

action and how to extend and deepen accountability, making the key point that democracies are unequal because not all people have equal ability to engage politically.

Friedman dismisses the cultural relativist *canard* that “Africa” is incompatible with democracy, before moving on to call for political scientists to pay more attention to citizens, and their ability to hold leaders to account: “the test of a broad and deep democracy is whether all have access to routine collective action *when they need it*, not the frequency with which citizens act in concert.” p. 123 (*italics in original*). In exploring the puzzle of why the exploited groups often do not challenge their domination, he draws on John Gaventa’s tremendously useful writings about power and powerlessness and explores the delicate balance needed between institutions and agency.


Having agreed with most of Friedman’s analysis, I am struck that he does not interrogate the origins of these ideas more. For example, the often-heard claims that people of country x “aren’t ready for democracy” (p. 48) do not just come from academics or even political elites but derive from colonial discourse and the experience of qualified franchises, as well as disillusionment with poor institutions and corrupt leaders. I was also disappointed not to encounter more engagement with people writing about politics all over the continent—the real living stuff of political science. Much of the key literature discussed was familiar from my student years—now several decades in the past. As a result, some of the discussions felt rather dry and dated.

This is a well-written, carefully structured book. I underlined many pithy lines and will reflect more on the key arguments in my own research on citizenship and political accountability. It is not, however, a page-turner. Even though I am familiar with most of the literature discussed and have grappled with many of the same issues in my own reading and teaching, it was not a quick read. That said, it rewards careful reading. We need more books like this—thoughtful, measured reflections on literature and real life, embracing a commitment to a vision of South Africa—and the world—“in which everyone decides” (p. 218).

doi:10.1017/rep.2021.15

## Ignored Racism: White Animus toward Latinos

By Mark D. Ramirez and David A. M. Peterson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. 238 pp., \$24.99. Paperback.

Andrew M. Engelhardt 

University of North Carolina–Greensboro, Greensboro, NC, USA  
Corresponding author. E-mail: [amengelhard@uncg.edu](mailto:amengelhard@uncg.edu)

(Received 23 March 2021; accepted 20 April 2021)

“White Americans’ attitudes about politics are inextricably linked to their attitudes about Latinos,” conclude Mark D. Ramirez and David A. M. Peterson in *Ignored*

*Racism: White Animus toward Latinos* (p. 173). That a broad literature speaks to the centrality of racial attitudes in Whites' politics, something only reinforced by the Obama and Trump administrations, may perhaps make such a conclusion seem unsurprising. But, investigations into racial attitudes' political effects frequently consider Whites' views of Black Americans. Often ignored are Whites' attitudes about other racialized groups. This is a particularly glaring omission for Latinos who comprise almost one-fifth of the United States population. As Ramirez and Peterson persuasively document, accounting for an omitted attitude, and thus more faithfully capturing the breadth and variety of Whites' intergroup attitudes, can shed important new light on White Americans' politics in particular and American politics more generally.

At *Ignored Racism's* heart lies Latino racism-ethnicism (LRE), a socially acceptable way of expressing anti-Latino animus. LRE comprises four interrelated beliefs: "(1) Latinos fail to succeed because of personal shortcomings rather than institutional discrimination, (2) Latina/o culture is inferior to Anglo-American culture, (3) Latina/o migration is distinct from past immigrant groups as Latinos do not want to assimilate into U.S. society, and (4) Latinos are inherently criminal" (p. 12). These four themes, Ramirez and Peterson detail, have historical resonances and contemporary manifestations. LRE advances the racial attitudes literature by not only expanding our understanding of the set of attitudes Whites hold about Latinos, it likewise contributes by identifying an attitude directly engaging the content of debates about Latinos' position in the United States.

Chapter 3 offers a rich investigation establishing LRE's empirical reality. Ramirez and Peterson operationalize LRE with four survey items that may be familiar to scholars of White racial attitudes. Respondents agree or disagree with statements such as: "Anti-immigration sentiment and racism have created conditions that make it difficult for Latinos and Hispanics to succeed in America." They validate this measure several ways. They canvass existing focus group research to uncover how people talk about Latinos, conduct measurement analyses to demonstrate the items capture a unique construct, and use an experiment to contrast LRE's association with views of Irish versus Mexican immigrants. This mixed approach offers a rich set of evidence highlighting the attitude's contours. Not only does this offer helpful support for LRE's content and construct validity, the chapter itself has terrific pedagogical opportunity in showing how scholars can move from measure conceptualization to operationalization and validation.

In subsequent chapters, Ramirez and Peterson demonstrate that LRE contributes to myriad political debates. Drawing on analyses of survey data and experiments, the authors show LRE undergirds immigration policy judgments, beliefs about policing and voting restrictions, and voting behavior. They highlight LRE's domain specificity by showing it influences opinion on policies connected to Latinos in some capacity, not salient but unconnected policies such as abortion, gay marriage, or healthcare (p. 178). Of particular interest may be the authors flipping traditional public opinion investigations by using LRE to predict politicians' behaviors. After constructing state-level estimates of LRE, they report that variation in LRE predicts Democratic senatorial and gubernatorial candidates taking hardline immigration positions, with no such effect for Republican candidates. Throughout, Ramirez and Peterson show how LRE

contributes to opinions net other group-specific attitudes such as stereotypes of Latinos or general orientations such as ethnocentrism and partisanship. Accounting for LRE is, therefore, important for understanding which specific orientation underpins opinion, offering a richer understanding of White opinion by helping scholars understand when, why, and among whom views of Latinos matter.

LRE's conceptualization and measurement offer an important advancement but may also feature an important limitation. As Ramirez and Peterson note, scholars striving to conceptualize and measure racial attitudes face challenges (p. 55). Their validation of LRE follows a path blazed by maybe the most challenging of attitudes to date: racial resentment. But, despite these careful efforts a critic might claim the hearty associations the authors uncover between LRE and various outcomes are because LRE is similar to the things it strives to explain, muddying these associations' interpretation. Despite this potential limitation, LRE offers a critical contribution by unpacking Whites' attitudes about Latinos. *Ignored Racism* lays a foundation future work can, and should, build on.

*Ignored Racism* also raises several interesting questions. First, by calling attention to the multiplicity of attitudes Whites have about Latinos, it suggests the utility of synthesis, something from which the racial attitudes literature in general might benefit. Given individuals' racial attitude repertoires, which matter, when, and for whom? Analyses typically highlight an association between an attitude and outcome with this net of complementary attitudes. Although these helpfully identify average associations, future efforts can work to specify, for instance, which types of people rely on LRE over stereotypes, affect, or ethnocentrism, and whether the type of judgment task makes LRE's relevance vary.

A second question takes LRE beyond White Americans. The attitude's content and origins may extend beyond this group. Consider racial resentment. Although originally designed to capture White Americans' attitudes about Black Americans, recent evidence demonstrates the attitude manifests similarly for both Black and White Americans (Kam and Burge, 2018). So, too, may LRE shed light on variation in Latinos' beliefs. After the 2020 presidential election, political observers have sought to explain apparently greater Latino support for Donald Trump in 2020 compared to 2016. Perhaps LRE helps explain this. *Ignored Racism* may not only contribute new insight into Whites' beliefs, it can set the stage for expanding scholarly understanding of group attitudes more generally.

Although political scientists have not ignored the political relevance of Whites' attitudes about Latinos, Ramirez and Peterson require scholars to think more carefully about how the content of group evaluations contributes to political judgments. By introducing LRE and highlighting its myriad consequences, hopefully White animus toward Latinos will no longer be frequently ignored.

## Reference

- Kam CD and Burge CD (2018) Uncovering reactions to the racial resentment scale across the racial divide. *The Journal of Politics* 80, 314–20.