Introduction

Edward Telles, Gaspar Rivera-Salgado,
Mark Q. Sawyer, and Sylvia Zamora

The dominant paradigm of American race relations has changed dramatically in the last two decades, as the prevailing white-black binary model is being challenged by recent large-scale immigration, mostly from Latin America. The size of the Latino[1] or Hispanic population has now surpassed that of the African American population and it will probably be double the size of the black population by 2050. Latinos now make up about 15 percent of the American population (and Mexicans in turn make up the largest majority of Latinos) and are projected to increase to 25 percent by 2050. In comparison, African Americans make up 13 percent of the U.S. population today, a proportion expected to remain stable to 2050. Moreover, immigration from various African and West Indian nations is making the African American population more heterogeneous—an issue we turn to later in this introduction. In a few short years, black-Latino relations have emerged as central to understanding the evolving racial dynamics in the United States, and they are likely to become increasingly important as interactions between the groups increase.

Traditionally, social scientists have examined black-white relations. When ethnic and race relations are examined between groups other than blacks and whites, the focus has tended to be on relations of these other groups with whites. As the dominant group, whites have always been the reference group for comparisons with respect to disadvantage, segregation, and assimilation. The study of relations between whites and non-European immigrant groups and their descendants, though, has clearly been secondary to understanding the relation between blacks and whites. With their history of mass slavery in the United States, decades of official segregation and exclusion, persistent economic disadvantage and social exclusion in American

society, and population size, African Americans have become the pre-
dominant Other in American social science. Other groups have been
either demographically small, regionally concentrated, or thought to
have assimilated. However, with the tremendous growth of the La-
tino and Asian populations and their dispersion through the country,
social scientists have recently begun to examine relations between
whites and either Latinos or Asians. Studies of relations among non-
white groups, such as between African Americans and Latinos, are
relatively few despite the dynamic ways that they are shaping U.S.
society in the twenty-first century.[2]

   With this book, we address the shortfall by bringing together im-
portant and rigorous social science research in the emerging field of
African American and Latino relations. We are fairly certain that this
area of research is likely to grow rapidly, especially as the Latino pop-
ulation grows and becomes increasingly U.S. born, and to the extent
that both Latinos and African Americans remain disadvantaged rela-
tive to whites. This volume provides a collection of studies by leading
scholars that may serve as models or points of departure for future
work. We have sought to engage research that focuses on different
levels of analysis (national, regional, local, and community), uses dif-
ferent methodologies (such as quantitative and qualitative), and ex-
amines public opinion as well as different types of social interactions
(such as labor market, community group, gangs, and youth). Rather
than a mere collection of disparate chapters, this work addresses im-
portant sociological questions and theoretical frameworks that can
help guide the development of the field. We begin this introductory
chapter by outlining the relevant demographic, social, and political
changes in recent decades, then seek to provide elements of a devel-
oping paradigm of black-Latino relations, and finally describe the
chapters that make up this volume.

   Among the issues we seek to address in this collection is whether
the traditional theoretical lenses of interethnic relations, particularly
that of conflict and cooperation, are adequate for understanding
Latino-black relations. We question whether close interaction be-
tween blacks and Latinos fosters understanding, contempt, or some-
thing else altogether, or whether other models better explain the na-
ture of these relations. In general, we have sought to promote a
dialogue among the authors so that the chapters address common
themes as well as seeming contradictions among them. In each chap-
ter, authors are explicit about which segment of the heterogeneous

black and Latino populations they describe, as we find that patterns of interaction, often cooperation on the basis of common or complementary identities, depend on internal differences between the groups along dimensions such as class, color, nationality, legal status, gender, and age. Overall, the chapters in this volume show the complexity of black-Latino relations and how they depend on such demographic factors as well as the nature of local communities, institutions, and political responses by the individuals involved. Conflict is far from inevitable, and any particular outcome depends largely on the (in)actions of communities and their leaders. An important lesson from this volume is thus that leadership matters and policymakers can make a difference by encouraging and supporting coalitional activities between blacks and Latinos.

LATINO POPULATION GROWTH AND RACIALIZATION

Since 1965, when the United States instituted major changes in immigration policy, immigration from throughout Latin America (and Asia) has resulted in the diversification and a quadrupling of the Latino population across the country.[3] The historical origins, reasons for immigration, and places of settlement among the diverse Latin American national groups are often quite distinct. Mexicans have long been by far the largest group and have the longest record of immigration. Since 1848, when the United States annexed Mexican land (what is now the Southwest region of the United States), Mexicans have continuously migrated into the United States, with immigration peaking during the 1910s and 1920s and then again after the 1970s. Immigration from Mexico, which shares a 2,000-mile border with the United States, has been characterized in recent years as largely unauthorized. Puerto Ricans, who are U.S. citizens by birth, have been migrating to the U.S. mainland (and mostly New York) in large numbers since the 1940s. Cubans have settled largely in Miami and southern Florida since the 1960s, mostly as refugees escaping Fidel Castro's socialist regime. Since 1965, large numbers of Dominicans have settled in the Northeast, Salvadorans and Guatemalans have largely settled in Los Angeles, Houston, and Washington, D.C., and several other nationalities have arrived in smaller but significant numbers (Durand, Telles, and Flashman 2006).

Immigrants currently make up about 45 percent of all Latinos, up

from about 30 percent in the 1970s. Although the number of later-generation Latinos is considerable, most Latinos are either immigrants or children living with immigrant parents. Furthermore, most of the Latino immigrant population today have arrived since 1990 and are unauthorized. According to the latest estimates, unauthorized immigrants number about 11 million,[4] of whom 6.2 million are from Mexico and 2.5 million from other Latin American countries (Passel and Cohn 2011). These immigrants are denied basic public services, subject to constant harassment and deportation by police and immigration authorities, and relegated to the lowest jobs and status available in U.S. society. Their exclusion is official and fairly complete, unlike that any other group in the United States currently faces. From the perspective of conservative media outlets and the supporters of anti-immigrant policies, this exclusion is justified. Although the conservative media also present African Americans in a negative context, the basic rights of blacks in the United States are rarely questioned.[5]

In terms of perceptions, Latino immigrants often arrive in the United States with defined notions about African Americans that are shaped by the Latino national background and personal experience, which in turn shapes the nature of Latino-black interactions. Racial attitudes and stereotypes about blacks are in fact often shaped in immigrants' home societies by images on television and other media or by personal experiences, particularly in the case of countries with large African-descendant populations, such as the Dominican Republic, Colombia, or Brazil. In addition, how Latino immigrants racially perceive themselves and African Americans is also shaped and transformed by their own distinct racialized experiences in the United States, including their interactions with African Americans, which are also transmitted back to the home society by immigrants. In other words, the social meaning of race and identity may begin in the country of origin but is constantly contested and reformulated within the larger Latino community.

The geographic spread of the Latino population has made black-Latino relations relevant and increasingly important throughout most of the United States. Latinos traditionally concentrated in only a few regions until the 1990s. Latinos, especially Mexican Americans, have lived predominantly in the Southwest and Chicago, Puerto Ricans in New York and Chicago, and Cubans in southern Florida. As a result, the points of contact between African Americans and Latinos were

generally limited to several southwestern cities as well as Chicago, New York, and Miami. Among rural areas and small towns there was little overlap in most of the twentieth century except in places like central Texas (Foley 1997), where the South and Southwest meet. However, as traditional destinations for Latin American immigrants have become saturated and as employers in nontraditional regions actively recruit these workers, Latinos have begun migrating in large numbers to new destinations since the 1990s (Zúñiga and Hernández-León 2005; Light 2006; Durand, Telles, and Flashman 2006). Today, Latinos have multiplied their numbers in new destinations, including southern cities (and some rural areas), which have long had exclusively black and white populations. Moreover, the Latino population in traditional places of settlement, such as Los Angeles and Houston, continues to grow tremendously, often significantly surpassing the size of the black population.

Although it is clear that Latino immigrants, especially the undocumented, are racialized and excluded in various ways, a nagging question remains about whether they will eventually assimilate the way the descendants of European immigrants did. Central and southern Europeans, who arrived between 1880 and 1920, were economically disadvantaged and treated as ethnic others, but that status, which we term *racialized*, was transcended within one or two generations after immigration (Gordon 1964; Alba and Nee 2003). The success of their descendants in becoming part of the mainstream is hailed in the American narrative, which is, largely because of this, generally optimistic about immigrants. Empirical evidence thus far shows that the children of Latino immigrants improve their status compared with their immigrant parents, though a gap remains when their socioeconomic status is compared with non-Hispanic whites (Kasinitz et al. 2008; Itzigsohn 2009; Telles and Ortiz 2008).

Unlike European Americans, Latinos may be racialized into the third and fourth generations post-immigration. Edward Telles and Vilma Ortiz (2008) find mobility for the Mexican immigrant second generation compared with their immigrant parents but, unlike European Americans, stalled mobility for the third and fourth generation. In contrast to European Americans, their rates of imprisonment, gang activity, and educational dropout are high despite high acculturation. Moreover, the majority of these later-generation Mexican Americans experience racial discrimination, believe that they are racially stereotyped, or do not identify as white, all of which further

suggest an experience of racialization (Telles and Ortiz 2008). We understand racialization as a concept that cannot be reduced to the African American experience but instead refers to a more comparative cross-societal notion that includes various forms of exclusion and categorization, including those experienced by Latinos and Asians in the United States (Kim 1999; Almaguer 1994; Mendieta 2000), African descendants in Latin America (Telles 2004; Sawyer 2006), and a variety of peoples in western Europe (Hine, Keaton, and Small 2009; Winant 2001).

Whether Latinos have been racialized and whether they are developing a group identity is based in part on the concept of a shared experience of racism in the United States, which may be important to understanding the possibility of Latino and African American coalitions. The chapters in this book demonstrate that Latinos are often seen as a group apart from other groups, whether or not the authors refer to them as a racial or racialized group. Although it may be neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for coalition formation, some sense of shared fate, or belief that African Americans and Latinos occupy a similar status as groups who suffer from discrimination or exclusion, might be important for developing a shared identity despite antagonisms between the two groups. If Latinos generally come to occupy persistently low-status positions and politically cohere, it is likely that they as a racial-ethnic group and their relations with other groups will continue to be of social scientific interest. Black and Latino relations will grow in importance only to the extent that the Latino population grows, Latinos continue to geographically overlap with blacks, and both groups remain disadvantaged relative to whites, creating the potential for similar political interests. On the other hand, the possibility remains of high levels of assimilation and acculturation for some Latinos, as significant rates of intermarriage suggest, which raises the question of whether race or ethnicity is consequential for those individuals and whether it makes sense to treat that segment of the population as part of the general Latino population.

AFRICAN AMERICANS AND BLACK IMMIGRANTS

African Americans have long been the nation's largest minority group and perhaps the most disadvantaged. More than any other group,

blacks are residentially segregated and overrepresented in America's prisons and unemployment lines (Massey and Denton 1993; Brown et al. 2003). Although often sympathetic to the social exclusion of Latinos, many blacks worry that immigrant workers will displace them in the labor market. Like earlier waves of European immigrants (and their children) who leapfrogged over African Americans into higher-status positions and eventually joined the mainstream, concerns have been raised about whether Latino (and to some extent Asian) immigrants will advance at the expense of blacks. This concern has been heightened in the context of deindustrialization, where many factories closed shop and relocated abroad, taking with them thousands of stable jobs previously held by African Americans (Wilson 1979, 2010). The new political economy has resulted in growing systemic inequality and job insecurity even for those who still hold relatively stable jobs. This feeling can be heightened when African Americans feel that another group may be competing with them for jobs and reaping the social services and other rewards that they fought so hard to gain during the civil rights movement. Such negative feelings are heightened when they question the legitimacy of Latino immigrants to live and work in the United States.

Outside the labor market, African Americans who are trapped in poor and segregated neighborhoods tend to feel pessimistic about how race and racism have affected their life chances, which might further their negative attitudes and sense of perceived threat from Latinos (Gay 2006). Less-skilled African Americans are especially more likely to perceive a greater sense of threat from Latino immigrants than highly skilled blacks are (Gay 2006; chapter 8, this volume), a problem that Claudine Gay (2006) believes can best be alleviated not by restricting immigration but by creating jobs and increasing educational and vocational opportunities for young African Americans.

Today's mass immigration has also added many new blacks to the population, many of whom share similar concerns with Latinos about immigration issues (Alex-Assensoh and Hanks 2009). This wave includes immigrants from Africa and the British-, French-, and Spanish-speaking Caribbean. Although these immigrants often seek to distance themselves from the highly stigmatized and native African Americans by (among other things) not identifying as African American or black, they are often considered as such by the rest of American society and official statistics (Waters 1999; Itzigsohn 2009). Their children, however, whose ties to their parents' language

and culture have generally weakened, are more likely to identify and be perceived as African American.

Many Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, Panamanians, and other Latinos are also considered black, and thus the black-Latino distinctions we make in this book are actually sometimes fluid. About 20 percent of Latin Americans are African descendants, given that fifteen times as many enslaved Africans were brought to Latin America as to the United States (Eltis 2010; Andrews 2007). Also, only about 3 percent of Latinos-Hispanics in the United States identify as black in the U.S. census (Logan 2003). This suggests that African Latinos are less likely than others to immigrate to the United States or that they do not identify as black in the United States. This is partly due to the predominance of Mexicans among all Latinos, whereas Mexicans of African descent constitute a very small part of Mexico's national population.[6] Also, although many African-descendant immigrants from Latin America might be perceived as black, they may in fact eschew such an identity, resulting in an underestimation of the Latino population that could also be considered as African American (Landale and Oropeza 2002; Candelario 2007; Itzigsohn 2009). This does not undermine the fact that, regardless of the complexity of identities, minorities are becoming a larger share of the American population and increasingly coming into contact with one another in neighborhood, workplace, and leisure settings in many big cities and some rural areas.

BECOMING NEIGHBORS

Together, African Americans and Latinos are numerical majorities in most of America's largest cities and in many smaller cities as well. They now constitute the majority in seven of the ten largest cities in the United States—New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia, San Antonio, and Dallas—and more than one-third of the population in the remaining three—Phoenix, San Diego, and San Jose. Separately, though, blacks are not a majority in any and Latinos are a majority in only one, San Antonio (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). These figures show that the largest cities are now majority minority, a result of the recent growth of the Latino population, along with white flight out of central cities and the persistent residential isolation of many black Americans in the nation's largest cities.

African Americans and Latinos are increasingly likely to be neighbors in many metropolitan areas. Table I.1 shows segregation indexes

over the last thirty years for the seven metropolitan areas with a ma-
jority-minority central city, as indicated in the previous paragraph.
The first four columns show dissimilarity indexes between blacks
and Latinos (Hispanics according to the Census Bureau) using the
1980, 1990, and 2000 censuses and the American Community Sur-
vey in the years leading up to 2010. Specifically, dissimilarity indexes
show the extent to which the Latino and African American popula-
tions in each metropolitan area are geographically distributed with
respect to each other. Thus, the dissimilarity index is independent of
the relative size of the groups being compared. An index of 100
means that they are completely segregated from one another, that is,
live in separate census tracts, whereas an index of 0 means that they
are evenly distributed in the city, that is, live in equal proportions in
all census tracts.

In all of these metropolitan areas, the trend has been toward in-
creasing residential integration of blacks and Latinos, and the pattern
is strongest in the four Southwest metropolitan areas: Los Angeles,
Houston, San Antonio, and Dallas. Using a rule of thumb that dis-
similarity indexes above 60 are high and 30 to 60 are moderate
(Massey and Denton 1993), black-Latino segregation has dropped
from high levels to the moderate range since 1980 in these south-
western metropolitan areas. By contrast, New York City has had only
moderate levels of black-Latino segregation since 1980, though with
a slight drop in the period, and in Chicago, black-Latino segregation
has remained high throughout, though it has dropped considerably
in recent years. In Philadelphia, where the Latino population is much
smaller (but growing) than the African American population, there
has also been a drop from high to moderate.

The exposure indexes in the last four columns of table I.1 show,
for 1980 and 2010, the actual chances that blacks and Latinos are
neighbors. Specifically, these indexes model the percentage of African
Americans who live in an average Latino person's census tract in a
particular metropolitan area (columns 4 and 5) or vice versa (col-
umns 6 and 7). Thus the distinct exposure indexes for the two groups
reflect the fact that the neighborhood experiences with members of
the other group may differ from those of either Latinos or African
Americans. Unlike the dissimilarity index, exposure indexes are not
symmetrical and are affected by the relative size of the groups.

The indexes in columns 4 and 5 reveal that Latino exposure to
blacks was fairly stable in these metropolitan areas, rising slightly in

Table I.1 Segregation in Major Metropolitan Areas

| | Black-Hispanic Dissimilarity Index | | | | Hispanic Exposure to Blacks | | Black Exposure to Hispanic | |
	1980	1990	2000	2010	1980	2010	1980	2010
New York	60	57	54	56	21	18	16	23
Los Angeles	72	59	54	55	8	8	19	43
Chicago	85	81	78	72	9	10	4	12
Houston	67	57	51	43	12	16	10	33
Philadelphia	66	64	57	57	27	25	4	8
San Antonio	65	57	52	45	5	6	32	49
Dallas	68	54	50	44	12	15	7	27

Source: Authors' compilation based on data from the American Communities Project (Logan 2010).

New York and Philadelphia and dipping slightly in Houston and Dallas. In contrast, the exposure of blacks to Latinos increased much more in all of these metropolitan areas, most surely as a result of rapidly growing Latino immigration. Today, at least one-third of the neighbors of the typical African American are Latino in San Antonio, Los Angeles, and Houston. In San Antonio, about half (49 percent) of the neighbors of the average African American resident are now Latino, though about a third (32 percent) were in 1980, where Latinos have far outnumbered African Americans. The percentages in black exposure to Latinos more than doubled in Los Angeles and Houston as well as in Chicago, Philadelphia, and Dallas. Thus African Americans have seen a dramatic change in their residential experiences since 1980, when they were relatively isolated from any group, to the present, when segregation has declined but largely in the way of having many more Latino neighbors. However, from the perspective of the Latino population, changes in residential contact with African Americans have been smaller.

Language and cultural barriers, along with persisting racial stereotypes and prejudices, continue to serve as challenges to black and Latino relations at the neighborhood level. Today, however, young blacks and Latinos are increasingly being raised in the same neighborhoods and coming into more contact with each other, particularly in school settings. Interracial contact also increases for those who go on to college and eventually enter diverse work settings. The psychological literature suggests that increased contact should lead to fewer stereotypes about each other (Allport 1954; Fiske 2000). In several chapters of this book, we examine the result of this growing neighborhood interaction between African Americans and Latinos. However, these relations are filtered through the practice of politics at state, local, and national levels.

POLITICS

Relations between African Americans and Latinos are largely mediated by politics. American politics, and local politics in particular, have been largely about race and ethnicity. Whereas blacks have been a long-term and central fixture of urban politics, their traditional rivals (outside a few traditional Latino cities) have been whites, often as ethnics early on (Dahl 1961), and later as part of an ethnically undifferentiated white population—except perhaps Jews. African

Americans have had great success in building political power in big cities with large African American populations, electing mayors and local legislators. They have also been quite successful at the congressional level. Recently, African Americans have built coalitions with Latinos to win at the statewide level, as in Deval Patrick's election as governor of Massachusetts and Barack Obama's election to the U.S. Senate. Although black political power is still on the rise, the relative size of the African American population is slowly decreasing, and black politicians depend increasingly on Latino voters to get elected.[7] Electoral support for Obama has been unprecedented among Latino voters in key states such as Florida, New Mexico, Colorado, and Nevada. Fully two-thirds of Latinos voted for Obama, and an astounding 85 percent of those under age thirty did, which bodes well for the future of black-Latino political relations.[8] Also, Latinos themselves are an emerging political power in important parts of the country, as symbolized by the election of Antonio Villaraigosa as mayor of Los Angeles in 2004 and of three Latinos as mayor of San Antonio, beginning with Henry Cisneros in 1981. However, political power for either group has not significantly diminished their economic and social disparities.

Black-Latino relations have also been notable at the grassroots level. Social movement actors and radical organizations have on occasion allied in their struggle for change. Groups like the Black Panther Party for Self Defense, the Puerto Rican Young Lords, and the Brown Berets worked together and were simultaneously inspired both ideologically and tactically by one another (Pulido 2006). This was also the case with the less radical Martin Luther King Jr. and the mainstream civil rights movement and the solidarity with groups like the United Farm Workers, led by Cesar Chavez. However, neither these coalitions nor the social movements that created them were sustained engagements. As a result, we have mixed patterns of conflict and cooperation between communities across time, space, and political ideology (Sawyer 2005). That many of the same actors in the 1980s worked on campaigns to end apartheid in South Africa and halt U.S. support for the repressive Salvadoran government and the Contras in Nicaragua demonstrates that—though not explicitly stated—leftist social movements dealing with black and Latino issues have on occasion found common cause. However, even the mainstream political coalitions between blacks and Latinos that led to the election of black mayors in Chicago and New York involved some

strains, including the inability to translate them into sustainable effective coalitions that would consistently carry mayoral elections.

Following reports of racial tension between African American and Latino residents in Los Angeles, community activists in places like Los Angeles have again sought to form interethnic coalitions, such as the Latino and African American Leadership Alliance and the Community Coalition. The reported tension seemed to be fueled in a new way by the explosion of a mostly Latino-driven immigrant rights movement that raised concerns among African Americans about the growing Latino population and its growing political organization. At a national level, black and Latino activists have recently come together to form the Black-Latino Summit, which seeks to support black and Latino political leaders who have formed black-Latino alliances on issues around criminal justice, education, housing, and immigration reform and to develop an agenda to shape investment and leadership priorities for the current administration.[9] These efforts, however, do not mean that tensions do not exist between the two communities.

COMMONALITY AND TENSIONS

A common conceptualization of black-Latino relations has been as either conflict or cooperation, despite the fact, as many of the chapters in this volume show, that black and Latino relations rarely are either clearly conflicted or clearly cooperative. Nicolás Vaca (2004) provocatively argues that African Americans and Latinos are at odds with each other, particularly with regards to employment and controlling other valuable resources. He goes as far as to say that blacks and Latinos face a zero-sum situation, in which gains for one group signal losses for the other. He asserts, for example, that African Americans have fiercely defended their overrepresentation among Los Angeles County employees to the detriment of Latinos (Vaca 2004). However, based on the chapters in this book and on other systematic social science research, zero-sum scenarios do not seem typical of black-Latino relations (for a review, see Sawyer 2005). In another well-known book, Earl Ofari Hutchinson emphasizes the continuing growth of the Latino population, and its eventual rise as the nation's largest minority, as presenting a challenge to black Americans in the way of education, politics, immigration issues, and political coalitions (2007). He identifies "black fears" and

negative black and Latino stereotypes as driving the black and Latino conflict and, most important, calls for a much-needed conversation between the two groups.

The labor market has arguably been the predominant focus of black-Latino relations, but most of the literature shows very little, if any, displacement (for a review, see Smith and Edmonston 1998). The perceptions of displacement may themselves affect the social relations, however. Surely, the massive entry of low-skilled immigrants into new labor markets involves disruptions in the labor market that may seem like displacements. But the issue is complex and far from a zero-sum situation, because growing immigration does not mean automatic displacement of natives. The dynamics of black and Latino job market shifts in labor markets can be seen in their changing occupational concentration, in which the relative growth of one group and thus the decrease of the other is sometimes perceived as displacement. For example, Telles and Sylvia Zamora (2008) found that, from 1990 to 2005, building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations in many metropolitan areas shifted from a largely African American to a largely Latino immigrant workforce. However, labor market analyses have mostly concluded that the employment and earnings levels of African Americans were not affected by these shifts partly because African Americans steadily increased their representation in protective service and in health-care support occupations during the same period (Telles and Zamora 2008). Immigrants are also consumers and thus they create jobs; they use health, educational, and other municipal services staffed by native workers; and they often provide low-cost labor, which keeps entire industries from fleeing to overseas locations, thus providing employment at other levels as well. In addition, their low-cost labor reduces production and consumer prices, thus improving American standards of living (Smith and Edmonston 1998).

Rather than making conclusive statements about the nature of black-Latino conflict, more careful researchers have sought to identify and understand the factors that lead to certain outcomes, including conflict or cooperation (Mindiola, Niemann, and Rodriguez 2003; Betancur and Gills 2000; McClain 1993; Gay 2006). One notable example is Tatcho Mindiola, Yolanda Flores Niemann, and Nestor Rodriguez's (2003) study of Houston, which examines the role of stereotypes in shaping interethnic relations between blacks and Latinos. They found that stereotypes largely shape intergroup

relations between blacks and Latinos and that, in general, African Americans had more positive views of Latinos than vice versa (see Oliver and Wong 2003; McClain et al. 2006; Kaufmann 2003; Gay 2006; Vaca 2004). Moreover, intergroup perceptions were more positive among males of both groups than among females, and among Latinos, the foreign born had less favorable views of African Americans than the U.S. born did.

Neither African Americans nor Latinos are homogenous groups that can be lumped together when discussing relations between them. Differences include important national, immigrant-generational, class, age, and other characteristics. The chapters in this volume are careful to distinguish segments of the African American and Latino populations, such as those based on income, education level, region of settlement, age, sexuality, immigration status, and racial-ethnic identity, that shape the outcome of group relations, often providing a sense of commonality between them. For example, chapter 9 shows the importance of age and popular culture as an important point of commonality, particularly for youth. Chapter 8 finds differences by class in how African Americans view Latinos.

Blacks and Latinos are also more likely to form coalitions when both groups share common interests around specific issues, such as education and economic issues. Sylvia Zamora's chapter in this volume highlights how similar concerns over educational disparities in Los Angeles public high schools and lack of healthy food options bring black and Latino residents of a community together. Rather than conceiving them as either black or Latino issues, community leaders emphasize the commonality that blacks and Latinos share as poor and working-class residents of South Los Angeles. This sense of linked fate has led to the emergence of a powerful grassroots black and Latino coalition. However, at the national level, rarely are black-Latino coalitions sustained.

Jonn J. Betancur and Douglas C. Gills's volume on the opportunities and struggles of blacks and Latinos focuses on the challenges in creating such coalitions, and calls for both groups to "confront their differences and to search for common ground toward the solution of many of the problems that they confront together in cities" (2000, 12). In the genre of social action research, the authors also search for solutions by examining the pitfalls of previous coalitional efforts to develop new strategies for action. Addressing several themes leading to contention between blacks and Latinos at the grassroots level,

such as class differences, racism, the uneven economic and social development of each group in cities, and the political manipulation by institutional elites, the authors found that blacks and Latinos were likely to form coalitions when both groups shared interests around specific issues, although so far these coalitions have rarely been sustained. At the same time, this volume seeks to test critical theories of social interaction that have been the bedrock of the study of intergroup relations and perhaps generate new insights from studying relations among minority groups, with an eye toward understanding that neither population is monolithic.

TOWARD A NEW FRAMEWORK OF INTERMINORITY GROUP RELATIONS

We call for a fresh approach to understanding relations between African Americans and Latinos, which have become important because of the demographic revolution that has occurred in the largest urban centers of the country. It has become increasingly important to conceptualize the relations between racial and ethnic minority groups in the United States in a way that is distinct from conceptualizations of intergroup relations between the dominant (white) group and a nonwhite subordinate group. Both Latinos and African Americans are economically disadvantaged with respect to whites and have little control of major political and material resources, except perhaps in some large cities, where resources are incidentally dwindling. Relying on the conventional social science approach to race relations is inadequate for addressing black and Latino relations in the twenty-first century.

The intellectual history of race relations in the United States has been dominated by a binary hierarchical model of race relations between whites and blacks. The central axis of this analysis has been the socioeconomic dimension of oppression and subordination of the African American population by the white dominant group. This conventional approach to the study of race relations runs the gamut of theoretical positions, from the liberal approach to racism and racial injustice in the United States, best represented by Daniel Patrick Moynihan (1965) and Gunnar Myrdal and Sissela Bok (2005), to the radical analysis developed by racial formation and critical studies of race (Omi and Winant 1994). Attempts to theorize about the immigrant experience and intergroup relations have resulted in models of

assimilation, incorporation, or exclusion, which are limited in their ability to explain current trends in minority-minority relations.

The undeniable existence of unequal power relations permeating the black-white divide was key to the development of a racist ideology that justified social and economic policies of exclusion that have led to the systematic oppression of African Americans nationwide. Racism is not an individual act stemming from prejudicial views but a powerful and historic tool of oppression over subordinate nonwhite groups (Omi and Winant 1994; Sidanius and Pratto 2001; Fredrickson 2003). Hegemonic racial ideologies of white superiority, however, are often uncontested and taken for granted by nonwhite groups. Rather than being white, or at the top of the racial hierarchy, the implicit positioning of any particular group becomes proximity to the top in relation to another other group. This includes not only social, physical, or geographic proximity to whiteness but also other claims to value or legitimacy, such as citizenship (Murguia and Forman 2003). Thus manifestations of racism and racial prejudice can also operate within and among communities of color. The same stereotypes of blacks and Latinos often held by whites are also often shared by blacks and Latinos about each other.

These stereotypes and the discriminatory behaviors that stem from them are important for understanding dimensions of racial prejudice and intergroup relations. Issues of racial hierarchy are similarly important in black and Latino relations. Latinos often hold negative and prejudicial views of blacks, sometimes filtered by greater interaction with blacks and, in some cases, by a shared similar socioeconomic status. Consequently, minority groups can face accusations of being racist in a way that parallels white-on-black racism. Along these lines, some African Americans may perceive Latinos as having the advantage of being able to pass as white, or nearer to white, or as immigrant outsiders with a weaker claim to American citizenship and the civil rights policies that blacks have historically struggled for.

Stereotypes, discrimination, and ideas of racial hierarchy provide elements that help understanding of or map relations between subordinate groups; but finer-grain theoretical and conceptual tools are needed to characterize these relations, where some features resemble those between dominant and subordinate groups but other key features are missing in some substantial way. However, the manifestation of such social elements among blacks and Latinos falls short of producing systemic racism in which racial ideologies are matched

with a series of institutional and individual acts that turn ideologies of hierarchy into a social, political, and economic reality. These ideologies help enable those acts and, ex post facto, justify the outcomes themselves.

We therefore have to begin to examine the interaction between African Americans and Latinos for what they are and not continue to try to use the framework of black-white relations as a theoretical guide.[10] Blacks and Latinos often interact in a context largely shaped by decisions they have little control of. Failing institutions such as schools provide an important context in which black-Latino interactions take place, but the context itself cannot be understood through relations between the two groups. That context, though, potentially creates a common sense of struggle for better schools and against a white-dominated system.

We believe that a paradigm for understanding black-Latino relations requires a solid empirical base and that this volume helps build it. We are probably still far from a clear understanding of these important relations but have learned from this volume, for example, that black and Latino relations can be understood as falling along a continuum of interaction types, from tension filled to intentional coexistence to avoidance. These interactions also vary by class, age, immigration generation, and various other demographic factors, as well as by economic contexts, and can also be shaped by politics, institutional development, and community organizing. Also, as various chapters make clear, active leadership makes a difference for developing successful cooperative relations between blacks and Latinos and thus public policy should encourage such efforts.

Several findings from these chapters may provide important elements to be considered in this new paradigm. For example, chapter 3 suggests that Latinos actually view coethnics as a greater source of competition than Africa Americans. Chapter 4 demonstrates that political awareness and cues from political leaders affect commonalities between blacks and Latinos more than the individual-level determinants often raised in existing studies, such as racial identity or contact with the other group. Chapter 9 indicates that having a strong sense of pride in, and linked fate with, one's own racial-ethnic group does not impede the development of support for coalitions. Chapter 10 finds that black-Latino coalitions depend on the ability of community leaders to frame issues in ways that appeal to both African Americans and Latinos. Chapter 12 discovers that avoidance, rather

than conflict or cooperation, is the dominant outcome in black-Latino social relations in marginalized urban communities, and chapter 11 makes it clear that the high-profile conflicts in the media between black and Latino youth in Los Angeles cannot be reduced to racial antagonisms. These are just some of the important contributions in this volume.

BACKGROUND

Our interest in this volume was motivated by several concerns: that Latino-black relations were becoming increasingly important in the Los Angeles area for demographic reasons; that several cases, as reported by the media, were highly conflictive; that little attention has been paid to interracial organizing; that these communities were unaware of the other's history and culture, including the presence of blacks in Latin America, including Mexico; and that an exchange with scholars might help on both sides. With support from the Ford Foundation, the UCLA Institute for Research on Labor and Employment Fund, and the University of California's Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, we held a two-day conference on the state of black-Latino relations at the UCLA Labor Center in April of 2008. We brought together leading scholars with community, labor, and youth activists with experiences in black-Latino community organizing. We sought to spark a conversation on these issues and develop a roadmap for collaborative and productive organizing. That conference proved a success in that the presentations were rich and enthusiastically received by an audience of fifty to a hundred people at any one time over the two days. Many of the scholarly presentations ended up as chapters in this volume, which we believe made the initial conference an academic success. These papers were informed and strengthened by the dialogue with the community activists and would later be discussed and fine-tuned at a second UCLA conference held a year later and through subsequent email discussions.

Previous research on the subject is best exemplified in the book *Prismatic Metropolis*, which systematically shows attitudes among the four major racial-ethnic groups in the Los Angeles area (Bobo et al. 2000). Raphael Sonenshein's *Politics in Black and White: Race and Power in Los Angeles* shows how political alliances among blacks, Latinos, Jews, Asians, and others were formed to elect Tom Bradley as

mayor of Los Angeles and later James Hahn and then Antonio Villaraigosa (Sonenshein 1993). Sonenshein argues that such political coalitions could exist alongside racial tensions like stereotyping, violent incidents, and resource battles that typically render those coalitions potentially fragile. However, much of the educated public's understanding of the topic had been shaped by journalistic and anecdotal accounts, which were often especially provocative and alarmist but not based on strong empirical evidence. These included accounts that blamed either Latinos or African Americans for conflictual and even violent relations or for the problems of the other group (Miles 1992; Hayes-Bautista 2004; Newsweek 2007; Vaca 2004).

In contrast, the chapters in this volume represent systematic cutting-edge research in an increasingly important area for which few sources of information are available. Many chapters contemplate both behavioral and attitudinal aspects of black-Latino relations at the national and regional levels, and they deal with politics and policy, as well as coalition-building efforts. Like the focus of our conference, many chapters are California based. Much to our lament, important areas of research under the more general rubric of black-Latino relations were covered at the conference but could not be included here, mostly because of space limitations.

THE CHAPTERS

We have organized the book by levels of analysis on racial cooperation and competition—beginning with a macro-view (on the labor market and national politics), followed by a meso-view (on studies of cities), and ending with a micro-view (mostly on ethnographic studies of Los Angeles)—involving a well-established black-Latino coalition and interactions among youth and gangs. A theme of conflict versus cooperation underlies all the chapters. More specific themes group chapters together into parts.

We focus on social aspects of black-Latino relations beside the labor market but feature one important review and analysis. In chapter 1, Frank Bean, James Bachmeier, Susan Brown, and Rosaura Tafoya-Estrada present a distillation of major work in this field. Such research on the labor market impacts of immigration often involve seemingly esoteric debates about how best to statistically model this impact and the assumptions that should underlie the econometric models used. Bean and his colleagues instead present time series and

cross-sectional data from 1980 to 2006 in this accessible synthesis of cutting-edge research. They find, as does the bulk of this literature, that immigration—whether in general or Mexican immigration in particular—has little or no impact on the employment or earnings of African Americans. We believe that at least an elementary understanding of the labor market impact literature, offered here in a succinct form, is fundamental for understanding other dimensions of black and Latino interactions.

In part II, "Politics," three chapters deal broadly with commonality and competition between Latinos and African Americans. Traditionally, scholars have argued that if groups perceive themselves to have certain commonalities they are more likely to form bonds, whereas if they perceive themselves to be in competition they are less likely to do so. The authors of chapters 2 through 4 use the Latino National Survey (LNS), which was designed partly with this issue in mind. Specifically, the LNS is a representative telephone survey of 8,634 Latino residents in sixteen states, and broadly seeks to understand the nature of Latino political and social life in America (Fraga et al. 2006). The survey sampled adult Latinos with surveys conducted in the preferred language of the respondent—English, Spanish, or both. The LNS is especially valuable because of its large sample size, which allows scholars to reliably distinguish Latinos by four generational groups and by various national origin groups, especially Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, Dominican, and Salvadoran.

In chapter 2, Michael Jones-Correa examines geographic differences, which are further explored in the remaining chapters. Specifically, he focuses on what makes these new destinations different from traditional Latino settlement areas, especially in regard to relations with African Americans. He finds that Latinos evaluate relations with African Americans and whites in new destination sites as being as good as, and perhaps better than, those relations in traditional areas of settlement. Perceptions of commonality with African Americans and whites are greater for Latinos in more integrated areas and for those who share social networks with them. However, Latinos who are more integrated and who share networks with blacks and whites also perceive greater competition in education, the labor market, and politics.

Jones-Correa also finds that the same factors that drive closeness also raise perceptions of competition. For example, integration and acculturation drive feelings of closeness with blacks. The converse,

however, is also true: interaction between African Americans and Latinos also promotes perceptions of competition. This raises a concern in part answered in chapter 3, which suggests that the variable of competition with blacks in the LNS may be telling a different story. Those likely to perceive competition with blacks are more likely to perceive competition with other Latinos as well. In chapter 3, Jason Morin, Gabriel Sanchez, and Matt Barreto develop what they call a relative measure of intergroup competition for studying African American and Latino relations and examine Latino perceptions of competition with blacks relative to perceptions of competition with other groups, including other Latinos.

Chapters 2 and 3 allow us to see this not as a paradox, because Latinos who feel connected with blacks may see them more like their in-group than a hostile out-group. Closeness therefore does not breed contempt, and even perceptions of competition need not be poisonous to interactions between the two groups. These chapters show that enterprising political elites can positively affect opinions and that even things we thought might be troubling, like perceptions of competition, are perhaps not as much a concern as once thought. In fact, perceptions of competition are often a product of feeling closer and more integrated.

This is mirrored in chapter 4, in which Kevin Wallsten and Tatishe Nteta find that messages by political elites help drive a sense of commonality. The authors suggest that we assess the impact that cues provided by Latino or African American political elites, or elite messages, have on perceptions of commonality between African Americans and Latinos. They find that politically aware Latinos, regardless of ideological leanings, are more likely to form opinions on commonality with African Americans: liberal Latinos saw more in common, whereas conservatives saw less. Wallsten and Nteta suggest the importance of moving beyond individual-level determinants of Latino perceptions of commonality toward "bringing politics back in" to an analysis of how the Latino and African American public forms opinions on the nature of intergroup relations.

The remaining eight chapters of the volume use a variety of sources, including local surveys, ethnographic, interview, and archival data. Six chapters are about the Southwest—one about Houston, four about Los Angeles, and one comparing Oakland and Los Angeles. Two chapters address the South. The Southwest has a longer history of black and Latino relations than other regions of the United

States, given that African Americans and Latinos, particularly Mexican Americans, have long shared the same or proximate neighborhoods and low economic status throughout the region. South Los Angeles,[11] the site in five of these chapters, is notable for its history as well as the fairly quick demographic change since the 1960s from an almost entirely African American district to one with shared Latinos and African American neighborhoods. Houston is one of the most diverse cities in the United States, and contact between African Americans and Latinos is substantial. The final three of these chapters are about new Latino immigrant destinations in the South and Midwest, where Latinos have rapidly become a significant presence.[12]

Part III examines social science surveys of the two urban areas. In chapter 5, Rodriguez and Mindiola use the 1996 and 2008 Houston area survey to examine trends in Houston regarding how intergroup attitudes have changed among African Americans and Latinos (mostly Mexican Americans) over time. They also explore black-Latino comparisons of attitudes regarding new social issues that have emerged since the 1996 study. They are particularly interested in issues concerning immigrants, who make up a large sector of the resident Latino population, including education for undocumented migrant children, the construction of a border fence, and policies for Spanish-speaking children in schools. They find that African Americans have complex views on immigration and simultaneously support restrictionist policies along with policies that would help aid and develop Latino communities, including a pathway to citizenship. They believe that black attitudes are driven by a complex mix of their own interests, group relations, and a sense of historical fairness that includes a sense of solidarity with the Latino community in Houston. They also believe that a common political destiny in the Texas Democratic Party helps forge coalitions and cooperation between the groups.

In chapter 6, using data from the 2007 Los Angeles County survey, Mark Sawyer examines the state of relations between blacks and Latinos in Los Angeles, a city that epitomizes the opportunities and challenges facing Latinos and African Americans sharing geographic space. Sawyer finds that blacks and Latinos are open to working together, but that these relations are hampered by stereotyping by both groups and black attitudes about immigration. However, he stresses, there are openings for intergroup coalitions because, unlike classic group conflict theory, these stereotypes do not necessarily structure

the political beliefs of blacks and Latinos or their willingness to coop-
erate. Sawyer discovers that racial identity for Latinos is a far more
complex issue than a causal observer may think because it is not
bounded by the prevalent binary model of black-white race relations.
Furthermore, Sawyer finds, African Americans in Los Angeles are
more concerned with education, unemployment, and discrimination
than immigration. These two findings, Sawyer maintains, open the
possibility for productive coalition work based on a "political com-
monality" between Latinos and African Americans. Taken together,
the chapters by Sawyer, Wallsten and Nteta, and Rodriguez and Min-
diola point to the potential positive role that elites and organizations
can play in advancing shared group interests and notions of common
fate. These chapters each note significant problems with stereotypes
and other dominant messages that must be overcome with strategic
coalitional efforts.

The two chapters in part IV, "New Relations in New Destinations,"
focus on the South, which has experienced the largest growth in La-
tino population over the last two decades. Latinos in the South, un-
like those in the Southwest, are almost entirely immigrants or their
young children. They also include secondary migrants who have
been deflected from traditional destinations such as Los Angeles
(Light 2006), as well as those who have been directly recruited from
Mexico by employers seeking cheap labor. These immigrants have
increasingly extended their social networks and ventured into desti-
nations where few Latinos had gone before, often bringing their en-
tire families with them. As a result, the visibility and permanence of
Latinos has increased most dramatically, raising concerns about their
impact on local labor markets, schools, hospitals, and other institu-
tions, pointing to perceived economic threat as a primary factor shap-
ing black-Latino relations in new destinations. These two chapters
show that relations tend to be highly contextualized, especially by
region and class. Given the newness of the Latino population, resi-
dents still seem to be in the process of making up their minds about
how to react. Whereas the diverse composition of the Latino popula-
tion in the Southwest, as argued in part II of this volume, has led
Latino and black political elites to seek alliances to strengthen their
political standing, no Latino political elite has yet emerged in the
South to shape discourse toward this population.

In chapter 7, Paula McClain and her colleagues raise important
questions about how native-born black and white Americans are re-

acting to the rapid emergence of the Latino population as well as how these new immigrants perceive their new black and white neighbors. By comparing residents in three locations—Durham, Memphis, and Little Rock—using the 2003 Durham Survey of Intergroup Relations and the 2007 Three City Survey of Intergroup Relations, McClain and her colleagues find that city contexts often make a difference. Whereas whites do not perceive an economic threat from Latino immigration but sometimes feel politically threatened by Latinos, blacks in all three cities feel that they have the most to lose—politically and economically—from rising Latino immigration. Chapter 7 shows us that the South is not homogenous and that black, Latino, and white intergroup relations may vary based on the particular setting, where racial compositions, histories regarding black-white relations, extent of anti-immigration organizing, and types of elected officials each varies significantly.

In chapter 8, Monica McDermott examines the impact of the new Latino immigration on the everyday lives of the native-born population in Greenville, South Carolina, particularly among blacks and whites of varied class backgrounds. She conducts interviews and ethnographic research in and around Greenville over an extended period, working primarily as a traveling sales vendor and living in a racially diverse neighborhood. She finds a general practice of black avoidance of and underlying hostility toward Latinos but highlights the salience of social class in varying patterns of reception. She also finds a nonmonotonic class pattern among black attitudes, the lower middle class being the most positive and the working and the upper middle classes largely negative. McDermott's findings suggest that the black lower middle class could be an important source of support for black-Latino coalitions, particularly in lower-income communities.

Each chapter presented in this volume has major implications for coalition building; the two chapters of part V focus on it. These chapters are concerned with the circumstances and conditions that increase the likelihood that blacks and Latinos will cooperate rather than engage in conflict. In chapter 9, relying on semi-structured interviews and the 2005 University of Chicago Black Youth Project Survey, Regina Freer and Claudia Sandoval Lopez analyze the relationship between racial and ethnic self-identity and willingness to form coalitions across racial boundaries. Contrary to claims that racial pride should be deemphasized in coalition-building efforts, they find

that youth with a strong sense of racial identity are more willing to engage in interracial coalitions than those without. They demonstrate the need to go beyond measuring openness to the idea of collaboration to examining actual coalition behavior in order to theorize the elements that lead to their success. By explaining the role of racial identity in coalition building among black and Latino youth, the authors present a useful pedagogical tool for activists on the ground.

In chapter 10, Sylvia Zamora focuses on community activists aiming to build a black and Latino coalition in South Los Angeles. She draws on participant observations and interviews among coalition staff and members and finds that organizational leaders create a sense of commonality across racial-ethnic lines by deploying an injustice frame rooted in racial, economic, and regional inequality. She finds that in areas where blacks and Latinos hold a similarly disadvantaged social and economic status, community leaders are able to deploy "injustice" frames that emphasize a collective sense of we-ness that can be contrasted to more affluent white communities. Constructing black and Latino commonality based on social and economic injustice that is neighborhood and class based, rather than merely race based, has proven crucial to coalition building among working-class blacks and Latinos in Los Angeles. Taken together, these two chapters provide rich data that can be useful for developing a broader strategy for black-Latino coalitional work in large urban centers across the United States.

Part VI, the final section, focuses on street culture in Los Angeles and Oakland, California. In chapter 11, James Diego Vigil examines South Los Angeles from the perspective of gangs, over a period of eighty years or so. In recent years, the media has gone as far as invoking the specter of ethnic cleansing, based largely on the declarations of a leading police official about a growing black-Latino conflict. Using his personal history and long-standing research on gangs in Los Angeles, Vigil provides an insider account, supported by police records and ethnographic evidence. He shows changing relations among blacks and Latinos with respect to gangs and their neighborhoods, as the result of dramatic demographic changes in the distressed neighborhoods in which they reside. Despite some intergroup friction, he finds that gang conflicts between blacks and Latinos, in the few cases they occur, are rarely race based but instead generally involve other sources, despite media hype to the contrary. A few cases, however, suggest that racial polarization could grow to the ex-

tent that often hostile black-Latino relations in prison can be promoted on the street and as gang conflict becomes increasingly lethal.

In chapter 12, Cid Martinez and Victor Rios further examine relations between black and Latino gang members in the inner city, by comparing ethnographic observations from South Los Angeles and East Oakland, California. They find that avoidance, rather than conflict or cooperation, is the dominant outcome in marginalized urban communities, particularly among youth. Even under ideal conditions, Martinez and Rios find very few cases of cooperation or conflict. Like Vigil, Martinez and Rios argue that conflict is rare and not reducible to race. Rather, neighborhood dynamics, particularly informal neighborhood practices, and a host of other factors shape interracial relations. It is often the convergence of two or more factors that can inhibit gang activity and growth, such as territorial control and affiliation and control of the illicit underground economy and neighborhood, where conflict is likely. Martinez and Rios go on to note the importance of gangs to understanding black-Latino relations in the ghetto and how the tactic of avoidance both acknowledges each other's presence and acts to maintain nonviolent social relations and order in a potentially dangerous environment.

We hope that the chapters in this book shed light on this increasingly important area and suggest pathways for further conceptual and empirical development. We expect that the chapters offer a greater understanding of the paradox posed by the seemingly contradictory relations between blacks and Latinos as well as provide guides for future political action. Analytically, they suggest a possible beginning for how we approach the analysis of minority-on-minority social behaviors. It cannot be taken for granted that as two racialized minority groups, blacks and Latinos will perceive each other as natural allies, as some have predicted, nor necessarily as natural adversaries, as others suggest. Rather, these relations are complex and they can be mediated by the efforts of leaders, among other factors.

The chapters in this volume provide rich data documenting the variety of factors that lead to various outcomes, highlighting the idea that black-Latino relations are context specific and vary over time, space, class, and gender. As two subordinated groups come head to head in large urban centers (and rural areas) of the nation, new possibilities open up, but these opportunities can only be seized when and if the two groups discard the reflexive negative way they view

each other. Politically, we believe that African Americans and Latinos must shed the mainstream view and develop a new way to see themselves, and others in the process.

NOTES

1. Though it may seem insignificant for some, we acknowledge our preference for the term *Latino* rather than *Hispanic*. We use Latino in most cases but also Hispanic when referring to that population as counted in the U.S. census. Although most Latinos or Hispanics prefer to identify with their country of origin, both pan-ethnic terms have become common in recent decades as the population has become more diverse and Spanish-language media, civil rights organizations, and the U.S. Census Bureau have found utility in using a designator that aggregates many national groups (Mora 2009). Our preference for Latino is mostly a conceptual one that we think is fundamental for dealing with issues of relations with African Americans. Our objection to Hispanic is largely based in the idea of hispanicity (hispanidad) as reflecting a European-based national identity rather than an indigenous, black, or mixed identity. This is clear for the Dominican Republic, where elites built a national ideology of hispanicity to distance Dominicans from neighboring Haiti and from blackness in general (Candelario 2007), and in the American Southwest, where Mexican American leaders emphasized their whiteness and sought acceptance as white by virtue of their hispanicity, despite their treatment as nonwhite (Foley 1997; Almaguer 1994).

2. A spate of works appeared on Asian and black relations after the Los Angeles riots and a series of incidents in major U.S. cities, but material on blacks and Latinos is more rare.

3. The Latino population increased from 9.6 million in 1970 (4.7 percent of the population) to 45.5 million by July 1, 2007 (15.1 percent of the population). The Census Bureau projects a count of 102.6 million Latinos in the United States in 2050, approximately 24.4 percent of the population (U.S. Census Bureau 2010), though Emilio Parrado (2011) considers that projection too high because of the overestimation of birth rates.

4. This number is down from the 12 million just before the 2009 economic downturn (see Passel and Cohn 2011).

5. The recent historical context is important in light of the massive anti-immigrant media campaign between 2005 and 2007, when there was a media firestorm of protest against George W. Bush's immigration reform initiative. Glenn Beck and Lou Dobbs greatly increased their audience,

the number of newspaper stories about illegal immigration nearly tri-
pled, and hate crimes against Latinos increased substantially (Kabili
2010). This massive media coverage had an impact on the attitudes of
Americans toward Latino immigrants and even all Latinos (see chapter
1, this volume).

6. Based on self-identity data from the Latin American Public Opinion Proj-
ect, fewer than 2 percent of the Mexican population identify as black or
mulatto. This compares with about 50 percent of the population of Latin
America's largest country—Brazil, from which there has been much less
immigration (Telles 2004). Certainly many enslaved Africans were
brought to Mexico (officially, 200,000), but slavery ended early there,
and their descendants were largely absorbed by the much larger indige-
nous population (Aguirre Beltran 1946). Moreover, Mexico's national
ideology tends to ignore that population in favor of its indigenous and
Spanish-origin populations.

7. In many cases, they represent districts that have substantial numbers of
Latinos, many of whom are unable to vote due to their noncitizen sta-
tus. Thus, although black political power may have reached its height in
the 1980s, there has been a recent resurgence of black elected officials
due to growing voting coalitions in some big cities between African
Americans and Latinos.

8. Julia Preston, "In Big Shift, Latino Vote Was Heavily for Obama," *New
York Times*, November 6, 2008.

9. Available at: http://www.policylink.org/site/c.lkIXLbMNJrE/b.5136695/
k.6346/The_National_Black_Latino_Summit_Solidarity_for_Ameri-
ca8217s_Future.htm (accessed May 11, 2011).

10. We do, though, find some use in the emerging literature about Asian,
white, and black relations, but even here Latinos are distinct (Chang
2000; Min 1996; Yoon 1997; Kim 2008). Latinos are similar to Asians in
that their societal valorization is that of between whites and blacks
(though probably less than Asians) but, as immigrants or perceived im-
migrants, they are also largely excluded from the American body poli-
tic, unlike whites and, arguably, blacks (Kim 1999). On the other hand,
Latinos in general tend to come to the United States without the same
kind of cultural or human capital as some Asian migrants and thus oc-
cupy a very different niche in local political economies.

11. Previously referred to as South Central Los Angeles.

12. Clearly, New York and Chicago have had large numbers of Latinos for
many decades, along with African Americans. The Miami case is still
more distinct, with large numbers of Latinos particularly within the last
five decades, since the beginnings of immigration from Cuba. Unfortu-
nately, we cannot cover the wide geographic scope of this phenomenon
in a single volume.

REFERENCES

Aguirre Beltrán, Gonzalo. 1946. *La Población Negra de México*. México: Fuente Cultural.

Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Alex-Assensoh, Yvette, and Lawrence Hanks. 2009. *Black and Multiracial Politics in America*. New York: New York University Press.

Allport, Gordon. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Perseus.

Almaguer, Tomas. 1994. *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Andrews, George Reid. 2007. *Afro Latin America: 1800–2000*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Betancur, John J., and Douglas C. Gills, eds. 2000. *The Collaborative City: Opportunities and Struggles for Blacks and Latinos in U.S. Cities*. New York and London: Garland Publishing.

Bobo, Lawrence D., Melvin L. Oliver, James H. Johnson, and Abel Valenzuela, eds. 2000. *Prismatic Metropolis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Brown, Michael K., Martin Carnoy, Elliott Currie, Troy Duster, David B. Oppenheimer, Marjorie M. Shultz, and David Wellman. 2003. *Whitewashing Race: The Myth of a Color-Blind Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Candelario, Ginetta. 2007. *Black Behind the Ears: Dominican Racial Identity from Museums to Beauty Shops*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Chang, Robert. 2000. *Disoriented: Asian Americans, Law, and the Nation-State*. New York: New York University Press.

Dahl, Robert A. 1961. *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Durand, Jorge, Edward Telles, and Jennifer Flashman. 2006. "The Demographic Foundations of the Latino Population." In *Hispanics and the Future of America*, edited by Marta Tienda and Faith Mitchell. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

Eltis, Stanley (grant holder). 2010. *Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database*. Available at: http://www.slavevoyages.org/tast/index.faces (accessed May 12, 2011).

Fiske, Susan. 2000. "Interdependence and the Reduction of Prejudice." In *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination*, edited by Stuart Oskamp. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Foley, Douglas. 1997. *The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fraga, Luis R., John A. Garcia, Rodney Hero, Michael Jones-Correa, Valerie Martinez-Ebers, and Gary M. Segura. 2006. *Latino National Survey*

(LNS), 2006 [Computer file]. 2006. ICPSR20862-v4. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. Available at http://dx.doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR20862 (accessed May 12, 2011).

Fredrickson, George. 2003. *Racism: A Short History*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Gay, Claudine. 2006. "Seeing Difference: The Effect of Economic Disparity on Black Attitudes Toward Latinos." *American Journal of Political Science* 50(4): 982–97.

Gordon, Milton Myron. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hayes-Bautista, David. 2004. *La Nueva California: Latinos in the Golden State*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hine, Darlene C., Tricia D. Keaton, and Stephen Small. 2009. *Black Europe and the African Diaspora*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Hutchinson, Earl Ofari. 2007. *The Latino Challenge to Black America: Towards a Conversation between African Americans and Hispanics*. Chicago, Ill.: Middle Passage Press.

Itzigsohn, José. 2009. *Encountering American Faultlines: Race, Class, and Dominican Incorporation in Providence*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kabili, Ben. 2010. "CNN, Latinos, and Brand Values." Blog post. Available at: http://alwayson.goingon.com/2010/CNN-Latinos-and-brand-values (accessed July 25, 2011).

Kasinitz, Philip, John Mollenkopf, Mary C. Waters, and Jennifer Holdaway. 2008. *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kaufmann, Karen M. 2003. "Cracks in the Rainbow: Group Commonality as a Basis for Latino and African-American Political Coalitions." *Political Research Quarterly* 56(2):199–210.

Kim, Claire Jean. 1999. "The Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans." *Politics and Society* 27(1): 105–38.

Kim, Nadia Y. 2008. *Imperial Citizens: Koreans and Race from Seoul to LA*. Palo Alto, Cali.: Stanford University Press.

Landale, Nancy, and Ralph Oropeza. 2002. "White, Black, or Puerto Rican? Racial Self-Identification among Mainland and Island Puerto Ricans" *Social Forces* 81: 231–54.

Light, Ivan. 2006. *Deflecting Immigration: Networks, Markets, and Regulation in Los Angeles*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Logan, John. 2003. "How Race Counts for Hispanic Americans." Paper for American Communities Project, Initiative in Spatial Structures and Processes, Brown University. Available at: http://mumford.albany.edu/census/BlackLatinoReport/BlackLatino01.htm (accessed May 12, 2011).

———. 2010. *American Communities Project* [database]. Produced jointly

by the Initiative in Spatial Structures in the Social Sciences, Brown University, and the Lewis Mumford Center, University at Albany. Available at: http://www.s4.brown.edu/cen2000/data.html (accessed May 12, 2011).

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton.1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

McClain, Paula D. 1993. "The Changing Dynamics of Urban Politics: Black and Hispanic Municipal Employment—Is there Competition?" *Journal of Politics* 55(May): 399–414.

McClain, Paula D., Niambi M. Carter, Victoria M. DeFrancesco Soto, Monique L. Lyle, Jeffrey D. Grynaviski, Shayla C. Nunnally, Thomas J. Scotto, J. Alan Kendrick, Gerald F. Lackey, and Kendra Davenport Cotton. 2006. "Racial Distancing in a Southern City: Latino Immigrants' Views of Black Americans." *Journal of Politics* 68(3): 571–84.

Miles, Jack. 1992. "Blacks vs. Browns." *Atlantic Monthly*, October 1992, pp. 41–68.

Min, Pyong Gap. 1996. *Caught in the Middle: Korean Communities in New York and Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mindiola, Tatcho, Jr., Yolanda Flores Niemann, and Nestor Rodriguez. 2003. *Black-Brown Relations and Stereotypes*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. 1965. *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*. Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Policy and Planning Research.

Murguia, Edward, and Tyrone Forman. 2003. "Shades of Whiteness: The Mexican American Experience in Relation to Anglos and Blacks." In *White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism*, edited by Ashley W. Doane and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. New York: Routledge.

Myrdal, Gunnar, and Sissela Bok. 2005. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*, vols. 1 and 2. New York: Transaction Publishers.

Newsweek. 2007. "Racial Cleansing in Los Angeles." October 23, 2007.

Oliver, Eric J., and Janelle Wong. 2003. "Intergroup Prejudice in Multiethnic Settings." *American Journal of Political Science* 47(4): 567–82.

Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Parrado, Emilio A. 2011 "How High Is Hispanic Fertility? Immigration and Tempo Considerations." *Demography* 48: 1059–80.

Passel, Jeffrey, and D'Vera Cohn. 2011. *Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends, 2010*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.

Pulido, Laura. 2006. *Black, Brown, Yellow, and Left: Radical Activism in Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sawyer, Mark. 2005. "Racial Politics in Multi-Ethnic America: Black and

Latino Identities and Coalitions." In *Neither Enemies nor Friends: Latinos, Blacks, Afro-Latinos*, edited by Anani Dzidzienyo and Suzanne Oboler. New York: Palgrave Press.

———. 2006. *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Cuba*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sidanius, Jim, and Felicia Pratto. 2001. *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, James P., and Barry Edmonston. 1998. *The Immigration Debate: Studies on the Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

Sonenshein, Raphael J. 1993. *Politics in Black and White: Race and Power in Los Angeles*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Telles, Edward. 2004. *Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University.

Telles, Edward, and Vilma Ortiz. 2008. *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Telles, Edward, and Sylvia Zamora. 2008. "African American and Latino Immigrant Occupational Concentration." Unpublished report. Ford Foundation, New York.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2010. "Hispanic Population of the United States." Available at: http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hispanic/hispanic_pop_presentation.html (accessed March 26, 2010).

Vaca, Nicolás. 2004. *The Presumed Alliance: The Unspoken Conflict between Latinos and Blacks and What It Means for America*. New York: HarperCollins.

Waters, Mary C. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian American Dreams and American Realities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wilson, William Julius. 1979. *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2010. *More than Just Race: Being Black and Poor in the Inner City*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Winant, Howard. 2001. *The World Is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy Since World War II*. New York: Basic Books.

Yoon, In-Jin. 1997. *On My Own: Korean Businesses and Race Relations in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zúñiga, Víctor, and Rubén Hernández-León, eds. 2005. *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.