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

Latinos are bifurcating such that only some can become white or honorary whites while others remain racialized as Latinos or become part of a "collective black" at the bottom of the hierarchy. Still others maintain that all Latinos are racialized as a distinctive nonwhite group that is not going anywhere.

Joe R. Feagin and José A. Cobas fall into this latter group. *Latinos Facing Racism* is partly a response to the first camp, seeking to remind them of the ways that Latinos are stereotyped and discriminated against. They interview middle-class Latinos about the everyday racism they experience to argue that Latinos are still seen as nonwhite, and that whites use a white racial frame to maintain their own power and privilege. Although the authors do not reference it, their argument is supported by a large literature on symbolic boundary maintenance. Feagin and Cobas are not the first to describe how whites police language use and expressions of culture or use physical or cultural cues to highlight group distinctions. But their book provides a thorough treatment of these acts and situates them within an analysis of the white racial frame, which will be familiar to readers of Feagin's other recent works.

In their analysis, the racial fate of Latinos is intertwined with issues of assimilation. Feagin and Cobas are critical of the assimilation tradition in U.S. immigration because of its implied one-way path toward Anglo-conformity. The authors focus particularly on the recent reboot of this debate, spearheaded by Richard Alba and Victor Nee (*Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration* [Harvard University Press, 2003]). Rather than a significant weakening of racial-ethnic identities that will allow contemporary Latino immigrants and their descendants to integrate into mainstream institutions, Feagin and Cobas argue that these identities are unlikely to diminish for immigrants of color. Whites simply will not give up the racial frame that protects their privileges and that "habitually makes racial injustice almost inevitable" (p. 30).

The illustration of the racism these middle-class Latinos experience is valuable, but analytical problems arise with the larger arguments. Unlike most of the scholarship they argue against, the authors treat assimilation as a group-level rather than individual process. For instance, as evidence that Latinos are not joining the mainstream, they repeatedly cite a fascinating but unpublished 2004 study finding that young, well-educated whites do not view any major Latino group as "white." But relying on such evidence understates the amount of individual movement across the Latino-white racial boundary. There is no attention to the role of phenotype in facilitating such movement because the authors view this as impossible by definition: "in US society, being truly 'white' in societal status has always been much more than a matter of individual socioeconomic achievements or self-chosen identity. Full integration into the core culture and institutions has

required being accepted by those whites in power . . . as truly white. Full integration into the core society is thus all but impossible for Americans of color" (p. 8). This position skirts the issue of earlier groups, like Jews and Irish, who were previously defined as nonwhite but have since become accepted as white, reminding us that being "of color" is itself a moving target. It also unilaterally views all Latinos as "of color." The authors strongly argue that such a view is appropriate. Latinos are defined by whites, they claim, "in terms of both *real* and *alleged* physical characteristics, with phenotypical characteristics typically *linked* closely to certain cultural characteristics of the targeted group. Thus, the fact that some Latinos are 'white looking' in some ways does not deter whites from defining and denigrating them as racially inferior and as 'not white'" (p. 16). In other words, signals of being Latino—including language, accent, names, or cultural behavior—can trump appearance and lead to classification in the subordinate group. I wholeheartedly agree with this assessment.

And yet many Latinos lose or withhold these signals, deliberately or not. Many Latinos speak English without an accent. Assimilation is also an intergenerational process, and many Latino immigrants or their children intermarry with whites, leading to children who may not bear the name, culture, or phenotype of their Latino side of the family. Analytically, such descendants are fully assimilated Latinos even if they no longer self-identify as Latino. Yet in dealing with these trends, Feagin and Cobas shift from an empirical to a normative argument. They view this loss of culture as highly problematic and believe that immigrants should not have to experience Angloconformity to integrate. This argument is forcefully made, and the book would be more satisfying if this were its stated purpose. Yet the rhetorical shift makes the premise of the book—to show that Latinos are not assimilating or becoming white—appear as a straw man.

The accounts of everyday racism provide a compelling portrait of the frustrations middle-class Latinos face but do not fully convince us that these experiences are incompatible with full integration into mainstream sociocultural institutions. Most of the encounters involve strangers in public settings. Few instances of workplace racism or incidents that might affect career trajectories are described, and in those that are, the Latino respondents effectively "resist." They refuse to stop speaking Spanish on the job, or they defend an employee's right to do so. These experiences make them feel "different" in those situations and justifiably angry, but whether they significantly hinder sociocultural integration is unclear. Indeed, the difference is striking between the overall tenor of the quotes here and those in Feagin and Karyn McKinney's earlier study of middle-class blacks (*The Many Costs of Racism* [Rowman & Littlefield, 2003]). Where those respondents seemed about to burst with overwhelming rage, more focus here is on

Latinos who are co-opted into adopting the white racial frame of their oppressors—which speaks to a kind of assimilation, albeit one the authors find undesirable. Indeed, I wished there had been more meta-analysis of Joe Feagin's collective work on everyday racism across races and genders and hope that it is forthcoming. For this volume on Latinos, one of its greatest strengths is in reminding us that even if some immigrant groups (or individuals) do become white, that does not dismantle any structures of racism. Feagin and Cobas argue that groups only assimilate and become white when the dominant white group allows it to happen. This counterpoint is useful for those debates on the racial fate of Latinos.

Legal Integration of Islam: A Transatlantic Comparison. By Christian Joppke and John Torpey. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2013. Pp. x+211. $39.95.

Anna C. Korteweg
University of Toronto

Legal Integration of Islam starts with the excellent observation that negotiations surrounding the integration of Islam in Western liberal democracies play out not only in politics but also through legal mechanisms. Thus, Christian Joppke and John Torpey usefully highlight the complexities that attend the accommodation of Islam on both sides of the Atlantic. Focusing on France, Germany, Canada, and the United States, the book is organized into four chapters, one for each country case, bookended by an introduction and conclusion. For each case, they lay out that country's general approach to the accommodation of religion, giving an overview of the legal mechanisms regulating each country's specific instantiation of secularism. Joppke and Torpey then focus on country-specific issues that have been the focal point in the regulation of Islam: the ban on face coverings in France, the incorporation of Islam as religious organization in Germany (as well as a discussion of halal slaughter, swimming lessons, mosque building, and religious education in schools), the Sharia law debate in Canada, and finishing with an analysis of the absence of conflict in American legal regulation of Islam.

In the first two chapters, Joppke and Torpey, in a somewhat surprising move, argue that in both France and Germany, there has been extensive accommodation of Islam. They cite a number of legal and political decisions to substantiate their claims. Though some of these are stronger than others, the point that existing law has generated a number of accommodations in both countries is well taken and generally well developed. In making this argument, these chapters provide insightful analyses of the legal mech-