

including Yolanda Sánchez who founded, with others, the National Latina Caucus (NLC). María Canino was an advocate for higher educational issues, and a member of the City University of New York (CUNY) Board of Trustees. Diana Caballero was president of the National Congress of Puerto Rican Rights (NCPR).

Beyond its persuasive, well-documented claims about the Puerto Rican community's essentially mainstream, liberal politics, the book's core message is that political empowerment of Puerto Ricans in New York took place through activism at many different levels, and arenas, of city politics, not just through electoral politics. Cruz identified important roles for Spanish language, and Puerto Rican culture, in this ascendance. The book documents Puerto Rican leaders' engagement with traditional (non-Puerto Rican) elites, and their use of existing democratic institutions to gain and maintain political influence. From a theoretical perspective, Cruz's work suggests that under certain demographic and political conditions, ethnic or racial minority groups can move from the margins into the mainstream of American politics. Puerto Ricans have demonstrated this in New York, and Latinx have the potential to demonstrate it on the national level soon.

This is an important book that I can highly recommend not just for undergraduate and graduate students, but for scholars, journalists, and anyone else who is interested in Puerto Rican politics specifically, and Latinx politics generally.

***White Identity Politics.* By Ashley Jardina. Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. \$24.99 (Paper)**

doi:10.1017/rep.2019.16

David C. Wilson,  
*University of Delaware*

In *White Identity Politics*, Ashley Jardina presents a compelling analysis of contemporary politics by investigating how America's changing racial–ethnic demographics influence Whites' perceptions of their group's

status (Chapter 1). According to Jardina, politics today are partly explained by *White identity*, which Jardina measures through several items that capture the importance (i.e., centrality) of being White and regard for the group (e.g., cohesion, pride, and perceived status) (Chapter 3). Strong White identifiers have lower education, hold closed beliefs like social dominance orientation (SDO) and authoritarianism, are Republican and conservative, and surprisingly, they are more likely to be female than male (Chapter 4).

Jardina proposes that past studies found little to no import of White identity because it was hardly threatened, measures were unavailable or less valid, and scholars narrowly focused on racial policy (Chapter 2). Prior studies took place during periods where the political usefulness of identity among Whites was not crystalized. Today, Whites hold a greater awareness of, and attachment to, their racial identity because “big events” make their race more relevant and meaningful. Thus, Whites’ dominant group identity is ostensibly a dormant source of privileged comfort until threatened, then it becomes a more easily accessible information filter for political judgments. The added salience comes with a political bent of protecting group interest manifested through various forms of political behavior.

For example, Jardina finds that stronger White racial identity predicts higher support for non-racial policies like social security, legacy college admissions, and Medicare, but also more support for government spending to help racial minorities (Chapter 7, p. 201). Thus, her study holds novelty as it is situated in a crystalized racial-political climate where non-Hispanic Whites hold a declining share of the U.S. population, immigration is conflated with terror, and African Americans are perceived to have gained increased political influence with the election of President Barack Obama (Chapter 8). This presents a ripe setting for investigating the influence of dominant group identity on politics, and vice versa.

The book is distinctive in its focus on *in-group* solidarity, underscoring the consequence of race beyond anti-out group attitudes like racism and prejudice, and narrow Black–White group debates. Importantly, Jardina does not propose that out-group racial attitudes have no consequence for politics (Chapter 9) or the development of White identity. Indeed, anti-black stereotypes, racial resentment, and out-group feeling thermometer scores are among the strongest correlates of White identity (Chapter 3). Instead, her analytic work reveals that Whites, rather than being wholly racist, prejudiced, or White nationalistic, hold anxieties tied to demographic shifts and their future position which leads them to support

(oppose) leaders like Trump (Obama) because these leaders, and their policy positions, protect (threaten) their racial group's dominant status.

The greatest strength of *White Identity Politics* is the sheer volume of analytic work undertaken by Jardina, and the level of thought devoted to a compelling story that challenges canonical beliefs about White racial attitudes among political scientists, and social scientists more generally. Jardina situates White solidarity as a construct that requires greater scrutiny and her primary data from YouGov, Knowledge Networks, and Survey Sampling International (SSI) supplement the American National Election Studies (ANES) to create an undeniable set of results showing that White identity is not merely conservatism, working class ideology, nationalism, or racial prejudice. Instead it operates as a coherent and meaningful core attachment among members of the dominant racial group in American, if not global, society.

Readers should not expect a completely new theoretical framework for the effects of White identity. Social identity theory and [sense of] group position theory, which serve as foundations to Jardina's framework, are more than familiar. The notable exception is that Jardina focuses on in-group rather than out-group attitudes. Nonetheless, scholars are aware that competitive threat, realistic or perceived, can activate both out-group dislike (e.g., prejudice) and in-group partiality and cohesion (e.g., identity solidarity).

While Jardina does not empirically investigate how Whites acquire (or accept/reject) threatening information, in theory, once activated, there is no clear stopping point to the threat's presence since it can be "perceived" rather than real (Chapter 9). This suggests Whites could adopt positions that actually harm democratic values like freedom, equality, and justice (i.e., civil rights and liberties) and ultimately threaten their own group interests. Despite the presence of Donald Trump, there is no puppeteer operating behind the curtain to turn the threat-spigot on and off when needed. Thus, White identity becomes a sort of American psychosis waiting for isolationist, xenophobic, and ultimately racially biased policy protections from a perceived threat. This "White identity as threatening to democracy" implication is underdeveloped in the book, but offers additional opportunities for future work: today, do Whites create an alternate reality to avoid adhering to Democratic values like racial equality, because their dominant position fundamentally requires inequality?

A related concern is conceptual. There is strong evidence (pp. 112–114) that SDO may underlie White identity. While Jardina acknowledges this possibility, she also tables the judgment and never returns to it. I suspect this may be due to the lack of consistent SDO measures in her

data. Individuals higher in SDO might exhibit similar behavioral tendencies hypothesized by Jardina; however, SDO would be a more implicit indicator of racial group identity. Jardina's White identity measure does not reveal unity on the construct, leaving the door open for an identity based on an attachment to status quo systems, practices, and values that support one's dominant group position, racial or otherwise (e.g., gender). Arguably, no racial-ethnic group is threatening the White race per se, rather they are threatening the systems, practices, and values that maintain the status quo hierarchy (e.g., scholarships, jobs, leadership positions). Perhaps what is believed to be White identity is actually an attachment to a privileged way of life regardless of race, and responses to the survey questions reflect strong and weak satisficing behaviors, which might explain the fluctuations in response distributions to the identity items across the several 2016 studies (Chapter 3, including footnotes 17–49).

None of these concerns diminish the book's merit or appeal. Jardina's research is carefully executed and there is no doubt that she has painstakingly attempted to proactively respond to potential criticisms. In many instances, the endnotes and online Appendix details help to answer many questions raised by those who care deeply about analytic and scholarly minutiae. Thus, Jardina's book is a must read for all who endeavor to understand contemporary politics, public opinion, or social stratification in the United States.

*The Politics of Blackness: Racial Identity and Political Behavior in Contemporary Brazil.* By Gladys L. Mitchell-Walthour. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018. 266 pp., \$34.99 (Paper)

doi:10.1017/rep.2019.9

Minion K. C. Morrison,  
*University of Delaware*

Gladys Mitchell-Walthour has written a welcome addition to a body of recent comparative research on racial politics and public policy in the