on racial and gender inequality in the United States is vast and covers a dizzying array of specialty areas addressing key areas of life chances including education, employment, and health. For many sociologists, documenting, understanding, and explaining inequality lies at the heart of the discipline.

One aspect of this previous research that sociologists have done well over the past few decades is social accounting—in other words, confirming racial and gender discrepancies. In statistical terms, social scientists often compare groups who have historically faced greater disadvantage against those who have experienced greater privilege, controlling for important factors that may explain the outcome of interest. Net of controls, social scientists often attribute mean differences between groups, or differential returns to assets (e.g., education and skills), to discrimination. From this "traditional" perspective, analysts tend to conflate discrimination and inequality.

In stark contrast to the traditional perspective, Samuel Roundfield Lucas, in his recent book *Just Who Loses*, suggests that we often assume that discrimination has winners and losers; however, Lucas argues that social scientists need to interrogate discrimination more fully. He convincingly argues that the traditional approach to understanding discrimination is misguided. Rather than center attention on inequality, Lucas pushes scholars to examine discrimination, which may or may not produce inequality and may not always be a zero-sum game.

Lucas provides examples of how the traditional approach to studying inequality may sometimes demonstrate no statistically significant differences between social groups, when, in fact, discrimination may be prevalent. This result is possible because discrimination may have negative effects on targets and nontargets alike. For instance, the effect of women entering male-dominated jobs may have negative effects on the earnings of both

men and women in those jobs. Lucas cites work that has made analogous claims; however, I believe this is the most thoughtful and coherent theoretical articulation of the idea that I have read. When completed, *Discrimination in the United States* is likely to become foundational work in social stratification. Similar to volume 1, I found that this volume made me think more deeply about not only the ideas Lucas so cleverly develops, but also how these ideas may inform my own thinking and research. This book is another solid volume in an extremely ambitious research project.

Lucas begins this volume by drawing on his previous volume and defines discrimination as "both the acts of *social* individuals *and* the matrix of norms, values, and public support mechanisms that are erected by social persons, norms, values, and public support mechanisms whose existence outlives the particular momentary acts that give birth to them" (p. 9). After providing a brief overview of his theoretical orientation, Lucas provides overviews of three primary types of explanations for inequality in the following two chapters, including biological explanations, socialization explanations, and discrimination explanations. These overviews will be especially useful for scholars who are new to this research area. Some readers who are already familiar with this area of work may find some of the literature reviewed a bit dated. While the literature may not be the most up to date, readers will still learn a great deal from the discussion.

Lucas discusses his conceptualization and measurement of discrimination in chapter 4. Consistent with his definition, Lucas uses state-level characteristics to capture "expected exposure to discrimination." One important set of indicators used is state-level discrimination and antidiscrimination laws. Lucas claims that only "persistent patterns" of intergroup social relations will become codified in law. This democratic view of policy making suggests that politicians listen to constituencies and vote accordingly. Indeed, much of the excellent work of Paul Burstein provides some support for this view (e.g., *Discrimination, Jobs, and Politics* [University of Chicago Press, 1998]). Burstein's work also emphasizes the role of social movements. In my own work, I have also suggested that the implementation of policy and the passage of laws may be linked to social movement pressures that may or may not be consistent with public opinion (Kevin Stainback and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, *Documenting Desegregation* [Russell Sage, 2012]). For example, Franklin D. Roosevelt's 1941 decision to issue executive order 8802, which outlawed employment discrimination on the basis of race in federal government and in firms with federal contracts, was less motivated by public support for such a policy than the pressure exerted by A. Philip Randolph's threat to organize a large-scale march on Washington (Louis Coleridge Kesselman, *The Social Politics of FEPC* [University of North Carolina Press, 1948]). The work of Anthony Chen (*The Fifth Freedom* [Princeton University Press, 2009]) is also informative in demonstrating how the passage of

fair employment-practice laws was the result of complex interest-group politics rather than public support for equal opportunity alone. In short, I would have liked to see a discussion of how interest groups and power relations play out in the policy-making arena, rather than a democratic portrayal of law as merely reflecting public opinion.

I would agree with Lucas that the extent to which groups are able to organize and pass discrimination laws (e.g., segregation, antimiscegenation) may be an indicator of a discriminatory environment; however, I am not convinced that states with antidiscrimination laws are necessarily less discriminatory environments, nor that they can capture discrimination. Such laws may pass for other reasons (e.g., power, legitimacy). Scholars may also take issue with other indicators of expected exposure to discrimination. Regardless of my skepticism concerning some of the indicators of expected exposure to discrimination, there is much in this volume to learn, debate, and ponder.

Throughout his empirical analysis of black and white men and women (1940 to 1990), and covering numerous outcomes ranging from education and employment to mortality, Lucas demonstrates that discrimination tends to harm everyone. Specifically, he finds that discrimination not only tends to have negative effects on target groups, but also nontargets. Hence, more discriminatory environments have negative effects on many outcomes for black and white men and women. This finding is novel, with implications for our understanding of discrimination, its operation, scholarly research, and legal conceptions of discrimination.

I thoroughly enjoyed Lucas's first volume of *Discrimination in the United States*. In that volume, Lucas demonstrated his masterful ability to weave a complex narrative of history, theory, and previous literature. In the follow-up volume, Lucas provides an empirical analysis to examine some of the ideas developed in the previous volume. This contribution is a great volume that scholars should read, contemplate, and challenge.

Latinos Facing Racism: Discrimination, Resistance, and Endurance. By Joe R. Feagin and José A. Cobas. Boulder, Colo.: Paradigm Publishers, 2013. Pp. xii+185. $24.95 (paper).

Wendy D. Roth
University of British Columbia

One of the more vibrant debates among contemporary scholars of race and immigration concerns the racial fate of Latinos. Some argue that Latinos will become white, like earlier European immigrants. Others say they will become "honorary whites," largely accepted socially and moving toward socioeconomic parity, even if still distinguished racially. Some contend that