

to convince Latin Americans that they should eschew their allegiance to whiteness in exchange for a mestizo identity. It is here that she finds a resonance with Du Bois and Vasconcelos in their visions of “mixture as futurity”. Indeed both thinkers should be juxtaposed rather than positioned against each other, however, this point deserves more attention. It seems that rather than create a national identity from mixture, Vasconcelos wishes to create a new (darker) form of whiteness that must include mixture but also erases blackness and indigeneity rather than value them, as Du Bois does. The chapter also includes an essential discussion of the travels of Vasconcelos’s writings as they are used/misused by contemporary Latino/a thinkers.

*Theorizing Race in the Americas* represents multiple critical contributions to both political theory as well as the field of racial politics. In addition to the principal claim that we should read race hemispherically, she demonstrates (1) the ways in which Latin American racial thought has both borrowed from and traveled to the United States and (2) the rightful expansion of African American political thought beyond the borders of the United States to interrogate black freedom, black fugitivity, racial mixture, and multiracial democracy. The book insightfully highlights how the role of the West and global white supremacy has created linkages between two previously disconnected geographical spaces of study, thus centering comparative racial politics in the field of political science.

***Convicted and Condemned: The Politics and Policies of Prisoner Reentry.* By Keesha M. Middlemass. New York: NYU Press, 2017. 288 pp., \$89 (cloth).**

doi:10.1017/rep.2017.28

Ariel R. White,  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

No one knows exactly how many people in the United States have been convicted of felonies, but we do know that hundreds of thousands of former offenders are released from prison each year. Once out, they

encounter an uncertain future and myriad pressures: meeting basic needs, satisfying the terms of any supervision, and trying to rebuild or maintain frayed relationships.

In *Convicted and Condemned*, Keesha Middlemass describes the conditions people with felony convictions face after release, using their own words. Middlemass conducted fieldwork at a nonprofit reentry organization in Newark, interviewing dozens of people and conducting participant observation. The resulting book powerfully illustrates the ways in which felony convictions persist and continue to entangle people long after they have served their custodial sentences, portraying a conviction as a “social disability.”

*Convicted and Condemned* does a masterful job of using interview transcripts to present the challenges people face in their daily lives, centering most chapters around a specific need: housing, education, jobs. Interviews are especially well-suited to helping the reader understand how people with convictions view the pressure they are under and the systems they are dealing with. In discussing their efforts to find work in a world where a felony conviction can bar people from entire occupations (by law) or businesses (by employers’ choices), interviewees describe gut-wrenching choices between bad options: remaining unemployed and unable to pay off legal debts or meet parole requirements, returning to criminal activity, or lying on job applications to hide their convictions. And they display nuanced understandings of how convictions matter and for whom: “Work comes first, [...] I did what they tell me, got clean, but nothing; it’s just crazy, all racial shit, really. White guys [who are convicted felons] do better” (p. 150). And throughout the book, Middlemass highlights important patterns that emerge from the full set of interviews, such as a comparison between people’s post-prison behaviors and the symptoms of more typically-diagnosed forms of post-traumatic stress disorder that deserves further research.

This approach also yields concrete policy proposals tailored to the problems people actually face. Chapter 2 proposes a strikingly practical but game-changing intervention: what if the state Department of Corrections, which has every prisoner’s identifying information, issued them an official state ID upon release, freeing them from the difficulty of trying to piece together enough documentation to get a non-prison ID card? Centering the voices of the real experts on criminal convictions—the people who live with those convictions—has the dual benefit of reminding readers just what is at stake in criminal policy debates, and producing insights that might not otherwise emerge. Understanding the

actual challenges people encounter, and how they themselves would prefer to solve those problems, can help policymakers and citizens frame a successful response.

Where the book seeks to diagnose the social and policy roots of these challenges, it sometimes falters. The analysis of the problems convicted people face is sharp and detailed; the attribution of blame for these problems often falls back on “society” rather than specific actors, or assumes that policymakers were all instrumental and perfectly forward-looking when they put in place the systems that gave rise to mass incarceration. The book sometimes feels like it is reaching beyond what the data at hand can tell us about the broader systems at play.

One example of the strengths and weaknesses of the book’s approach comes from the housing chapter, when a woman reports her experience applying for a Section 8 housing voucher: “Before the background check comes back, I get put on the [wait] list, but then I get denied. I mean they say come back, but look, you know, they know, and I know that I can’t get Section 8. I’m denied” (p. 99). This person’s report of her own experience with housing authorities, how it affects her life, and the way she attributes it to her conviction is important to understand, and the reliance on interview data is perfectly-suited to portraying it. But the book then generalizes this example to report that public housing authorities in the region routinely use waiting lists to effectively “[deny] an applicant on the basis of a felony” (p. 98), without citing other evidence. It is entirely possible that Newark-area housing authorities are denying or delaying housing benefits to people due to their convictions. But Section 8 is a non-entitlement program that does not receive enough funding to serve everyone who is eligible, and housing authorities across the country have years-long waiting lists that are often closed to new applicants regardless of their records. It is not clear that the chapter’s implied solution—requiring housing authorities to ignore or reconsider Section 8 applicants’ criminal histories—would actually ensure that many more people with felony convictions would get the housing that they need. That said, limitations like this do not negate the value of this chapter, or the book, at all. Regardless of the extent to which people with felony convictions are being systematically, disproportionately wait-listed, the book starkly describes how housing instability structures their lives. As one interviewee pointed out, “When you ain’t got a place to sleep, you ain’t thinking about nothing else, you can only think about a place to sleep. You sure ain’t thinking about voting and stuff like that” (p. 102).

*Convicted and Condemned* makes a valuable contribution to the literature on the carceral state, and I hope to see more ethnographic work like it. It provides a richer understanding of the lives of people dealing with criminal convictions, and it generates policy proposals and hypotheses that should inform both policymaking and future research.

***Unsettled Americans: Metropolitan Context and Civic Leadership for Immigrant Integration.*** Edited By John Mollenkopf and Manuel Pastor. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016. 344 pp. \$24.95 (Paper).

doi:10.1017/rep.2018.18

Michael Rich,  
*Emory University*

Immigration has been a core issue in the partisan polarization currently paralyzing national policymaking and was a central issue in the 2016 presidential election, with Donald Trump taking a strong anti-immigration position. President Trump moved quickly to fulfill his “America First” campaign promise, including the issuance of travel ban restrictions, continuing to advocate for the construction of a wall along the border with Mexico, and in September 2017, announcing he would end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program in 6 months unless Congress enacted a replacement. Thus, rather than resolve the immigration deadlock, the 2016 presidential election intensified the positions on both sides of the debate.

Over the past decade, as national consensus on immigration appeared well beyond reach, state and local governments have become more prominent actors, with some, such as Arizona, adopting anti-immigration policies and others such as California and Connecticut passing a variety of pro-integration initiatives. With a nod to former House Speaker Tip O’Neill’s observation that “all politics is local,” two of the nation’s foremost scholars on racial and ethnic politics in urban and metropolitan communities have convened a superb group of coauthors to examine the determinants of contemporary immigration integration in seven metropolitan regions. The key question driving *Unsettled Americans* is why does